The artist as leader: research report.

DOUGLAS, A. and FREMANTLE, C.

2009

The Artist as Leader
Research Report

Professor Anne Douglas
Chris Fremantle

**On the Edge Research,
Gray's School of Art, The Robert Gordon University**

with

**Performing Arts Labs
Cultural Enterprise Office
Scottish Leadership Foundation**

The Artist as Leader
Research Report

Professor Anne Douglas
Chris Fremantle

On The Edge Research,
Gray's School of Art, The Robert Gordon University

with

Cultural Enterprise Office
Performing Arts Labs
Scottish Leadership Foundation

2009

Acknowledgements

Contents

Introduction/Executive Summary

A foundational principle of organisational leadership is the exercise of certain skills and competencies by individuals with high levels of responsibility.

The focus of this research is the artist as leader, and the artist is sometimes an organisational leader, but may sometimes lead in other ways.

Change is just about the only constant that can be articulated in relation to experience. Leadership is intimately connected with change. Organisational contexts are only one area in which this connection is played out. Leadership by artists in other contexts will inevitably reflect the kinds of creative tactics and strategies that keep us moving and responsive without being consumed by change.

Whilst it may be difficult to say foundational things about the arts, it is not claimed that the arts offer a unique or exclusive model of leadership. The focus on the leadership of artists opens up a complexity around leadership and takes the discourse beyond organisations, skills and competencies.

The other *Artist as Leader* programme (Southbank Centre 2008) has focused on Daniel Barenboim. He demonstrates leadership in at least three ways. Pragmatically, as a conductor, he is the leader of a group of other artists. As a pianist he is a leader through the sheer quality of his work. As co-founder of the West Eastern Divan, established with Edward Said, he leads by demonstrating the role music can have in the political sphere.

Leadership, along with creativity, is increasingly considered to be one of the important drivers of economic success, as articulated in the Cox Review (2005). Most of the Leadership programmes in the cultural sector (Clore Leadership Programme, Cultural Leadership Programme, as well as the new courses at for instance at the universities of Liverpool and London) are directed at the leadership of cultural organisations and place emphasis on the importance of good management skills. The transferring of management skills from business to areas of social leadership has also occurred, though exploring the nuances of this transition falls outside of the remit of this research. Currently the tendency has been to treat arts and cultural organisations as businesses in the sense that much of the literature drawn on is standard Business/Business School material such as *The Mind of the Leader* (Harvard Business Review 2005). This material references, for its evidence, the biographies of business leaders including Bill Gates, Jack Welch, Andrew Carnegie, etc. The discussions focus on issues such as morality, psychology, the relationship between leaders and followers, the difference between leaders and managers, vision and the communication of vision, emotional intelligence, and the development of leadership through mentoring and coaching.

There are some underlying assumptions. The leaders exemplified are all heads of major or multinational corporations. Success is wholly understood to be in economic terms, and often more specifically in terms of driving change to position corporations to achieve higher earnings.

The transposition of this discourse into the public sector is well developed with both the National Health Service and the Department for Education sponsoring Leadership Schools.[1]

---

[1] http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/creativity/images/Emerging%20good%20practice%20in%20creativity_tcm4-378297.pdf published 2006 and http://www.hmie.gov.uk/documents/publication/lflcltc.pdf published 2007 both accessed 21 08 08 http://www.nhsleadershipqualities.nhs.uk/ published 2006 accessed 09 02 09

The further extension of this agenda to the cultural sector seems to take limited account of existing practices of creativity and leadership framed by a range of drivers, not just economic competitiveness. These other drivers might include, for example, concern for the environment.

The objective of this research is therefore to explore examples of these different constructions as they appear in arts' practice and highlight what may be learnt from them.

This research into artistic forms of leadership emerged to some extent from earlier research into forms of art production, in particular the kinds of processes that certain leading edge artists have been undertaking in the public sphere. Supported by current literature into the value of the artist including Kester (2004), Bourriaud (2002), Carey (2005) and Matarasso (1997), this earlier research indicated a particular kind of dynamic in the way that many artists work in public. This might be characterised in pragmatic terms as the artist operating within the public realm undertaking ambitious, large scale projects from small, flexible organisational structures. There seems to be more to these practices than the pragmatic. For example, John Latham and Barbara Steveni, co-founders of the Artist Placement Group (APG), understood that artists are uniquely placed to work with the specificity of local circumstances while simultaneously grasping the meaning and implications for action within different frames of reference.[2] These artists also think about the long term implications of their actions where most other areas of production or service are expedient, solving the problem on hand and in the immediate context.[3] They are capable of working across hierarchies and social groupings, enabling individuals to transcend barriers of discipline, belief and specialism. Some artists working in public specifically place value on, and manifest skills in, constructing dialogue, communication, improvisation and empathy. They articulate critical perspectives, acting as individuals where organisations are more likely to value loyalty and conformity. A handful of individuals who have been reference points in this research exemplify these qualities and they include Suzanne Lacy,[4] Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison, as well as Barbara Steveni and John Latham (APG).

This earlier research therefore suggested the potential for multiple, overlapping positions on leadership created by the diverse roles in which individuals engage with the public sphere exemplified in the arts as they are currently and have historically been practiced.

Summary of Methodology[5]

This research has developed through a partnership between four organisations drawing together the academic, professional arts and business support and training sectors. The four organisations are On the Edge Research (OTE); Performing Arts Labs (PAL); Cultural Enterprise Office, Scotland (CEO) and The Scottish Leadership Foundation (SLF). The conclusions being drawn in this report from *The Artist as Leader* programme represent the views of the authors and not necessarily the views of the partnership or the participants.

The Artist as Leader programme has had two strands. The work undertaken by On The Edge Research, Gray's School of Art, The Robert Gordon University, as the academic partner, has been funded by an Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) Research Networks and

---

[2] See http://www.tate.org.uk/learning/artistsinfocus/apg and http://interrupt.org.uk/symposia/educator/repositioning-art/ for an introduction to the work of APG.

[3] Kester (2004) explores this in relation to the Artist Placement Group (APG) founded by Barbara Steveni and John Latham, a radical experiment in which artists were placed in industry and government with an open brief.

[4] A key case study in this research is Suzanne Lacy, whose 10 years of Oakland projects simultaneously addressed issues of race and youth and the breakdown of communication between youth ad the adult world, by concentrating on particular groups within Oakland focusing on media literacy - their image within the media.

[5] The methodology is outlined in detail in Appendix 1.

Workshops (Creativity) Scheme 2006; a strand of funding set up to respond to the Cox Review 2005 on the nature of creativity in business and the economy. The Lab programme has been funded by Arts Council England's Cultural Leadership Programme, the Scottish Arts Council and the Jerwood Foundation.

The initial research phase formed a network of contributors drawn from arts practice, art organisations and cultural policy sectors who brought their experience to bear on conceptualising artistic leadership. The majority of participants work in Scotland. The network was identified by the partnership by drawing up a long list from their combined knowledge of the field. Through in-depth interviews, participants addressed a framework of five questions, exploring their perceptions of leadership in relation to each individual's situation and role. The questions and the analysis of the resulting material responded to the initial research questions outlined in the AHRC bid.

The questions explored current constructions of leadership and the potential of a different construction informed by the way in which artists work creatively in the public sphere.

The interviews and the articulation of a position within the wider leadership debate were the responsibility of the research funded by the AHRC. This wrapped around the practice-based element of the research - *The Artist as Leader Lab.* Participants were selected from the network and included artists, policy makers and organisational leaders. They shared their practices within the Lab element in order to develop new understandings about the current and potential role of artists in change. The emerging thinking on artistic leadership drawing on the interviews was shared and discussed as part of the Lab process and the wider dissemination of the research, thereby constructing a series of iterative loops that informed the sector on a regular basis and that also informed the research as it was developing.

The research has therefore been disseminated in a number of ways - through the network, through published refereed papers and conference presentations, as web pages on the On the Edge website and through a book chapter.

The Lab was structured between five practising artists from different media and five 'policy makers' including leaders of arts and cultural organisations, civil servants and academics. A number of 'provocateurs,' again drawn from the network, came in for short periods to challenge the shape of the discussion.

The first section of this report establishes the importance of policy in framing the context for artists, in terms of the underlying politics and economics that generate context and opportunities. It argues that in order to retain a degree of autonomy and critical positioning artists need to be conversant with policy developments.

The second section articulates three ways in which artistic leadership is perceived to take form. These three ways have been framed as scenarios through which artists move fluidly in relation to one, two or three of these scenarios depending on their individual approach and critical position. The three scenarios also relate to the opportunities for artists to create work in the context of prevailing policies. This dynamic relationship of the individual to the organisational and to the political may be related to a capacity to be responsive to change.

The first scenario addresses the influence of quality art. The second looks at the role of artists leading within arts organisational practices, e.g. directors of plays, choreographers, conductors all exercise leadership in the production of the work. The third scenario encapsulates artists who have positioned themselves in the political e.g. the artist choosing

to enter civic discourse or using their practice to enable others to participate/to be heard in decision making processes. Each scenario exposes tensions and limitations, the exploration of which is developed in this report.

Summary of Conclusions

The research concludes that cultural leadership should be about more than simply well-run cultural organisations. It should include an understanding of the capacity and value of artists leading through practice. The current and emerging leaders of cultural organisations need to understand the capacity of artists to lead through practice, not least because the leaders are often negotiating with other sectors to involve these artists.

Artists correspondingly need to know how to work with organisations and how to establish parameters that give them sufficient creative, critical freedom. Working with cultural organisations is essential to the visibility of artistic endeavour and is increasingly where challenging opportunities lie for innovative work.

Three questions arise:

1. How can learning and therefore leadership development take place in a relational (rather than a hierarchical) model of artists working with organisations?

2. How can learning and therefore leadership development become critically informed by examples of best practice?

3. How is creativity sustained within the process, allowing for the tension between responsibility and open-endedness?

In answering these questions it is necessary to critique the prescriptive models and techniques that inscribe 'best practice' in other fields and to have the courage and support to 'grow one's own'.

The research highlights a number of areas of further development based on these questions:

1. The need to encourage and develop methods for both artists and cultural organisations to engage with the policy context and to understand how and why opportunities to work in the public sphere are shaped by policy.

2. The need to foster, share and highlight new forms of practice and related evaluation emerging between artists, organisations and public policy. These could take the form of projects that challenge current modalities and address the need for artists, organisational leaders and policy makers to work together.

3. The need to publicly recognise where artists are leading, and have led, through practice; highlighting the relevance of their leadership to wider cultural, social, environmental and economic development.

SECTION ONE:

Policy and the Context for Practice

Introduction: *The Artist as Leader* research questions – leadership and public realm

The purpose in this Report is to set out the research undertaken as part of *The Artist as Leader* programme. The research has been developed with a critical eye to the current iteration of the cultural and creative industries discourse. Leadership is one aspect of this discourse. By mapping policy changes in relation to the arts, we aim to demonstrate the importance of knowledge of policy developments to arts practice as the first step towards developing a critical stance in relation to artistic leadership.

There are a series of key questions that *The Artist as Leader* research programme has set out to investigate. These include, "Who can be leader in addressing new and emerging challenges in the social public realm? Who sets the leadership agenda? What informs leadership thinking? Where is it useful for leadership to be positioned? In what sense can the artist be considered a creative leader? What might a different positioning on leadership (more creative rather than management based) contribute to our understanding of the Nature of Creativity in public life?"[6] These questions frame the interdependency and tension between the arts developed through self organising, self determining principles and the degree to which policy shapes opportunity.

This Section is set out in a number of discrete parts drawing on literature from a variety of sources including academic centres and policy 'think tanks' - Hewison working with Demos; Creative Industries Task Force (CITF), National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA) and Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) as well as the Cultural Policy Collective, among others.

Two key papers, Hesmondhalgh (2008) and Garnham (2005), provide an overview of the discourse on the creative and cultural industries, highlighting some of its critical trajectories. David Hesmondhalgh focuses on the development of creative industries policy with particular reference to the position of the cultural worker. Nicholas Garnham focuses on contextualising the creative industries within the wider knowledge economy arguments.

In counterpoint to these policy focused documents, Ingold & Hallam (2007) present a different perspective drawing on social anthropology to question the language and underpinning concepts of 'creativity' and 'innovation'. They come from the perspective of the individual who inhabits and experiences the world as a process of 'keeping going', a perspective that is closer perhaps to that of the artist than the world of policy.

As artist-researchers the authors have attempted to draw on these diverse sources to construct a narrative, tracing how policy is made, how cultural leadership has emerged, what defines the creative and cultural industries and what are the implications of these definitions for the arts. Through a brief history of development of creative and cultural industries discourse, we also attempt to trace how policy alters with changes of government and through wider social, political and economic forces such as post-industrialisation.

---

[6] These questions formed the core of the successful bid to the Arts and Humanities Research Council's Research Networks and Workshops (Creativity) Scheme, 2006

To aid this understanding, we have developed a timeline of key developments in policy as well as practice. The aim has been to create a lineage for the current creative industries policy context. This timeline is by no means comprehensive, but it begins to indicate the critical points and shifts that have taken place while acknowledging that the process is not linear. Issues move in and out of focus at a given point in time (Appendix 3). Section One should be read with reference to this timeline.

The text and timeline reveal a shift from the arts as patrimony within the broad project of post-war regeneration in which economics plays a limited part, to an increased focus on the arts as an economic force in post-industrial regeneration and the rise of the knowledge economy. At critical moments in this transition, ethical and democratic considerations appear to work hand in hand with economic pressures. This is exemplified in the establishment of a twofold set of priorities by the Greater London Council (GLC) in the early 80s - growing the audience for culture including commercial culture and broadcasting, alongside economic regeneration. Multiculturalism emerged as a major policy consideration during the 80s and subsequently became co-opted as integration in the post 9/11 period. The election of New Labour in 1997 marked a different transition from an understanding of 'cultural industries' as an ethical discourse to a more reduced and single minded focus on the 'creative industries'. At this point there appears to be some ambiguity about the role of the arts in the knowledge economy. Some people focus on creativity as related purely to innovation in technology, rather than artistic development. Others acknowledge that within ideas such as Creative Cities, the development of the arts and intellectual property, also has an economic significance.

In the context of the trajectory of policy development over some 40 years artists take on a mercurial character, and can be seen to work in a range of ways across a spectrum from single mindedness to being quite tactical, as a means of 'keeping going'. We touch on one or two key figures, in particular APG, as not eschewing the challenge of the artist critically connecting with policy.

What is policy and who makes policy?
How is this understanding related to leadership?

Policy on which this work is based is the means by which organisations, and in particular government, direct resources. Garnham (2005) argues that the fundamental question that drives policy is,

> "...why and how should the state intervene?"

And the Modernising Government White Paper (1999) describes policy-making as,

> "...the process by which governments translate their political vision into programmes and actions to deliver 'outcomes' - desired changes in the real world."

A number of different types of people contribute to the formulation of policy. Government (both national and local) publishes public policy written by public servants and approved by politicians. Both politicians and public servants make the decisions about which areas require policy. They are influenced by what they perceive to be public opinion. Academics and policy think tanks contribute to framing the areas (providing the evidence and shaping the issues) that might require policy through papers and provocations. Sometimes these individuals are involved in the writing of policy, but they also have an economic interest – they earn a living through this work. Hewison (2006, p.24) argues that,

"...in the cultural sector a second triangular relationship is also in play. This is between the politicians and policymakers, who set cultural policy and provide the funds, the professionals who use those funds to pursue their cultural objectives, (which might or might not conform to the politicians' intentions), and the public, who enjoy – or decline to participate in – the results."

The policy context is important to arts practice because it informs the nature of opportunities for artists to work in relation to a public. It requires practitioners to be able to operate critically in relation to policies yet it appears not to be well understood. The Cultural Policy Collective[7] (2004, p.4) argue that,

"The reactionary character of social inclusion policy has been widely argued by sociologists and social policy specialists, although their writing seems to have been little read by arts managers. This failure to make the connections between cultural practice and public policy more generally has proved very disabling."

There is not one public policy that shapes the arts. Some aspects of the arts depend on subsidy, such as that provided by the Arts Councils (and in some areas Local Authorities). Other aspects are directly commercial. In addition the arts also enter into financial relationships with other public sectors (driven by policy) including education, health, law and order, and environment, and 'cross-cutting' issues such as regeneration. All of these strands of the economy of the arts are the subject of state intervention. The relationship with the arts is self-evident in the first and the third, but issues such as 'droit de suite' (artists resale rights), intellectual property law, US tax relief on gifts of art to museums, etc., demonstrate that policy affects the commercial arts sectors as much as the public arts sectors.

The issues around public subsidy of culture and the arts are complex, and status is a key factor, and Hewison (2006, p.10) says,

"...as people working in the sector are deeply aware, publicly funded culture does not enjoy the same political legitimacy afforded to education, health, law and order, defence or even sport. This has contributed to the crisis of leadership that the recent government initiative is intended to address."

The arts, which are generally considered of low overall political importance, gain resources by attaching themselves to areas of higher political importance, such as education, health and regeneration. From an economic perspective it is possible to analyse the issue of status and priority and in particular the arts' relationship with other public sectors, often described as 'cross-cutting,' by thinking about 'attachment' and the dialectic that this generates. Hewison goes on to argue (2006, p.22) that,

"Since the 1980s the justification for funding arts and heritage has been framed, first in terms of the economic benefits that it brought through employment, regeneration and tourism, and then in terms of social benefits such as education, social harmony and the reduction of crime."

It is therefore necessary to recognise that it is not just cultural policy that affects arts practitioners, as well as structures, but also policy in a wide range of other areas. Therefore artists and arts managers can find it necessary to be able to articulate the value of their work in relation to policy agendas across the whole public sector.

---

[7] The Cultural Policy Collective is a loose and anonymous group of artists, curators, educators and cultural workers in Scotland www.culturaldemocracy.net

The emergence of cultural leadership

The Cultural Leadership Programme, along with the Clore Leadership Programme, is a key initiative intended to strengthen the sector and increase competitiveness in a global context. Interestingly the Clore Leadership Programme was initiated by a private charitable foundation, the Clore Duffield Foundation in 2002. The Cultural Leadership Programme was subsequently initiated by the UK Government in 2006. It was launched by Gordon Brown, then Chancellor of the Exchequer. Hewison (2006, p.11) uses this moment to highlight the changes taking place,

> "In his early morning speech, however, the Chancellor was emphatic about his commitment to this new project:
>
>> *What we are talking about this morning is something that is not at the margins, but in the mainstream now. It is not a sideshow, it is right at the centre – not just of a modern culture and a modern society, but of a modern economy.*
>
> The reference to the economy was deliberate. Politicians have come to understand that the cultural sector is a key driver of the creative industries, which are growing at a much faster rate than the economy as a whole. The Chancellor was happy to cite Sir George Cox's 2005 review of creativity in business, which reports that the sector contributes 8% of gross added value to the national economy, and is worth £11.5 billion to the balance of trade."

This quote and interpretation clearly places cultural leadership at the heart of an economic agenda. In the following sections the link between culture and the broader economy will be explored and some of the critiques indicated.

How are the creative industries defined?

The Creative Industries Task Force (CITF) Mapping Document (2001) provide the following definition,

> "...activities which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have the potential for wealth and job creation through generation and exploitation of intellectual property."

This definition again emphasises the economic through the development of intellectual property, and the skills required to develop the relationship between the two.

The current widely used definition of the creative industries is advertising, architecture, art and antiques markets, computer and video games, crafts, design, designer fashion, film and video, music, performing arts, publishing, software, television and radio.

This definition conflates the arts with other forms of creativity in culture, again reinforcing the nature of the output of a creative process in economic terms.

The National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (NESTA)[8] which describes itself as a unique and independent body with a mission to make the UK more innovative, has also adopted an analysis of the creative industries focused on the product: creative services, creative content, creative experiences, and creative originals.

---

[8] http://www.nesta.org.uk/about-us/

By focusing on the form of product i.e. service, content, experience and original, NESTA highlights the relationship with the audience or consumer. It also foregrounds the relationship between innovation and intellectual property.

In contrast, many artists and other related roles would place the emphasis in terms of creativity and quality in the process as well as its end result, considering its conceptualisation and articulation and even its power to create change. This difference, in turn, engages the need to understand leadership in the arts differently. Although leadership in terms of the management of production, in relation to client/audience is important, the artistic leadership articulated as an attitude and approach to creativity in culture is perceived by artists and related practitioners to be more than a purely economic endeavour, more than knowledge that is bought or sold within a market. It therefore fits uneasily into, or is only partially accounted for, in the construction of the creative economy offered by the government or grant-giving bodies such as NESTA. A different construction of leadership, that for example takes into account art's critical role in culture, politics and the economy, would have consequences for understanding how artists can act as leaders.

Fundamental to this whole area of thinking has to be the recognition of different understandings to which the word 'culture' refers. Misunderstanding the usage across different definitions is at the root of much misunderstanding of the construction of cultural policy.

From the perspective of the social sciences, 'culture' can mean all intellectual, emotional and behavioural features and their manifestations that are transmitted between generations. Culture can also be defined more tightly within the social sciences as the shared processes and meanings that contribute to social cohesion or conflict. Whether using a broad or tight definition, art is a significant part of culture.

Within the Western tradition there is another, specific, meaning, where the classical arts are synonymous with 'culture'. Implicit within this definition is formal knowledge i.e. access to the arts is restricted to those with the knowledge and skills of particular art forms. 'Culture' meaning 'the arts' is therefore dependent upon forms of patrimony - knowledge owned and passed down through restricted forms of inheritance and learning.

These different meanings of culture become confused and conflated in art practice as well as cultural policy. Understanding the difference is important in terms of how artists and policy makers choose to align themselves.

Since the Second World War 'Cultural policy' has shifted from a focus on the high arts - the 'patrimony' - to a focus on social cohesion, the economic, and relationships with other sectors such as health, education and the environment. With this shift has come a new understanding of the complexity of arts interrelationship with economics and the requirement to handle the relationship critically, as a question of ethics and the democratic process alongside productivity.[9]

The following sections attempt to trace the history of this shift as articulated by Garnham and Hesmondhalgh.

---

[9] Garnham (2005) articulates this important change in the increased sociological attention on culture, "...from the wider "culture turn" in sociology that shifted attention away from the analysis of social structure and class towards the analysis of culture. Social cohesion was now explained in terms of shared belief systems, social domination in terms of cultural hegemony and social struggles were seen not as struggles over economic power and material distribution, but as struggles between sub-cultures and identity groups for recognition and legitimation."

History of the development of the Creative and Cultural Industries

Both Garnham and Hesmondhalgh highlight that the origins of the terminology of 'culture industry' with Theodore Adorno and Max Horkheimer in the 1940s as an ironic terminology used to focus a critique of the conditions of oppression of cultural workers.

Garnham highlights Adorno and Horkheimer's focus on the relationship between the producer and the consumer as a reorientation of the argument from the 'elite/mass' dialectic that had previously dominated.[10]

In making this shift Garnham aligns himself with the later generation of cultural policy theorists who, in taking up Adorno and Horkheimer's thesis, began to focus on the term 'industry' seriously and address the economics of culture as a way of understanding the evolution of the field.[11]

Both Garnham and Hesmondhalgh situate their own critique within the broad tradition of 'political economy'. Hesmondhalgh in particular believes that within the discourse on cultural industries there needs to be a dimension of "ethical and normative questions" (2008, p.1). They argue that the alternative, 'creative industries', appears to sit within a more simplistic economic discourse.

The Artist as Leader research is not focused on the whole cultural creative industries discourse, but rather on the expectations, positions, and actions of artists as a subset of creative practitioners. The primary focus of this research is not with the ability of these practitioners to achieve mass-market success, another key characteristic of this discourse, which would take us deep into questions of the impact of intellectual property, new technologies and the dynamics of risk and reward. Rather the research is concerned ultimately with trying to understand how artists work increasingly in relation with other sectors of society and the different organisational forms that result. These modes and relationships have implications for different understandings of what leadership means in the relationship between creativity and policy and the dialectic that results between freedom and constraint.

Post war subsidy – patrimony, regeneration, accountability

Cultural policy following the Second World War focused on the intrinsic and educational benefits of being exposed to the patrimony of European culture. Following the formation of the Arts Council of Great Britain through to the 1970s it would appear that the arts received public subsidy largely without an emphasis on 'accountability', beyond the process of peer review and the reviews of critics. Garnham (2005) notes another parallel differentiation,

> "Historically there was a clear division between policy towards the arts, based broadly on principles of patronage and enlightenment and on assumptions of an inherent opposition between art and commerce, and policy towards the mass media, and therefore the provision of mass or popular culture, where the main concerns were

---

[10] Garnham (2005) suggests that Adorno and Horkheimer's argument "…is a general shift to the commodification of cultural products and the alienation of the cultural producer as a wage labourer within increasingly concentrated large scale corporations…"

[11] However Miege's critique of Adorno and Horkheimer 's 'culture industry' argument as described by Hesmondhalgh (2008) suggests their articulation is an oversimplification based in a failure to recognise the significance of technological developments on artistic practice that in turn created an emphasis on markets and commodities and not a monolithic 'culture industry' governed by a single process. In fact technological developments created competition for the same pool of disposable consumer income and labour.

> press freedom, pluralism, defence of a national film industry, and the regulation and public service provision of broadcasting on the grounds of spectrum scarcity."

The 1980s saw the emergence of a new tendency. Within the subsidised sector there was a greater emphasis on accountability. In parallel, practices that emerged in the 60s and 70s including community arts, public art, arts in education and in health, amongst others, became subject to policy initiatives in the 80s both from the Arts Councils and from those other policy sectors. This is manifest in the arts both seeking to engage with other sectors, and the production of policy in those sectors that facilitates or drives this. At this point, the interrelationship of arts practice to arts policy is dialectical. Radical and oppositional initiatives in one decade appear to become policy in the next (e.g. the placements developed by the Artist Placement Group (APG), and the 'residencies' funded by the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, in the late 60s and 70s are followed by a massive growth in 'residency opportunities' in the late 80s and 90s leading up to the UK-wide Year of the Artist in 1999).[12] However, it is important to avoid an assumption of cause and effect. Just because artists worked in communities in the 70s does not mean that policies to involve artists in communities in the 80s took up the learning from the work in the previous decade.

Broadly there are a number of interweaving policies and initiatives that affect practitioners working in the public sphere. Foremost of these starting in the 80s is regeneration. But we need to note that the idea of the 'knowledge economy' is emerging at the same time, though it does not seem to have a link with the arts until much later when the 'creative city' and then national 'creativity' policies emerge.

The following paragraphs trace this chronology more carefully.

Cultural Policy: the focus on audiences and economic regeneration

Hesmondhalgh highlights the importance of the priorities that the Greater London Council (GLC) developed in the early 80s, but was unable to implement before it was abolished by the Thatcher Government. According to Landry (2005, p8), it is Nicholas Garnham, on secondment to the GLC, who develops these ideas.

Hesmondhalgh highlights the GLC as a key point in the emergence of what is now recognised as 'cultural policy', as opposed to 'arts policy'. He argues that the GLC focused on two key issues – growing the audience (distribution and exhibition as opposed to production) and economic regeneration. He remarks, "…the use of money to promote 'ordinary' culture was seen as anti-elitist" (2008). In essence the GLC changed the landscape by focusing on the audience, and in particular the recognition of the importance of commercial culture and broadcasting as the primary shaper of "people's cultural tastes and practices" (ibid).

The GLC's second strand, economic regeneration, was focused on boosting the image of the city and it is here that the idea of a 'return on investment' becomes a key feature of the broad discourse. It is worth noting that in fact the GLC did not invent the link between culture and regeneration to develop policy. As noted above, there is a dialectical relationship between practice and policy. There were precedents that the GLC might or might not have

---

[12] Practices can even be rediscovered as radical and oppositional strategies again (e.g. the re-emergence of the Manifesto as a radical tool for artists and highlighted by the Serpentine Gallery's *Marathon of Manifestos* in 2008).

drawn upon, which include the Arts Council of Great Britain's policy on Art in Public Places, which was grounded in regeneration, and the above noted work of APG amongst radical art practices.[13]

By the end of the 80s regeneration became a major recurrent theme across the UK and Europe. Notably Glasgow City of Culture in 1990 is a 'success story' alongside an expanding literature associated with creative cities. This is evidenced by a series of reports from the Comedia Group starting in the late 80s and continuing to the present day.[14] Comedia also published *Use or Ornament?* (Matarasso 1997), one of the key texts on the social impact of participation in the arts.

In attempting to map the development of the key aspects of 'creative industries' policy, the two threads of economic regeneration and the focus on the audience emerge and interweave. More specifically, some radical practices developed in resistance to the 80s Thatcherism become mainstream policies by the end of the 90s.

Another Strand: Multiculturalism

During the 80s, perhaps intertwined with regeneration, there is also an increased discourse around multiculturalism. The riots in British inner cities may have been a stimulus to this development. Certainly by the 90s social inclusion had also become a significant policy agenda in Europe.

Existing policies intended to support and foster a society in which a diversity of cultures and beliefs co-exist were then re-purposed following 9/11 into a policy that seeks to integrate these cultures and beliefs at a fundamental level, with only superficial acknowledgement of difference and alterity. These shifts are described by Jewsbury (2006, p.66),

> "This progression can be mapped onto particular moments in recent British cultural history: those first race laws of the 1970s coincided with a reconfiguration of parts of the Left around new readings of colonialism and culture, and with attempts by the 'New Left' to fuse the Marxist analysis of class with a parallel concern with race. It was not until well into the 1980s that this exercise reached out of the academy to influence mainstream politics, but by the mid-1990s, it had come to predominate, largely displacing earlier assimilationist ideas – such as Norman Tebbit's 'cricket test'. It is crucial to keep in mind a clear differentiation between assimilation and integration in this discussion,…"

and by Kunzru (2006, p.18) in relation to the importance of economics,

> "In the 70s, traditional Keynesianism had ceased to produce good outcomes and by the mid-80s the right was holding all the economic policy cards, so the left retreated to the terrain of word. However, New Labour now feels it 'owns' economics again and diversity can safely be dropped for a more muscular approach to community."

---

[13] APG during the late 70s had initiated placements in both the Scottish Office and the Department of the Environment. The Department of Environment (DofE) Placement in 1975 undertaken by Roger Coward focused on Littleheath in Birmingham and resulted in a publication by the DofE; and the Scottish Office placement saw John Latham focusing on Derelict Land and Urban Regeneration as key parts of his placement.

[14] See Timeline (Appendix 3)

The New Labour project - the ethical to the economic

These various threads all form part of the New Labour project, and from their election in 1997 a series of initiatives across all of these areas can be clearly identified.

Specifically, Garnham (2005) notes the transition from the terminology of Cultural Industries to the terminology of Creative Industries most visibly taking place as New Labour move from opposition to power - a shift away from the critical ethical discourse of the political economy towards a more narrow focus on economism.

> "In the arts policy documents produced by the British Labour Party prior to its 1997 election victory, it used the term "cultural industries" to describe a range of activities with which it was principally concerned (Labour Party 1997). In the government policy documents it produced after victory in that election, the organising term shifted to the "creative industries" (DCMS 1998)."

The formation in 1997 of the Social Inclusion Unit and the Creative Industries Task Force, both located at the heart of UK Government, put in place the key organisational drivers for this shift. The work of Policy Action Team 10 set out the relationship between arts and sports in neighbourhood renewal. Significant arts policies have been developed across education, health and audience development. The Arts Councils encouraged projects linked to audience development, multiculturalism and social inclusion, and initiatives such as Creative Partnerships invested substantial sums to deliver arts programmes in schools.

The Comedia group started developing the 'creative cities' argument in the 80s, but it was only in the 90s that it really gained traction and became mainstream. The idea of the creative city is a progression in the economic regeneration argument. What makes the difference is the foregrounding of creativity in regeneration through linking with the idea of the knowledge economy. The arguments around the knowledge economy raised the value of creativity and innovation.

The central thrust of Garnham and Hesmondhalgh's argument is that, where cultural industries policies had a dimension of 'ethical and normative' discourse, this was lost in the shift to creative industries policies.

> "Unlike many of the economistic approaches that have come to dominate policy formation in recent years, however, the cultural industries approach does not lose sight of issues of power and inequality." (Hesmondhalgh 2008)

It is not the link to the knowledge economy per se, but rather perhaps the urgent economism that results in this lack. Hesmondhalgh goes on to place this in the emerging context of the neoliberalism. Hesmondhalgh (ibid) argues that,

> "…as neoliberalism emerged triumphant, recognition of the importance of cultural markets could soon be turned, in practice, into an accommodation with the market, as the critical elements of the original GLC vision were lost."

The manifestations of creative cluster/creative city policies are usually critiqued as gentrification. The narrative is that artists inhabit areas where property prices are low. They contribute to those areas becoming dynamic and fertile. Other creative professionals move in driving property prices up. The artists are forced to move on. This phenomenon has been described in Glasgow, Edinburgh, London, Berlin and most other cities where strong grassroots arts sectors exist. Hesmondhalgh highlights the role of Richard Florida's book *The Rise of the Creative Class* (Florida 2004) as a banner carrier for creative clusters/creative

cities, but he also notes the work of a number of researchers at Queensland University of Technology in developing this argument. Fundamental to this argument is the flip from 'society shapes us' to 'we shape society because we are innately creative'. [15]

What is more interesting is Hesmondhalgh's reference to the work of Justin O'Connor developing a critique of the argument about localism. O'Connor challenges the oft stated assumption that localism, which might be characterised as knowledge of and valuing of the specific characteristics of place, including distinctive vernacular architecture, independent retailers, and local culture, is one of the key factors in the success of the creative city. He highlights the argument that cities can gain competitive advantage because this local knowledge cannot be codified or exported, and its commodification benefits the locality through both retention of creative people and through tourism.

Whilst it may benefit tourism, O'Connor argues that the key characteristics of successful creative practitioners are not in fact focused around local knowledge, but rather,

> "...on access to a range of formal knowledges, about global markets, about larger companies and about distribution networks." (Hesmondhalgh, 2008).

The importance of formal knowledge will be returned to in the discussion of leadership.[16]

Finally Jamie Peck's (2007) critique of *The Rise of the Creative Class* highlights the fundamental problem with the creative city, "Creativity strategies have been crafted to co-exist with these problems [segregation and poverty], not to solve them."

From creative cities to creative industries

The key move that takes the economic regeneration argument, first articulated by the GLC in the 80s, to the level of national policy, is the argument that the creative industries are the 'key new growth sector' and that they are therefore a source of new employment and export earnings. This argument has become a largely unquestioned cornerstone of much creative industries policy. It is also the cornerstone of the response to global competition and the outsourcing of manufacturing and service industry jobs to Asia and the Pacific Rim.

Both Garnham and Hesmondhalgh highlight a number of reasons for a wide range of those co-opted under the creative industries umbrella to band together under the banner of 'key new growth sector'. The arts become of national importance, neither as patrimony nor as critical citizenship, but as part of an economic engine. The 'commercial' part of this new sector, the media and entertainment industry, are able to claim shared interest with artists and

---

[15] Hesmondhalgh (2008) indicates nuances of the creative cluster/creative city idea, suggesting that there can be versions of this which do not result in 'gentrification', and he points to one example in Australia where creative clusters approaches have made a difference outside major metropolitan centres.

[16] This critique tallies with Richard Sennett. Sennett is writing a history of the changes that have taken place in the concept of public life and he provides an analysis of movement in the city, drawing on amongst others Henri Lefebvre. Sennett describes the development of *quartiers* in cities and comments that those which are now valued for their local colour are the product of the development of 'working class' areas of the city in the 19th century. He argues that it is precisely the cosmopolitan member of the bourgeois who values such areas, precisely because they are not trapped by them.

> "That experience, however, did not belong to all urbanites of the last century equally; it had a class character. As the structure of the *quartier* and neighbourhood homogenized along economic lines, the people most likely to move from scene to scene were those with interests or connections complicated enough to take them to different parts of the city; such people were the more affluent. Routines of daily life passed outside the quartier were becoming bourgeois urban experience; the sense of being cosmopolitan and membership in the bourgeois classes thus came to have an affinity. Conversely, localism and lower class fused. ... The celebration of localism and of the small-scale neighbourhood on the part of well-meaning planners today is an unwitting reinforcement of a new form of domination, a deprivation of the city, imposed on workers in the last century." (Sennett, 2002, p.137)

other small scale cultural producers in making arguments for strengthened intellectual property and copyright legislation. The education sector also moves to centre stage with the apparent need for a new suite of training and skills to support the creative industries. A core aspect of the 'enterprise agenda' in primary and secondary school is creativity. Higher and Further Education have also reoriented themselves around the creative industries.

According to Garnham, the cultural sector and the cultural policy community value the shared interest in intellectual property noted above with the 'commercial' part of the sector because it brings them within the prestigious heading of the 'knowledge economy'.

In fact the grounds for the creative industries being the 'key new growth sector' are challenged by evidence published in Alan Freeman's research (2007) on London's creative sector. This statistical analysis seems to indicate that the creative industries sector, rather than being a 'key new growth sector', is tied to and tracks the financial and business services sector.

> "The key factor assessed is the impact on London's creative industries of the cyclical decline in London's private sector industries, in particular that of Finance and Business Services, which began in 2000." (Freeman 2007, p.4)

But by this stage the 'cultural industries' version of policy, with its concern for the ethical seems to have become thoroughly marginalised and remains only in the academic discourse, in the UK. In contrast the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions specifically reintroduces the ethical into the debate on the creative industries.

The 'knowledge economy' argument

Garnham argues that the origins of the creative industries are two fold: firstly in the analysis of the failure of British manufacturing attributed to a "failure of design"; and secondly to the emergence of the information economy, subject of a Cabinet Office Report (1983), *Making a Business out of Information.*

Garnham develops his argument for the centrality of the information society or knowledge economy in shaping policy development by drawing on several strands of economic theory including Daniel Bell, Joseph Schumpeter, Kenneth Arrow and post-Fordism. Garnham highlights a number of key aspects of these theories: Bell's move from 'physical capital' to 'human capital'; Schumpeter's emphasis on 'innovation' as the driving force in capitalism over 'price competition'; Arrow's argument that information had scarcity value and that market rules could apply to intangible products; and the post-Fordist focus on the service economy and its configurations. Garnham points out that one of the attractions of this model and in particular the focus on 'innovation' is that those who develop successful innovations have, for a period, an effective monopoly.

Garnham rightly highlights that innovation is understood to be technological innovation, driven by entrepreneurs and technologists, which draws on not pure science (let alone the arts) but the applied sciences. When seen from this perspective the creative industries are seeking to develop a case for their economic importance in light of creativity (or more correctly innovation) being driven by entrepreneurs, technologists and scientists.

Once these aspects are put together and connected with the information economy it becomes apparent that the key players are the managers and information specialists in the knowledge economy, as well as the supporting acts – the lawyers, accountants, and management consultants.

Garnham concludes his argument by dismissing the traditional division between access and excellence with the hard nosed reality of economics. Neither access nor excellence is the key to jobs and export earnings, the over-riding priorities for the creative industries.

Where technology generalises the role of labour in many industries, in the creative industries this is countered, in particular in the arts, by value placed on the named creator as an aspect of the added value (Ryan 1992). In this account the Marxist assumption that the individual is subservient to the drive for accumulation is complicated. Creative labour is subservient to the market, and the need for this concrete individual is controlled by 'formatting' and a managed sequence of stars and styles. The individuals, historically and in the contemporary context, who might be identified as leaders, and who apparently influence other practitioners and also audiences, can be read as products being managed. This area of analysis therefore is a critique of the whole cultural leadership argument and is developed further in Section 2.

Another line of criticism overtly directed towards the adoption by the arts and cultural sector of New Labour social inclusion policy, and implicitly towards the creative industries agenda, is developed by the Cultural Policy Collective (2004). They develop an argument for 'cultural democracy,' drawing on the writings of Walter Benjamin in the 30s and Paolo Friere in the 60s. There are resonances with the aspect of the GLC's cultural policy focus on audiences, and there is definitely a shared assumption that priority should be placed on growing culture from the grassroots, prioritising democratic forms of culture.

The central thrust of the critique in this text is that social inclusion, rather than being a process of democratic empowerment, is actually directed at preparing the unemployed and low paid for work, and that this is intended to be achieved through the established arts.

> "For any adequate assessment of inclusion policy, the question 'inclusion into what?' is crucial. For New Labour the answer has been overwhelmingly the world of work." (Cultural Policy Collective 2004, p.6)

The Cultural Policy Collective's focus on the 'grassroots' looks to strong traditions of workers education and social programmes as a means to challenge both the economic focus of current policy and also the dominance of established arts structures. They argue that the real grounds for growing cultural democracy lies in a focus on public libraries, social documentary and access to broadcast media, amongst other fields. They develop a trenchant criticism of arts practitioners and managers for delivering programmes that, rather than seeking the freedom of the excluded, actually build the structures of oppression.

> "As we argue, cultural democracy is best defined by political arguments addressing inequalities in cultural provision and calling into question the rule of the marketplace in our daily lives." (ibid, p3)

Creativity as 'the way we work' not 'what we produce'

Ingold & Hallam (2007) as anthropologists challenge the understanding of creativity within the policy discourse, in particular the idea that creativity and innovation are interchangeable terms. They challenge the conflation of creativity with economism opening up the possibility of a different set of relations between the arts, culture and economics -

> "...the fields of business and organisational management where creativity is seen as the key to commercial success, and in education, which is supposed to produce the kinds of creative individuals who will go on to succeed in a knowledge-based economy." (ibid, p.2)

Ingold and Hallam seek, at a number of stages, to flip mainstream assumptions. The first and most important of these is to move priority from the term innovation, to the term improvisation. They argue that innovation is essentially looking back on a process and seeing it retrospectively as 'innovative'. They note that, in mainstream assumptions, improvisation is taken to be a less valuable characteristic associated with 'make do' and 'the everyday'. They seek to reposition this differentiation along a different axis, between improvisation as 'process oriented' and innovation as 'product focused'. This is a very important move and is central to their whole approach.

They argue that the characteristics they have attributed to innovation (radical disjuncture, attributed to one individual, instantiated) arise from a temporal interpretation: looking back and seeing innovation through the lens of the product. In looking forward improvisation becomes the key. They quote Edward Bruner (1993 cited in Ingold & Hallam, 2007, p.2), who argues that people

> "…construct culture as they go along and as they respond to life's contingencies."

Ingold and Hallam set out four characteristics of improvisation.

> "First, it is *generative*, in the sense that it gives rise to the phenomenal forms of culture as experienced by those who live by them or in accord with them. Second, it is *relational*, in that it is continually attuned and responsive to the performance of others. Third, it is *temporal*, meaning that it cannot be collapsed into an instant, or event a series of instants, but embodies a certain duration. Finally, improvisation is the *way we work*, not only in the ordinary conduct of our everyday lives, but also in our studied reflections on these lives in fields of art, literature and science." (ibid 2007, p.1 authors' emphasis)

Creativity is protected, for economic reasons, through copyright. This creates a tension between creativity as a generative process and creativity as a protected and isolated product.

Ingold and Hallam argue that it is precisely anthropology's role to challenge

> "…the polarity between novelty and convention, or between the innovative dynamic of the present and the traditionalism of the past, that has long formed such a powerful undercurrent to the discourses of modernity." (ibid, p.2)

This corresponds to the experience of *The Artist as Leader* research. Whilst the retrospective view of particular artists' practices may make them appear as innovative, the wide range of practitioners interviewed talked about hunches, exploring, direction finding, working with people and values.

It is important to note that Ingold and Hallam's argument around creativity and improvisation relates to human experience, not just the experience of artists and creative workers.

Ingold and Hallam go on to revisit their key attributes of improvisation to highlight the way this 'looking forward' changes the perception of reality.

> "Because improvisation is generative, it is not conditional upon judgements of the novelty or otherwise of the forms it yields. Because it is relational, it does not put the individual against either nature or society. Because it is temporal, it inheres in the onward propulsion of life rather than being broken off, as a new present, from a past that is already over. And because it is the way we work, the creativity of our imaginative reflections is inseparable from our performative engagements with the materials that surround us." (ibid, p.3)

But it is important to note at this stage that this 'looking forward' is not to deny the past and tradition, but precisely to encompass it. It is not a 'looking forward' from a fixed point, but rather a looking forward as a trajectory in which the point of looking forward is not fixed, but rather accumulated. It is in Ingold & Hallam's terms a *"carrying on"* (ibid, p.7 authors' emphasis).

A key function of their argument is to break down the assumption of who is creative. They argue that it is not just the architect who is creative in conceiving of a new form for a building. The builder must improvise in order to construct the building and he too is creative.

From the perspective of the artist this is a difficult argument. Artists will argue that creativity is not simply working through something. It is manifest in defining the 'field of play', the selection and structuring of 'figure-ground' relations, as well as the ability to analyse, synthesise and edit. But Ingold and Hallam fully recognise the centrality of skill and judgement. They do not suggest that just because everyone is creative, everyone is equally creative, or that all creativity is of the same character.

They develop another dimension of this argument, one which does not enter into policy discourse. They align human creativity with the essential creativity of nature. For them the deep rooted assumptions of design, consolidated by genetic science, and the constant attempt to allocate realities either to nature or to nurture, is a fundamental construction of modernity which misses the complexity of the process. They argue that it is a misunderstanding of organic processes if it is assumed that the design exists in the genetic code, which is then simply realised.

Conclusions

Section One started with aligning leadership with the discourse of the creative and cultural industries. It also started with the research questions:

> Who can be leader in addressing new and emerging challenges in the social public realm? Who sets the leadership agenda? What informs leadership thinking? Where is it useful for leadership to be positioned? In what sense can the artist be considered a creative leader? What can a different positioning on leadership (more creative/ artistic than management based) contribute to out understanding of the Nature of Creativity in public life?

It traced the issues through the development of cultural policy from the post war period until the present, considering cultural policy as a significant shaper of the opportunity for artists to work. This short history of the development of cultural policy and specifically creative industries discourse is relevant because without knowledge of the policy context, it becomes difficult to understand what a different construction of leadership might look like - one that takes the artist's work and critical positioning as its starting point.

The chapter reveals a trajectory in which policy increasingly values art for economic reasons, with very little acknowledgment of the reality of the range of roles that art plays within broader understandings of culture and as a presence within a political economy. This trajectory suggests that any construction of artistic leadership would need to embrace a more complex set of artistic positions in which artistic endeavour becomes more than the valuing of a certain form of production in monetary terms.

What is the evidence for such a counterpoint? Section Two articulates an alternative position drawing on the empirical evidence of the Artist as Leader interviews and Lab experience.

SECTION TWO: Three Scenarios

Introduction

The analysis has resulted in the identification of three ways that artists are involved in leadership. These three ways are framed as scenarios.

The terminology of scenarios also highlights the need for attention to the internal dynamics of a scenario: the understanding that each scenario can 'play out' in a different way. The reason for scenarios playing out differently lies in context, actors and ambitions. The scenarios also overlap with each other – they are not mutually exclusive. Many of those interviewed described experiences that relate to all three scenarios.

The first scenario addresses *the influence of quality art.* It has been generally acknowledged through the interviews that particular artists exert influence over other artists as well as the wider culture.

The second scenario looks at the role of artists *leading within arts organisational practices.* It is evident that within the performing arts individuals have a key role in leading – directors of plays, choreographers, conductors, all exercise leadership in the production of the work.[17] Variations in the visual arts focused particularly by the terms 'artist-led' and 'lead artist' are explored.

The third scenario encapsulates artists who have positioned themselves in the political. In an anthropological definition, the political is the means by which groups organise themselves to make decisions within power relations.[18] The aesthetic is 'coming at' the world in a particular way - a self-conscious forming of meaning and experience.[19] In this scenario the political and the aesthetic are profoundly interconnected. There are different forms such as the artist choosing to enter civic discourse or using their practice to enable others to participate/to be heard in decision making processes. One example of this third scenario, highlighted by the Southbank Centre's Artist as Leader programme, is Daniel Barenboim. As a performer he fits the first scenario in terms of being an outstanding musician. As a conductor he fits the second in terms of being leader of a group of people to make a work. As an artist he fits the third in terms of appropriating a known construction - the orchestra and reframing it to engage a political process, the West Eastern Divan, an orchestra of young people in the Middle East established as Barenboim says, "…the Divan was conceived as a project against ignorance" (quoted by Vulliamy 2008).

Throughout this process a range of positions are described, and through this the tensions and contradictions that emerge are highlighted.

The conclusion of this discussion develops the limitations, and points where the role of the artist as leader in terms of these scenarios appears to break down. Finally some indications of directions for future work are set out.

---

[17] In fact conductors are referenced in the business leadership discourse, and not infrequently drawn into business schools to articulate their leadership qualities. Understanding Leadership, WCH Prentice, reproduced in Harvard Business Review on The Mind of the Leader, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, 2005

[18] "Politics revolves around what is seen and what can be said about it, around who has the ability to see and the talent to speak, around the properties of spaces and the possibilities of time" (Ranciere 2004, p.13)

[19] "Aesthetics refers to a specific regime for ways of doing and making, their corresponding forms of visibility, and possible ways of thinking about their relationships" (Ranciere 2004, p.10)

Scenario One: leading through the work

All the participants in the research agree that quality art has influence. It influences the way (through all the senses) the world is perceived, and lives, emotions and experiences are understood. It is intuitively understood that many artists have led – Shakespeare, Cezanne, Beethoven, Joyce – the canonical version of the histories of the arts is made up of their names.

Lucy Mason says:

> "For me, the artist has always been the leader – actually.   That is the starting point. Maybe that is naïve, but then I suppose there is a question about, "What kind of leadership?" and I think…you can be a leader without even realising it … the impact of [making] a book, or reading or seeing something – that is an impact that an artist has beyond expectation or even knowledge." (2008, 29:58)

Within *The Artist as Leader Lab* and surrounding research it was striking the range of artists that the participants acknowledged as influential in these terms: James Marriott by Ken SaroWiwa, Wole Soyinka, Chinua Achebe and Athol Fugard as well as APG; Janice Parker by Walter Scott's *The Antiquary* and Royston Maldoom; Emma Davie by Rob Fairley's Room 13; Chris Fremantle by Rodchenko and Vaclav Havel; Francis McKee by Superflex; Deborah Keogh by Erin Pizzey's *Scream Quietly*; Guyan Porter by Caravaggio; Kirsten Lloyd by Artur Zmijewski; Jim Tough by Mark Twain's *Huckleberry Finn*; John Wallace by Stravinsky and Miles Davis; Susan Benn by Sylvia Crowe; Willie Payne by Patrick Ellon Fraser; Jude Kelly by Daniel Barenboim. By acknowledging that artists lead through 'the work,' the transformational impact of the practices of certain key individuals in opening up a new set of possibilities, is recognised.

There is a danger in this formulation of leadership because it can mythologise the individual without seeing that the potential for leading comes about because of the relationship between the individual, the moment in time, the cultural context and existing social systems, including prevailing policy. Nonetheless it is important because within the interviews the impact of works of art is almost consistently the starting point for leading through practice.

There are three concerns about the influence of the individual artist seen out of context.

Firstly, as noted in Section One, these individuals, dead or alive, are managed within an economic system which structures genres, stars and styles into fashions. This is achieved through the infrastructure of commercial and non-commercial organisations. So long as it is not possible to distinguish between fashion and art, this remains a specific challenge to any construction of the artist as leader.

Secondly, the canonisation of artists also raises the question of who is excluded from being able to lead in this way. For example, Art & Technology, a radical programme connecting artists with industry developed by the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (1967-1971) involved almost exclusively white male artists. During the same time period the Women's Liberation Movement develops a critique of the male dominated art world. This is evidenced by Linda Nochlin's article "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" (1971) and perhaps epitomised by the Guerrilla Girls' *Do women have to be naked to get into the met. museum?* (1989). In fact there may well be a relationship between certain forms of artistic leading and exclusion and oppression. Within *The Artist as Leader* research this was

evidenced by Lacy talking about Jane Addams and by James Marriott talking about the influence of Ken Saro-Wiwa on the members of PLATFORM.[20]

The third concern focuses on the potential for the artist's ability to create an aesthetic to become part of an authoritarian politics. This is manifest throughout human history, but was particularly evident in the 20th Century in Germany and Italy and also in the Soviet Union.[21]

In acknowledging that the making and experience of art is profoundly linked to context, the question arises as to who is allowed to lead at any particular point in time, who is allowed to lead in a particular situation, as well as the reach of leadership.

Andrew Senior takes up this idea and also challenges it.

> "If I have been asked fifteen years ago about how I would have perceived the notion of an artist as leader, it would have been about those things – challenging, stimulating, creative – because that is how I would have seen an artist as working. But I think my experience over the past fifteen years has changed in two very fundamental ways.
>
> One is the fact that I think that we have got to understand artists also in the context of the commercial arena – not in terms of actual commerciality per se, but just in the way in which they have to operate because they have to make a living; they have to feed their families and pay the mortgage and all those sorts of things. The economics of the world affects anybody.
>
> At the same time, the other thing which I am very conscious of is that [in seeing this notion of challenge], we have to be very careful then about how we go about taking that into other societies". (2008, 12:01)

Senior is arguing that this first scenario is an insufficient or incomplete picture, particularly from his perspective of working with the British Council to develop the Creative Industries in a wide range of cultural contexts. It is not appropriate to understand the artist as leader simply in terms of the artist as someone who challenges, stimulates and is creative. It is necessary to take account of the economics, and more specifically the entrepreneurship of artists. This context has been fully explored in the discussion of UK policy development in Section One. Senior suggests that practice cannot be comprehended without an understanding of an economic and policy context.

It is also necessary to recognise the importance of Senior's last point. The arts are in many respects specific to particular societies. It is necessary to be cautious of translating Anglo-Saxon assumptions of leadership to other cultures. Assumptions about the role of artists and the role of the arts to challenge may be substantially different.

Senior offers a further challenge. He argues that people who do not necessarily make the greatest art, may be very important leaders in the arts.

> "I actually don't think that an artist who is also leader is necessarily a great artist. … Because I think that sometimes it is the politicisation of the individual. They may be an artist, but actually it is the edge of understanding what they can do politically, which allows them to move forward and become a leader in that context." (2008, 13:19)

---

[20] PLATFORM works across disciplines for social and ecological justice. It combines the transformatory power of art with the tangible goals of campaigning, the rigour of in-depth research with the vision to promote alternative futures www.platformlondon.org .

[21] The authors develop this argument further in their forthcoming essay The Artist as Leader in *Common Work: Art and Social Engagement*, 2009, Oxford: Peter Lang

Senior, in mentioning politicisation, raises the question of who has the power to define excellence in art – a recurring issue.

The question remains - how do artists, organisational leaders and policy makers learn about the artistic process and how do they learn about the policy process? The importance of learning across these different sectors is highlighted by Angela Saunders, who is Head of Participation and Advocacy in the Culture Division of the Scottish Government.

> "When you say you are a policy maker … sitting there with people [managers and funders] and trying to encourage them to deliver their policies and services by working in different ways and with different interventions [e.g. culture and the arts], and if they then [come to me] and say, "Well, why should we do this?" Frankly, [I can't say] because it leaves some people smiling and … I could also say "it is good for them," but that on its own is not enough reason, and slightly patronising! It's reasonable for people to look for evidence and evaluations of what has worked well.... we are only talking about recording activities and outcomes. How you are doing it and what you are learning and what the people you are working with – whether they are funders or community, whatever – what they are telling you about what you are doing..." (2008, 19:35)

Scenario Two: leading and organisations

Artists, particularly in the performing arts, work together and with others in the development of the practice and pieces. This practice requires an individual to bring leadership – a vision, team working skills, emotional intelligence, communication skills, etc – to realise a work. There are people (viz. participants in the Lab including Matt Hulse, Gill Robertson, and Janice Parker) whose work is dependent on working with other people and also dependent on one person driving the initiative.

Lucy Mason suggested that leadership in the arts is about more than individual acts of creativity,

> "Take someone like Janet Smith. She is artistic director of Scottish Dance Theatre, so she encompasses a role which is about having a vision for her ten dancers, wanting their development artistically, technically, stylistically, aesthetically, to be catered for through a variety of different voices coming in, to make work on that group of ten bodies and she is very, very, good at bringing in different people to create different works of art on those people with different collaborators, musicians, designers. She also choreographs herself. …I suppose that is an example of artistic leadership being more than about one act of creativity. It is about an overarching vision." (2008, 38:04)

But Lucy Mason also raised a caveat about artists and organisational leadership.

> "I think there is this tension about the extent to which the artist can, should, wants to, lead within an organisational structure." (2008, 31:01)

This issue, of artists who demonstrate leading through their practice, and the choices about entering organisational leadership roles, was highlighted by two Lab participants. Hulse and Parker particularly articulate the tension between being an artist and leading within organisations. They went on to articulate avoiding (even ducking) opportunities to become organisational leaders.

Parker said,

> "…one of the things that's been important for me is to keep that position of being an independent artist, and I've really struggled not to set myself up as a company – which makes it sometimes really difficult to get funding, visibility, support network and co-workers." (2008, 40.55)

Reflecting on Lab One in January 2008, Hulse said,

> "By the end of the week John [Wallace] was saying, "What we need at the RSAMD [Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama] is a creative organiser like Matt" and I thought, "Oh, no!" You know, it is really not how I see myself or where I want to go, but I could see that others would see that as a really strong aspect of what I was doing and there was a slight feeling of panic. I was thinking, "Help! I am getting sucked into, or I am merging into this role despite actually it being something that I might want to resist." (2008, 39:29)

John Wallace, Principal of RSAMD, himself described the challenges of taking the skills and qualities of artistic practice into an organisational role.

> "I have to make a big leap within myself to try and see how I bring the talents that I had as a performer into this, and I 'perform' in the same way." (2007, 0.30)

Jude Kelly articulates it in a slightly different way:

> "For my own part, when I came here two and a half years ago I invited a number of artists to be in residency in order to create viruses. That is how I view it – that the artist is a virus which needs to be spread inside an organisation. I suppose I am a virus as well – a battle between myself and myself. You know, as the Artistic Director – there are certain expectations about how you will operate; and as an artist, there are other expectations of how you operate. I am much truer to myself as an artistic director if I operate as an artist than if I try to operate as a bureaucrat." (2008, 15:100

Suzanne Lacy (2007) describes being invited by the Mayor onto Almeida County's Education Panel and then resigning in order to be free as artist to avoid representing an institutional position.

> "I was invited to continue working on police training and I certainly could have had a job in education running the art programme for the Alameda County Office of Education. Instead, I decided to stop and reflect for the next period of time on what it was, precisely, that the Oakland projects were."

In this cluster of positions there is also Robert Laycock who, as Director of Helix Arts[22] in Newcastle upon Tyne, is both organisational leader and artist, and insists on keeping these discrete. He did not even articulate being an artist as being particularly influential on his organisational leadership.

It is clear therefore that the relationship between individual practice and organisational leadership is by no means straightforward. It is not linear – artists who manifest the ability to lead do not necessarily want to enter positions of organisational leadership. Some artists who

---

[22] Established in 1983, Helix Arts is an independent charity specialising in the development of high quality arts based projects with socially excluded groups delivered in partnership with the public and voluntary sectors: www.helixarts.com

do enter positions of organisational leadership believe that their practice as artists remains vital, whilst others keep these aspects discrete.

There are contradictory aspects to leading. One apparent defining characteristic of leading is that 'the buck stops here'. This is an important factor in understanding the role of the leader, but it presents particular challenges for the artist as leader. Bob Last responded to this point in Lab 2 by commenting that he experiences the tension between the responsibility of leadership (in his case as producer, being responsible to investors for multi million pound film budgets) with the need to maintain the space for "openness and fragility" (Last 2008) required for making art of quality. This tension lies at the centre of the issue for many artists interviewed. Parker and Hulse both indicate that in their judgement they need to avoid organisational leadership roles to preserve 'openness and fragility'. Wallace describes the big leap to find how to bring being a "performer" to leading an educational organisation.

Barbara Steveni also makes this point when she said,

> "They want to manage risk, but they will not take risks. They will not leave it free enough. So, my big question is, how can the artist-practitioners protect the initiatives and their creativity in these very important places like in the social and political contexts? That has always been my concern." (2007, 10:49)[23]

Approaching this point from a different direction, Goto breaks down the underlying assumption that leading and following are different (Goto, 2007). She describes the experience of working with others, in her case other disciplines, as a reciprocal process of leading and following. In her articulation the artistic process mimics experiences of life in which at different points an individual might drive a process and also depend on others to pick up the leading role at other moments. Goto specifically talks about the Nine Mile Run project,[24] inviting scientists to visit the site of a polluted stream that developers were planning to culvert. The scientists led an investigation of the site, drawing attention to the bug life in the stream. As a result of this Goto and her partner, Tim Collins, were able to develop an environmental restoration project. This highlights the importance of understanding 'lead' as a verb rather than as a noun, i.e. it is part of a process rather than an attribute of a role. Tom Shakespeare illuminates this, and reflects back to the positions that have been articulated throughout this discussion when he said,

> "Art is a way of looking at the world rather than a job title" (2008, 21:41)

The contradiction between the need for leaders to take responsibility, and the need for leading to be a process, rather than a status, remains an unresolved and important tension.

Variations on a theme

If artists lead, and are sometimes led, in groups to make work, then it is also necessary to pay attention to the context of this leading, whether in the context in drama – the theatre – or the context in the visual arts – the gallery. Jude Kelly articulates a concern with the relationship between the artist and the organisation as the 'means of distribution' and this is a recurrent theme in her interview:

---

[23] Steveni proposed a network to *Reposition the Artist in the Decision-Making Process of Government*, with the specific objective of protecting artists' initiatives, at the inaugural meeting of ELIA (European League of Institutes of Art and Design) in Amsterdam, 1990

[24] Nine Mile Run Project (1996-9) Studio for Creative Inquiry, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, www.cmu.edu/studio/projects/nmr.html

"...the artist's practice has also got to be the vehicle by which it is practised..., and if you separate them out, what you end up with, what always happens, is that the artist is excluded; the institution constructs itself and that it mediates the artist back into itself on its own terms. And that mediation presents to the audience a disjuncture because they perceive the artist differently from the way the artist portray themselves if they have first-hand engagement." (2008, 14:26)

The development of the artist's practice as a vehicle is manifest in the example of 'artist-led'. 'Artist-led' is a self-selected term used by initiatives and organisations in the visual arts that seem to be characterised by the desire to construct the means to make/distribute work where apparently the existing vehicles (i.e. galleries, dealerships, public art agencies, studio providers) are not fit for the purpose.

They span from the very pragmatic, such as self-organised open studios, to the more radical and/or political articulation of a set of critical ideas. Kirsten Lloyd, Curator at Stills and Lab participant, articulates this in relation to that organisation:[25]

"I mean a different sort of public space where we are actually having a lot of different activities (because, as you know, we have residencies, we have education programmes and things like this) and what does that mean to an organisation such as ourselves. Do we keep all those activities very separate, or do we try to integrate them? What kind of experiences do we want people to have when they come to Stills? Do we want them just to come in and see an exhibition and leave? Or do we want them to engage in some way? How can we build a 'community of interest' around what it is that we are doing and not just be about us telling people what we think, which is the kind of art that I do not like, if you like, and build the space that more reflects the artistic practice that we are dealing with, which is building a space for consideration and thought." (2008, 17:48)

This again relates to Jude Kelly's idea of the practice and the vehicle for the practice, but it grows it apparently in the direction of being more than a vehicle for a practice into being a vehicle for multiple practices.

Guyan Porter is a visual artist and founding President of the Scottish Artists Union.[26] The Union represents the emergence of a different form of leadership in the arts. It is a group of people with a common interest self-organising in order to be able to be critical of the received values and to be pro-active about change. In his interview Porter describes the formation of the Union as a particular response to the circumstances of visual artists:

"If you work in isolation then you are at the mercy of other people telling you what to do. You are at the mercy of structures that surround you" (2007, 50:26)

Porter has a particular take on the term leadership which prioritises its role in activity, and resists a focus on structures:

"Leadership is very much for me about avoiding hierarchies: not about creating new systems but finding new ways to create new projects and new work, to look at things differently." (2007, 7:43)

What is interesting about some formulations of 'artist-led' in the visual arts is that the issue of the individual leader does not seem to be foregrounded.

---

[25] Stills is an arts organisation with a focus on photography and lens based media, providing a gallery, production facilities and social space;.and programming exhibitions, residencies, education and training. www.stills.org
[26] www.sau.org.uk

Lloyd highlights Transmission, an artist-led gallery in Glasgow. She suggests that, although it is a 'client funded organisation' of the Scottish Arts Council (SAC), the Committee of Transmission resists participating in many of its hierarchies and policies.[27] In Lloyd's judgement it has retained its character as artist-led, and has fended off the pressures to be overtly articulate about education and organisational principles such as staffing-structures and audience development policies. This can be understood in terms of an organisation which prioritises 'openness and fragility' over policy driven responsibilities.

Lloyd highlights the artist-led initiatives as constantly evolving in order to be able to challenge received values, whilst also simultaneously becoming perceived as important stepping stones on certain career trajectories.

> "Artist led culture… gave us a collective model and a space model as well – building a space for discussion and consideration and leading through that." (2008, 12:01)

> "I think [artist-led culture] is quite Darwinian in the way it functions, but I think that, at the moment, it has become quite institutionalised. It has become a career step. … Anything new like this becomes something that is used by artists in order to get to a particular point, …

> …what is interesting in Scotland is the relationship … between artist-led groups and publicly funded organisations and institutions and an emerging market in the visual arts; and how these spheres are very similar. How the landscape is very, very, similar.

> …. that you can be involved with an artist-led collective as a sort of stepping stone almost. Yes, it's a very strategic way of dealing with the art world. …

> … Interestingly, some artists are saying that they are absolutely not interested in public funding – and also not selling. I think that is fascinating. That is an acknowledgement that is nice sometimes to do your own thing and not be bothered about consequences and really have that sense of just doing it and not being responsible or ethical, necessarily, being allowed to be elitist – and valuing that." (2008, 100:23)

Clearly this suggests that in some cases artists are self-consciously managing their relationship with the economic dynamics highlighted in Section One. Lloyd indicates that artists are consciously engaging with specific structures and roles in order to construct a narrative of development aimed at positioning themselves in the marketplace (whether public sector or commercial).

Another construction for understanding these developments is 'elitism' and this was discussed in Lab 2. Elitism has in recent years become a bugbear in the cultural sector, seen as a negative characteristic. A different understanding of elitism, closely connected groups building upon each others' knowledge and networks, might be in terms of the importance of creating concentrations of energy that allow for development. Elitism might be gathering round a common purpose temporarily, and having the potential to lead to new forms of practice.

This scenario acknowledges the artist leading other artists as a necessary form of organisation in the development of certain kinds of work. At its clearest perhaps it can be exemplified

---

[27] Transmission describes itself on its web site (www.transmissiongallery.org) as : "Transmission was set up in 1983 by graduates from Glasgow School of Art who were dissatisfied with the lack of exhibition spaces and opportunities for young artists in Glasgow. …The gallery is managed by a voluntary committee of six people. Each member of the committee serves for up to two years and is then replaced. Transmission evolves under the influence of each successive committee member and continues to draw in a young peer group as active participants."

by the interdependence between the performing artist and the institution of the theatre or concert hall, though this is one of a raft of different relationships including artist-led initiatives. It is in this scenario that the artist and organisation are at their closest and where forms of organisational leadership and artistic leadership are most likely to intermingle. It is therefore also important to explore artists' resistance to this becoming a conflation by avoiding the possibility of becoming subsumed into organisations. It is particularly important to note the way that artists draw the relationship between their form of practice and that of organisations.

The Artist Placement Group (APG), whose work will be returned to in scenario three, notably developed a language and process for how artists might work in industry or within government and the civil service. Their formulation pivoted around a number of key points. The artist was described by Latham as an 'incidental person' i.e. a free and, in the context of industrial and bureaucratic organisations, unspecialised agent.[28] APG's aim was to negotiate placements for artists within organisations on an equal footing with other employees. In the case of the placements within government this meant that they were on an equal footing with Civil Servants. Although at least one placement lasted three years, all started with a Feasibility Study, a period of between six weeks and three months. The artist undertook this on an 'open brief'. This 'open brief' specified the context, but not the outcomes. The result of the Feasibility Study was in the form of proposals by the artist as to what they might do during a placement within the organisation. This approach meant that there was the possibility to continue the relationship within mutually agreed plans acknowledging that some kind of understanding had been reached about the role of the artist in that specific context. APG's process stands in stark contrast to most of the ways in which artists currently work with organisations in publicly funded projects where there is no possibility of non-action or even of mutually agreed action because the grounds of action have been predetermined in advance of the artist's appointment. This predetermination is made by the funder and the perceived opportunities and challenges of the host organisation.

In conclusion one of the key points to emerge is that in focusing on the artist as leader, leading frequently needs to be understood more as a verb than noun - different people might lead at different times. Leadership is less often articulated as the attribute of a particularly talented individual. There is a threshold between leading necessary for the practice, and moving into organisational leadership. There are challenges to making that move and challenges in not doing so. Both highlight the importance of drawing a relationship between the artist and the organisational in ways that are effective. At one end of the spectrum where the artist is the organisational leader, the skills and competencies arguably conflate with classic leadership skills. At the other end, leading artists and groups such as APG have gone well beyond classic leadership skills (though they do manifest them) forging and testing alternative practices.

Scenario Three: contributing to the public sphere

In this scenario the leading through practice is articulated as the artist moving beyond what is expected in terms of the conventional production of quality art works to re-imagining and reconstructing the understanding of what art is. This re-imagining or reconstructing can address any of the dimensions of art: what can be art, who makes it, or who or where or how it might be experienced, or how and why it might be distributed, or perhaps most importantly how it might relate to other things in the world including policies and practices in other

---

[28] Barbara Steveni notes that the 'incidental person' was a term developed by John Latham and was not used in negotiations except where people were familiar with Latham's thinking.

sectors and disciplines. In particular this scenario addresses art and the political. This is not necessarily the same as Political Art.[29] It returns to the definition of the political offered at the outset - the political as the means by which groups organise themselves to make decisions within power relations. What perhaps characterises the range of different approaches in scenario three is the role of art in opening up political space, offering up different possibilities for the way that groups organise themselves to make decisions and address power relations.

Jude Kelly offers a very clear articulation of this in terms of the artist contributing to civic discourse. She compares the practices of Barenboim and Ashkenazy. Kelly does not distinguish between the talent or quality of these two artists, rather she simply highlights that Barenboim chooses to take his practice into the civic space (which she also describes as toxic). In Barenboim, Kelly is highlighting leadership as a quality of extending the practice. Barenboim does so by taking the institution of the orchestra and effectively recasting it within a politically charged situation - the Middle East conflict, reconfiguring what is possible in terms of relationships. Importantly, the exercise does not focus on making political statements, but rather demonstrating that through music and the construction of a space focused on making music, young people can come together and momentarily set conflict aside within a shared experience.

Jude Kelly articulated Barenboim as exemplifying the artist as leader and cited his decision, as an Israeli, to conduct a concert in Nazareth for Palestinians on Israel's Day of Liberation.

A second construction within this scenario is activism, whether it is social, environmental or political, in which the artist positions their practice centrally within civic discourse, rather than by extending into civic discourse.

Jackie Kay says:

> "But, anyway, for myself, 'Artist as Leader' means somebody who is culturally, ...
> makes culture in any shape or form – from paintings, to writing, to theatre, to music
> – it is at the centre of their lives [and they see music maps when they are writing or
> whatever], as in some way towards change – and that could be social change; it
> could be cultural change; it could be political change; it could be all sorts of different
> change. Somebody who does not see their ideas – their political ideas or their artistic
> sensibility as being separate things. That is to me the most important thing. For me,
> my artistic sensibility and my political sensibility are one." (2008, 6:10)

Roanne Dods, Director of the Jerwood Foundation and Lab participant, describes leadership in terms of a vision and the challenges of realising a vision,

> "Leadership, for me, is having a sense of a mission, or a clarity, of what you want to
> do even though you might not know what it looks like. And having the ability to ask
> the right questions and make the right decisions to follow through to that truth – to that
> vision – and bringing people with you on that journey. … I think in order to both
> have the vision, stick to it, stick to the path, requires a significant amount of courage,
> it requires a significant amount of trust, it requires an integrity to the mission, but it
> also requires an adaptability, and an ability to communicate what you are trying to
> do well and to look after yourself in that process… Part of it has to be about really
> understanding yourself in the context, and being confident in yourself, in being able
> to know when you move forward and when you hold back." (2008, 11:22)

---

[29] The articulation of a particular political viewpoint such as Diego Rivera's murals that represent his perspective as an active communist

James Marriott describes it as,

> "I would tend to look at it in this way: it is not so much leading as direction-finding. By that I mean, if we think about, a wheel turns – you know. I think about two things: first of all that the wheel turns constantly and it just repeats itself; it is moving around – a cycle of whatever you want to call it, seasons or days or livelihoods – in a sense it is going nowhere, but going around. But, at the same time, if the wheel turns, then it moves across a landscape. There are two things happening at the same time. The first – the question of the wheel turning, does not necessarily … Well, it requires imagination because it requires the imagination of perseverance – of, "How do we just carry on doing the same thing and keeping our souls together?" But the other one, which is the question of, where is it going, requires the imagination of direction-finding. 'OK, if we go this way, the road is going to be very hard; if we go that way, the road is going to be easier. If we go this way, it is uphill; if we go that way, it is downhill, as opposed to marshy; or it is solid'." (2008, 12:25)

Marriott's contribution on climate change, drawing on the work of PLATFORM, was extremely resonant in the Lab with a number of individuals including Jackie Kay, Matt Hulse and Gill Robertson specifically referring to the impact – two of them describe making phone calls during the Lab to develop or redirect projects. Jackie Kay said,

> "The thing that felt life-changing to me was James' talk on the climate. It affected a lot of people there, shook people awake." (2008, 41:45)

As a consequence of the discussions within Lab One, Hulse, is flipping the conventions of film production in his current film project of Dummy Jim.[30] He is proposing to make this film 'in an ecological way' by identifying opportunities to minimise the carbon footprint of the production process.

> "During the shooting of Dummy Jim we will aim to reduce to zero our carbon footprint by creating, wherever possible, alternative, sustainable transportation for crew and production kit, using clockwork cameras and banks of cyclists to power generators for lighting. Imagine the scene!

> These alternatives will naturally have an impact upon the production of the film and will therefore ultimately affect the way the film turns out - I believe for the better. Imposing a 'green framework' upon my working method will in fact bring positive creative benefits rather than hinder creativity. My experience is that limitations induce creative solutions. I'm not following a bandwagon, I'm choosing to lead it, setting a clear environmental agenda for this project." (2008)

Hulse is also proposing an alternative economic model to resource this production redrawing the kind of relationships and interdependencies a filmmaker might have with funding model. Rather than chasing grants he is focusing on individual giving and participation through the Dummy Jim website.

In this construction artists re-orientate conventional notions of how an artist works in order to challenge the political. James Marriott, as well as Helen Mayer Harrison & Newton Harrison and Suzanne Lacy amongst others, exemplify this approach. In each case influencing civic discourse is at the heart of their projects, and they construct their practice in such a way as to achieve that objective. This brings considerable tensions because, where Barenboim's

---

[30] www.dummyjim.com

practice is excellent measured against the classical structure, these practices tend to sit on the edge of or outside institutional forms of art making. By operating directly in the social sphere this can result in a sense that the art is instrumentalised and that the artist is being didactic.

Lloyd reflected upon the broad range of politically and socially engaged art practices. Preferring strategies which retain qualities of openness and ambiguity as opposed to

> "…a one way lecturing experience…" (2008, 6:10)

Lloyd also challenged the responsibility and expectations placed on the artist when operating in a social context, asking whether art should be subject to the same strict ethical codes as the social sciences and other related disciplines. Lloyd cited the exploratory and occasionally transgressive practices of artists who aim to find other means to open up these political spaces including Artur Zmijewski and Walid Raad.

It would appear that common characteristic across all of these constructions is that the artists evidence deep knowledge and understanding, not only of the arts, but also of the sphere of civic discourse.

Philip Schlesinger, Director of the Centre for Cultural Policy Research, University of Glasgow, and Lab provocateur, defined leadership as precisely

> "…it requires you to understand the underlying conditions within which you are practising. Not purely the aesthetic and material ones, but the political, economic and broadly cultural ones. In other words, it requires you to lift your head up from wherever you might be painting or whatever you're sculpting or whatever you're doing with your highly sophisticated editing system and actually understand the policy world." (2008, 17:54)

He emphasised the importance of leaders understanding the specialist languages of policy. He described those who refuse to engage with policy as excluding themselves from the discourse.

Schlesinger also emphasised the 'cost of entry' into policy discourses. Each sector draws on highly evolved knowledge and language. The bridging of discourses enables recognition and collaboration in a profound way. Therefore the artist can work with the political in the sense of being a 'public intellectual' (Sheikh 2004) or an 'incidental person' in John Latham's terminology. The artist can also work politically in a more pragmatic sense of marshalling a set of well-defined interests, such as the need for income, resources and recognition, and address these to the political sphere.

James Marriott's contribution on climate change during the Lab, as a small representation of the work of PLATFORM across a range of issues; Suzanne Lacy's articulation of the depth of knowledge required for the Oakland Projects; Barenboim's evident knowledge of the complexities of the Middle East conflict; all are interwoven with art practices of quality. These practitioners exemplify a 'cost of entry' in two dimensions – in achieving a high quality art practice and in being capable of making a contribution to civic discourse at high level. This cuts across a range of practices and is not confined to practices characterised as activist. What is specific in the activist practices is that the two are interwoven. Although the political knowledge might not influence the music making in Barenboim's practice, it is clear that the music making shapes his intervention in political discourse - he brings his analysis of music as a form and a structure into his analysis of the political circumstance, in particular in relation to the inevitable presence of conflict.

One interesting aspect of this, and one that tallies with various descriptions of the core qualities of artists' practice, is that this knowledge and understanding is best exemplified as 'knowing the right questions to ask' rather than 'having answers'. Wallace Heim's Evaluation Report (2008) on the Harrisons' Greenhouse Britain project elucidates this idea,

> "They all reported that the experience was illuminating, informative, challenging, imaginative, liberating. Their respect for the cross-disciplinary knowledge of the Harrisons was high, including both the science, the land-use planning and architectural aspects, and including Newton Harrison's ability to ask 'the right questions.' … But, from their responses, the exercise was not just one of being relieved of limitations, but one which was highly informed, creative, and reflective, not just of their own methods of work, but of more conventional responses to climate change. They reported feeling supported, mentored, and reported an appreciation of what this kind of process of 'art' can achieve in providing the context, the time and space for imagining possible futures, for rehearsing what may happen."

Another version of this idea is described by Barbara Steveni recounting a meeting during John Latham's placement in the Scottish Office where when the question was asked "Is the artist going to solve problems?" to which the senior civil servant Derek Lyddon, who was facilitating the placement, replied,

> "Artists will show us answers to the problems we did not yet know to exist." (2007, 59:20)[31]

All of these practices aim to create fundamental change and are essentially transformative rather than representational of the world. As noted at the outset, all work of quality has influence, but it is important to distinguish influence from leading, and highlight transformation as different from influence.

APG shares many aspects in common with these practices. For example APG is future orientated, it is cross sectoral and it engages with the deep knowledge and understanding of context. Steveni, in describing the selection of artists for placements, commented that their skill and experimentation with material was a key indicator of their suitability for placements in industry and in government, but was not necessarily an indicator of what might come out of the placement. But there are a couple of areas in which it appears to differ. On the face of it not all APG placements are overtly about civic discourse, although the 'meta-project' of APG certainly is precisely about articulating a role for the artist in the civic. The placements are encounters that mutually disturb both the workplace and the experience of the artist. But APG's working assumption of the potential role of the artist and the conception John Latham developed of the 'incidental person' is where transformation lies.

---

[31] John Latham's placement at the Scottish Office is discussed in detail by Craig Richardson in his article for Map Magazine Issue 11, Autumn 2007, accessed 22 Feb 2009 at
http://www.mapmagazine.co.uk/index.cfm?page=984F1E34-BDF5-2379-71075D0184E53D92&articleid=235

Some reservations

Echoing Kirsten Lloyd's reservations about the loss of ambiguity, Francis McKee addresses the third scenario – artist as leading by contributing to civic discourse. He articulates circumstances where this focus can get in the way of making art. He describes encountering young artists in Ramallah who are so biased in relation to one political position that is itself so emotionally charged, that the art becomes simplistic and overly contrived in relation to a political message. He found himself encouraging these young artists to take a different stance, to closely observe the world that immediately surrounded them, to avoid rehashing pre-existing forms of 'political art'.

This resonates with what Kelly described as the 360º vision of artists - interested in the complexity of the world.

Jim Tough, Acting Director of the Scottish Arts Council, nuances the idea of activism by articulating the role of artists being that of 'opening up tensions between actions' rather than training to be a certain kind of artist - poet, painter or activist. Through the Lab experience he discovered a different construction of the relationship between the organisation (in this case the Scottish Arts Council) and the individual artist.

Tom Shakespeare's provocation had opened up for Tough the kinds of choices that artists need to make in terms of positioning their work. Tough proposes a different relationship between artists and policy makers,

> "…to create a space for artists to explore their critique of the world as being as important as inviting them to talk about whether or not we should be focusing on contemporary theatre practice or not." (2008, 14:19)

He explored different methodologies of displacing the 'paper shuffle' with real experiences and shared understanding'.

David Butler, director of the LifeWorkArt professional practice programme at Newcastle University's Fine Art Department, addresses a more pragmatic danger. In artists becoming increasingly entrepreneurial, there is a danger that their particular qualities become absorbed in the language of commerce. He argued that 'leadership' is a term derived from business and has application to other spheres of pubic life. Whilst an engagement with the business world can be extremely important, including being entrepreneurial, stimulating innovation and building powerful networks, it is important to keep in focus the quality of the work as art.

> "When you then try to unpack something like leadership you don't try and say 'here are a number of models' (off the shelf). What you need to be saying is: "What is it that we are actually doing, is that working well and how do we learn from that? I'm not saying we can't learn from outside the sector but we should remember that we have a wealth of artists and arts organisations who have been very successful working with limited resources. So there have to be useful leadership models in there." (2006, 1:14:40)

Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of this research has been to look at the role of artists in leading. Section One started by highlighting the current construction in which both creativity and leadership are valued within an overarching focus on economic competitiveness. Section Two developed the three scenarios broadly highlighting the range of constructions of artists leading. The first scenario focused on the power of the quality artwork to influence. In this scenario recognition in terms of leadership has historically been largely retrospective and dependent upon the knowledge of the work itself as well as the cultural, economic, social and political circumstances of its creation.

In the second scenario the research then identified the relationship between the artist and organisation as a significant site in which leadership plays out. At times management models of leadership collapse neatly into artistic forms of leading. This occurs to a great extent where and when artists are delivering their work from within organisational structures that exist to support a particular medium, or form, or venue e.g. conductor/orchestra/concert hall.

Tensions arise in relation to responsibility and freedom – openness and fragility in Last's language - the need to be accountable for spending and consuming resources (the arts make high demands on resources) and the need to play, to be creative in an open ended way.

Tensions also arise when certain forms of practice fall outside of these conventions of production and support. In response artists, as part of their creative endeavour, choose to craft relationships with organisations in a range of ways. The conventions of management leadership may count in this situation, but the emphasis shifts towards identifying and inhabiting new metaphors – 'artist-led', artist as 'incidental person', 'the open brief', and so on. A simple transfer of skills and competencies from management leadership in these situations does not address the challenge, though it may aid aspects of it.

In the third scenario the research looks at the relationship between arts practices and the political - the political is the means by which groups organise themselves to make decisions within power relations. A wide range of artists' practices invest themselves in this territory, often with an objective of opening up space of participation in civic discourse, but also with the objective of engaging artists directly with policy making.

One of the clearest and most resonant definitions of leading through practice emerged in the discussion with Phillip Schlesinger. Leadership rests on having a deep, critical knowledge of a particular field (arts practice, organisational practice or policy making) and having the ability to articulate this knowledge is accessible ways. Schlesinger also pointed to the complexity of the challenge of working with two very different notions of culture (and by extension the arts). The one is based in economism within a competitive global market (Creative and Cultural Industries). The second is based on culture as 'there for its own sake', for the betterment of society through education or creation of identity and nationhood. The tensions between these two positions have played out throughout the research, not least in this report.

Schlesinger defines a key aspect of leadership in terms of knowledge of context and Jim Tough acknowledges the process from the perspective of organisational leader learning how artists work.

> "I think that is much more a personal dynamic; a personal chemistry…that reflection and understanding extended and that knowledge of the artist - the artist's practice, the sensibilities that are around that …will have and has had an impact on how I do my job as a policy maker or an organisational leader." (2008, 15:43)

The Artist as Leader research reveals that in this field it is important not to pigeonhole the discourse and retain the possibility of artistic leadership having many dimensions, including the organisation, social, political and aesthetic in order to fully represent the fluidity with which the arts sector works. This complexity is not necessarily reflected in other leadership discourses.

Outcomes

The research concludes therefore that Cultural Leadership should be about more than simply well run cultural organisations. It should include an understanding of the capacity and value of artists leading through practice.

The current and emerging leaders of cultural organisations need to understand the capacity of artists to lead through practice, not least because they so often negotiate with other sectors to involve artists.

Artists correspondingly need to know how to work with organisations (artistic as well as others) as that is where challenging opportunities lie for innovative work. Artists have created their own vehicles to do this and thought through the basis on which a dynamic relationship might evolve, such as APG. Artist led organisations such as Stills, Edinburgh, are creating different ways to work with individual artists and support wider relationships between artists and communities of different kinds, including non-art organisations.[32] These examples are important to draw on, in part because they thoroughly deconstruct the process of relationship building, examining it as a self conscious process; and in part because they are in a constant state of evolution and improvisation, constantly exploring and developing models and techniques of 'best practice', without becoming trapped in orthodoxies.

The question then arises as to how learning can take place within the relationship of artist to organisation, how learning becomes critically informed by examples of best practice and how creativity is sustained within the process allowing for the open-endedness on which it thrives and avoiding prescriptive models and techniques that inscribe 'best practice' in other fields.

The evident depth of knowledge exemplified by key practitioners seeking to contribute to and construct work with a political dimension is significant. There is evidence that artists can contribute beyond roles in communication and delivery of policy agendas. Some artists raise fundamental questions about policy and offer alternative views of significant social and environmental challenges. Organisational leaders and policymakers need to recognise the role artists can play in direction finding (Marriott), asking the right questions (Harrisons), being the 'incidental person' (Latham).

The research highlights several interrelated areas of further development.

Focusing on the key set of relationships between the artist, the cultural organisation and a number of other sectors including education, health, environment, it would be of considerable value to understand the role of leadership as exercised by both artists and other individuals. How do other individuals understand and respond to artists exercising leadership? How can the leaders of cultural organisations support and nurture artists leading through practice? What can be learnt from these activities and how can that learning be disseminated?

---

[32] e.g. the current programme Recreate http://www.stills.org/recreate.html

Focusing on the importance of knowledge, both of the 'other' and of the 'context' how can organisational leaders and artists be supported to develop their knowledge and understanding as an underpinning of their exercise of leadership?

If artists leading through practice can be characterised as challenging or reframing either the aesthetic and/or the means of production, then it is important to develop case studies which evidence this, and highlight the value of this to other sectors.[33]

---

[33] Jane Jacobs (1985) identifies that there are two cultural paradigms: the one concerned with managing property and the other concerned with commercial activity. The precepts and rules of moral engagement are interlinked and also contradictory for example trading in the commercial syndrome is creative, based on values of trust and exchange whereas in managing property within hierarchies, loyalty is valued above openness. The moral precepts in each syndrome as defined by Jacobs are helpful to analysing the complexity of artists working with organisations·

Interviews

Butler, D	Life Work Art, University of Newcastle	*Newcastle, 24 November 2006*
Davie, E* [a]	Film maker and Lecturer Edinburgh College of Art	*Glasgow, 6 November 2006*
Dods, R*	Director, Jerwood Foundation	*Telephone, 8 October 2008*
Farquhar, A	Creative Director NVA	*Telephone, 18 June 2008*
French, L [a]	Publisher Variant	*Glasgow, 6 November 2006*
Harding, D [b]	Head of Environmental Art (retired), Glasgow School of Art	*Glasgow, 8 June 2007*
Hulse, M*	Experimental Film maker and Lecturer Edinburgh College of Art	*Edinburgh, 5 March 2008*
Kay, J*	Poet and Professor of Poetry	*Manchester, 15 February 2008*
Kelly, J	Artistic Director of Southbank Centre	*London, 14 April 2008*
Kinloch, M [c]	Head of Drama, RSAMD	*Glasgow, 11 January 2007*
Lappin, C	Executive Director, Y-Dance	*Glasgow, 7 November 2006*
Last, B*	Producer	*Glasgow, 31 October 2006*
Laycock, R	Artist and Chief Executive, Helix Arts	*Newcastle, 24 November 2006*
Lloyd, K*	Curator, Stills,	*Glasgow, 7 March 2008*
Lochhead, L	Poet and Writer in Residence, Glasgow School of Art	*Glasgow, 8 June 2007*
Marriott, J*	Artist and Co-Director PLATFORM	*London, 15 April 2008*
Mason, L*	National Performing Companies Unit, Europe, External Affairs and Culture	*Edinburgh, 19 March 2008*
McKee, F*	Curator and Director CCA	*Glasgow, 14 December 2006*
Parker, J*	Independent Choreographer	*Edinburgh, 22 April 2008*
Patrick, A* [a]	Lifelong Learning Co-ordinator, Glasgow Women's Library	*Glasgow, 6 November 2006*
Porter, G	Artist and Founder President Scottish Artist Union	*Glasgow, 5 December 2006*
Robertson, G*	Artistic Director, Catherine Wheels Theatre Company	*Musselburgh, 2 April 2008*
Saunders, A*	Head of Cultural Participation and Advocacy, Culture Division, Scottish Government	*Edinburgh, 19 March 2008*
Schlesinger, P*	Director, CCPR, University of Glasgow	*Glasgow, 23 April 2008*

Senior, A*	Head of Creative Economies Unit, British Council	*Telephone, 23 March 2008*
Shakespeare, T*	Performance Artist, Chair Arts Council North East	*Telephone, 18 February 2008*
Sharkey, S [a]	Associate Director New Learning, National Theatre of Scotland	*Glasgow, 6 November 2006*
Steveni, B [b]	Co-Founder APG/O+I	*Glasgow, 8 June 2007*
Steveni, B	Co-Founder APG/O+I	*London, 15 April 2008*
Tough, J	Acting Director Scottish Arts Council	*Edinburgh, 20 March 2008*
Wallace, J* [c]	Principal, RSAMD	*Glasgow, 11 January 2007*
Zwanenberg, Z Van*	Chief Executive, Scottish Leadership Foundation	*Edinburgh, 25 October 2006*

Asterisks denote participants in the Lab programme.

[a] Emma Davie, Leigh French, Adele Patrick and Simon Sharkey were interviewed together on 6 November 2006.

[b] David Harding and Barbara Steveni were interviewed together on 8 June 2007.

[c] Maggie Kinloch and John Wallace were interviewed together on 11 January 2007.

References

Adorno, T. and Horkheimer, M., 1977/1944. *The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as mass deception* in James Curran, Michael Gurevitch and Janet Wollacott eds *Mass Communication and Society.* London: Edward Arnold

Bruner, E., 1993. *Epilogue: Creative persona and the problem of authenticity* in S. Lavie, K. Narayan and R. Rosaldo (eds), *Creativity/Anthropology.* Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press

Bourriaud, N., 2002. *Relational Aesthetics*, Translated by Simon Pleasance & Fronza Woods with the participation of Mathieu Copeland. France: les presses du réel

Cabinet Office, 1983. *Making A Business Out Of Information.* London: The Stationery Office

Cabinet Office, 1999. *Modernising Government.* London: The Stationery Office

Carey, J., 2005. *What Good Are The Arts?* London: Faber and Faber

Cox, G., 2005. *Cox Review of Creatiivty in Business: building on the UK's strengths.* The Stationery Office

Creative Industries Task Force, 2001. *Mapping Document.* London: The Stationery Office

Cultural Policy Collective, 2004. *Beyond Social Inclusion: Towards Cultural Democracy.* Scotland: Cultural Policy Collective

Florida, R., 2004. *The Rise of the Creative Class, And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life.* Cambridge (MA): Basic Books

Freeman, A., 2007. *Working Paper 22: London's Creative Sector: 2007 Update.* London: GLA Economics

Garnham, N., 2005. *From Cultural to Creative Industries: An analysis of the implications of the "creative industries" approach to arts and media policy making in the United Kingdom.* International Journal of Cultural Policy, Vol. 11 No. 1

Goto, R., 2007. *Artist as Leader* in Douglas A, & Fremantle, C, eds *Leading Through Practice.* Newcastle: a-n The Artists Information Company Research Papers, March.

Harvard Business Review, 2005. *Harvard Business Review on The Mind of the Leader.* Boston (MA): Harvard Business School Press

Heim, W., 2008. *Evaluation Report: Greenhouse Britain: Losing Ground, Gaining Wisdom.* http://greenhousebritain.greenmuseum.org/evaluation/

Hesmondhalgh, D., 2008. *Cultural and creative industries.* [online]. London: London School of Economics and Political Science. Available from: http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/ geographyAndEnvironment/whosWho/profiles/a.c.pratt/preclab/Hesmondhalgh.doc [Accessed 9 February 2009]

Hewison, R., 2007. *Not A Sideshow: Leadership and Cultural Value: A Matrix for Change.* London: Demos

Ingold, T and Hallam, E., 2007. *Creativity and Cultural Improvisation.* London: Berg

Jewsbury, D., 2006. *Show Some Disrespect! in Dis-Integrating Multiculturalism.* Mute Vol 2 No 2

Kester, G., 2005. *Conversation Pieces: Community + Communication in Modern Art.* Berkeley (CA): University of California Press

Kunzru, H., 2006. *The Values on the Ground: Multiculturalism and the War on Terror in Dis-Integrating Multiculturalism.* Mute Vol 2 No 2

Lacy, S., 2007. *Working in Public, Seminar 2.* Aberdeen: On The Edge Research. www.workinginpublicseminars.org

Landry, C., 2005. *Lineages of the Creative City.* Netherlands Architecture Institute

Matarasso, F., 1997. *Use or Ornament? The social impact of participation in the arts.* Stroud (Glos): Comedia

Nochlin, L., 1971. *Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?* Art News 69, January, 22-39, 67-71

Peck, J., 2007. *The Creativity Fix.* Fronesis (24) republished in Eurozine, 2007

Rancière, J., 2008. *The Politics of Aesthetics.* London: Continuum

Ryan, B., 1992. *Making Capital from Culture.* Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter

Sennett, R., 2002. *The Fall of Public Man.* London: Penguin

Sheikh, S., 2005. *In the Place of the Public Sphere?* [cited 22 cited 17 January, 2008].http://www.societyofcontrol.com/research/sheikh.htm

Southbank Centre, 2008. *Daniel Barenboim: Beethoven Piano Sonata Cycle.* London: Southbank Centre

Vulliamy, E., 2008. *Bridging the Gap.* London: The Guardian, 13 July

Further Reading

Ashkanasy, N (ed.), 2006. *Special Section: Art and Design in Management Education.* Academy of Management, Academy of Management Executive, Vol. 5 No. 4

Auses, J, Kester, G, Strayer, J., 2005. Groundworks: Environmental Collaboration in Contemporary Art. Pittsburgh (PA): Carnegie Mellon University

Belfiore, E., 2008. *On bullshit in cultural policy practice and research.* International Conference in Cultural Policy Research

Bishop, C (ed.), 2006. *Participation.* London: Whitechapel Gallery in assoc. with Cambridge (MA): MIT Press

Bourdieu, P. and Haacke, H., 2005. *Free Exchange.* Oxford: Polity Press

Carter, P., 2004. *Edge FM 87.9 MHZ.* Aberdeen: On The Edge

Castoriadis, C., translated Kathleen Blamey, 1998. *The Imaginary Institution of the Society.* Cambridge (CT): MIT Press

Cialdini, R. B., 1988. *Influence: Science and Practice* (2nd Ed). USA: Harper Collins

Cunningham, S., 2002. *From Cultural to Creative Industries: Theory, Industry, and Policy Implications.* Media International Australia, Incorporating Culture & Policy. 102

Douglas, A., 2005. *INTHROW: Revealing Change.* Aberdeen: On The Edge

Farquhar, A., 2006. *The Storr: Unfolding Landscape.* Edinburgh: Luath Press in assoc. with NVA

Farquhar, A., 2007. *Half Life: The Remnants of a Myth from Across the Landscape.* Glasgow: NVA

Foster, H., 1996. *The Return of the Real.* Cambridge (MA): MIT Press

Friere, P., trans. Myra Bergman Ramos, 1996. *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* London: Penguin

Garcés, M (Casas-Cortés, M. and Cobarrubias S., trans), 2006. *To Embody Critique: Some Theses. Some Examples.* EICIP [cited 16 January, 2008]. <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0806/garces/en/print>

Hargie, O D W (ed), 2000. *The Handbook of Communication Skills.* London: Routledge

Harrison, H. M. and Harrison N., 2007. *Public Culture and Sustainable Practices: Peninsula Europe from an ecodiversity perspective, posing questions to Complexity Scientists.* Structure and Dynamics: eJournal of Anthropological and Related Sciences Vol.2 Issue 3. http://repositories.cdlib.org/imbs/socdyn/sdeas/vol2/iss3/art3/

Harrison, H. M. and Harrison N., 1985. *Lagoon Cycle.* Ithaca (NY): Cornell University

Jacobs, J., 2000. *The Nature of Economies.* New York: Modern Library

Jacobs, J., 1992. *Systems of Survival: A Dialogue on the Moral Foundations of Commerce and Politics.* New York: Random House

Johnson, G., 2004. *New Audiences for the arts: The New Audiences Programme 1998-2003.* London: Arts Council England

Kaprow, A. (J. Kelley ed.), 2003. *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life.* Berkeley (CA): University of California Press

Kwon, M., 2002. *One Place After Another: Site Specific Art and Locational Identity.* Cambridge (MA): MIT Press

Lacy, S (ed.), 1996. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art.* San Fransisco: Bay Press

Negt, O., & Kluge, A., 1993. *Public Sphere and Experience: Towards an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere.* University of Minnesota

Papastergiadis, N., 2006. *Spatial Aesthetics: Art, Place and the Everyday.* Rivers Oram Press

Ratcliff, C., 2000. *Out of the Box, The Reinvention of Art, 1965-1975.* New York: Allworth Press

Scruton, R., 2007. *Culture Counts: Faith and Feeling in a World Beseiged.* New York: Encounters

Sheikh, S., 2004. *Representation, Contestation and Power: The Artist as Public Intellectual.* Republic Art [cited 17 January, 2008] http://www.republicart.net/disc/aap/sheikh02_en.htm

Tyndall, K., 2007. *The Producers: Alchemists of the Impossible.* London: Arts Council England/ The Jerwood Charitable Foundation

Walker, John A., 2002. *Left Shift: Radical Art in 1970s Britain.* London: I.B.Tauris & Co

Warner, M., 2002. *Publics and Counterpublics.* New York: Zone Books

Williams, R., 1986. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society.* London: Fontana.

APPENDIX ONE:

Methodology

This research has developed through a partnership between four organisations drawing together the academic, professional arts and business support and training sectors and including On the Edge research (OTE), Performing Arts Labs (PAL), The Cultural Enterprise Office (CEO) and The Scottish Leadership Foundation (SLF) (Appendix 1). Each organisation has brought their particular perspective or experience to bear. OTE, as academic partner, develops practice led research in the arts, focusing in particular on artists working in public. PAL develops radical thinking and collaborative processes, products and policy through interdisciplinary creative practice within laboratory environments. CEO supports development for creative businesses through a range of training, mentoring, coaching and networking programmes. Since 2001 SLF has delivered leadership training across all public services in Scotland.

The research has received funding from a number of different sources: the Arts and Humanities Research Council's Research Networks and Workshops (Creativity) Scheme (2006), Arts Council England's Cultural Leadership (2006-8), Scottish Arts Council and Jerwood Foundation.

The initial phases were concerned with identifying and forming a network of contributors including artists, organisational leaders and policy makers who brought their experiences to bear on conceptualising artistic leadership. The participants were identified by the partnership through drawing up a long list from their discrete networks and knowledge of the field. Thirty individuals have been interviewed, some more than once. The interviews addressed a framework of five questions:

What does the artist as leader mean to you?

What do you understand by leadership?

Why is it an important question?

Participants in the research fall into overlapping categories as artists, organisational leaders and policy makers. Where do you position yourself?

What are the limits of the idea and where does it break down?

The interviews were then transcribed, checked against the original audio and then checked with the interviewee. Interviewees have corrected misheard statements, added detail and in some cases clarified their points. The researchers then conducted an analysis. This was an empirical process, based on revisiting the material in the context of the collected interviews to articulate the emergent picture, mindful of the original questions that formed the AHRC submission.

Within the analysis the researchers sought to understand the relationship between the artist and the wider organisational and policy context.

The interviews wrapped around a practice based element of the research - *The Artist as Leader Lab.*

Over 18 years, PAL has evolved a methodology for bringing together individuals increasingly from different disciplines, in the development of new work. It is evident and well documented that Labs speak to creativity and probably also implicitly to leadership.[34] *The Artist as Leader Lab* was specifically constructed to make the issue of artistic leadership explicit. It drew together artists, policy makers and organisational leaders (listed in the unpublished Welcome dossier) in a unique experiment conducted through two discrete, interrelated events.

Part one of the Lab was held at Hospitalfield in Arbroath 21-26th January 2008 and Part 2 was held at Royal Scottish Academy of Music and Drama, Glasgow 3rd-4th June 2008. Each participant offered to the shared space their past experience as well as challenges and desires for the future.

This Lab was structured around an exchange of different practices that shape artistic creativity and its presence in the public sphere - artists to organisational leaders to policy makers. This indicates a sharp distinction from, but complementary with, skills based approaches to leadership such as the Clore (project management, handling the media, fundraising, presentation skills, building and sustaining networks). Individuals were invited in to learn from each other and to contribute to the research, conceptually as well as by developing new forms of practice and creative partnerships.

New emergent project ideas were presented in the second Lab in June along with interim research findings. These were tested with professional representatives, notably Nicola Turner, Cultural Leadership programme; Bob Last, entrepreneur and producer, who had acted as provocateur in Lab 1; Clive Gillman, Director of Dundee Contemporary Arts and Tania Holland, Peach Placement artist with British Council.

For the Research this approach (network development/exploratory interview combined with the Lab element) enabled us to build and sustain a network with the interest and experience to inform the issue of artistic leadership from different positions: artist, policy maker and organisational leader. Emergent creative thinking came from significant expertise with a commitment to take the experience forward into practice.

The research was informed by selected literature in art and cultural policy as well as arts practice, in particular articulations of the approaches of particular artists identified as manifesting different forms of leading through practice (see bibliography).

Finally, the findings are being disseminating across the academic and professional platforms. To date this has included presentations at three conferences, two seminars, and publication in the a-n research edition (see Appendix 2).

---

[34] Douglas, A. (2004) Evaluation of PAL for NESTA (unpublished Report).

APPENDIX TWO:

Dissemination

Presentations – External

Keynote, Creative Rural Economy Conference, Lancaster, 12/13 September 2006,

Highland Visual Arts Gathering, Ullapool, 13/14 November 2006

Common Work Conference, Glasgow, 19/20 April 2007

Collective Presentation, Edinburgh, 27 October 2007

Keynote, The Graduate Institute of Interdisciplinary Art, National Kaohsiung Normal University, Taiwan, 15 December 2008

Presentations – Internal

Masters Seminar February 2008

Masters Seminar November 2008

Lab 2 June 2008

Publications

Leading through Practice, a-n The Artist Information Company: Research Papers March 2007, ISBN 0 907730 75 2

The *Leading through Practice* Research Paper was distributed with the March 2007 issue of a-n magazine (approximately 11,000 subscribers) and is available from their website, the communityarts.net website, the Visual Arts and Galleries Association (VAGA) website and the On The Edge website.

Chapter in *Common Work: Art and Social Engagement,* Heather Lynch, ed. Oxford: Peter Lang, forthcoming

APPENDIX THREE: Timeline

An incomplete timeline of the development of UK policy relating to the arts, regeneration, social inclusion and the Creative Industries

With thanks to David Haley, Sophie Hope, Ian Hunter, Euan MacArthur, and James Marriott for their assistance in assembling this timeline

Year	Theoretical & Policy Texts	International	UK National Policy phases	UK National Policy initiatives	Regional Policy	Arts Policy	Practice initiatives
1940's	1947: Adorno & Horkheimer's Dialectic of Enlightenment	1945: UNESCO established; 1948: Universal Declaration of Human Rights				1946: Arts Council of Great Britain established	
1950's				1951 Festival of Britain			
1960's	1960s Sociology takes 'cultural turn' moving from class to culture		1963 Harold Wilson "white heat of this [technological] revolution"	1968-69 Town and Country Planning Act/ Skeffington Report consultation and public participation in Planning.		Jenny Lee appointed first Arts Minister, publishes 'A Policy for the Arts: First Steps'	1966 Artist Placement Group established; 1968 Welfare State International established; 1969-1972 Shelter Neighbourhood Action Project; Granby; Development of Community Architecture Movement (e.g. Ralph Erskine in Byker, Newcastle); 1968-1978 David Harding, Town Artist, Glenrothes.
1970's	Prof Harold Baldry's report Community Arts in Great Britain						Community Arts Movement; Gulbenkian Foundation and Manpower Services Commission funding residencies; Artists Union established; 1972-1980 Association of Community Artists
Late 70s			1979 Conservative Government elected			Arts Council Great Britain publishes Strategy on public art linked with regeneration. Accountability has emerged as a specific issue	APG Placements in Government including Small Heath in Birmingham and Peterlee in North East; two key exhibitions: 'Art for Whom?' (Whitechapel) and 'Art for Society' (Serpentine)
1980		Early 80s US studies into economic impact of the arts	80s: Multiculturalism emerges as policy issue				
1981							1981-1991 Peter Dunn and Lorraine Leeson's Docklands Community Poster Project
1982		UNESCO report on cultural industries – Bernard Miege					
1983	Cabinet Report Making a Business of Information				1983-1986 GLC Cultural Industries Unit		
1984				1984 – 1992 Garden Festivals Programme			PLATFORM established
1985	Faith in the City Church Urban Commission		Arts Tourism emerges				Environmental Art course starts at Glasgow School of Art
1986					GLC abolished		
1987	1987-92 Ian Hunter PhD on Artists working in Regeneration						
1988	Arts and the Changing City: An Agenda for Urban Regeneration, British American Arts Association Myerscough Economic Importance of the Arts in Britain, Policy Studies Institute		Economic Regeneration through culture booms and spreads nationally and internationally as public sector initiative				
1990	Glasgow: The Creative City and its Cultural Economy, Comedia	Social inclusion policies across Europe			Glasgow City of Culture		1990-2000 Suzanne Lacy's 'Oakland Projects'
1991	British Invisibles: Overseas Earnings of the Arts 1988/98		Foundation for Sport and the Arts established				Projects Environment established
1992							PLATFORM's EFRA Redevelopment Agency
1993			UK Lottery established as 'additional' funding				White Cube Gallery opens; First 'Littoral' Conference (New Voices in the City);
1994	Creative Cities – Viability Indicators, Comedia	Creative Nation' Initiative Australia			Arts Council of Great Britain broken up, Scottish Arts Council becomes independent		
1995			Creative Cities/Creative Clusters iteration of regeneration thinking				Projects Environment becomes Littoral
1996	Creative Cities in Britain and Germany and Art of Regeneration, Comedia; Gorham and Partners Export Potential for the Cultural Industries; Suzanne Lacy's Mapping the Terrain						
1997	Use or Ornament? Matarasso; Create the Future: A Strategy for Cultural Policy, Arts and the Creative Economy, Labour Party	Guggenheim Bilbao Opens	New Labour government elected; 'Social Inclusion' and 'Creativity' are key policy initiatives	Creative Industries Task Force established Social Inclusion Unit established			
1998				Government introduce Public Service Agreements monitored by Quality, Efficiency and Standards Team; Creative Industries Task Force Mapping Document		1998-2003 ACE New Audiences Initiative	
1999	Ken Robinson National Commission All Our Future: Creativity, Culture and Education; Leadbeater & Oakley The Independents, Demos			Policy Action Team 10 Report advocates for sport and arts in social inclusion	Devolution in Scotland and Wales		
2000	The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators, Comedia	Cultural/Creative Industries in widespread use			Scotland: 'National Cultural Strategy'		
2001	Howkins links creative industries with Intellectual Property					Creative Partnerships Programme established	(2001-2004 On The Edge Phase One)
2002	Richard Florida's Rise of the Creative Class					Clore Leadership Programme established	
2004	Cultural Policy Collective publish Beyond Social Inclusion						
2005	Cox Review of Creativity in Business	UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions			Scotland: Cultural Commission Report		
2006						Cultural Leadership Programme Established	(Artist as Leader Programme 2006-2008)
2008					Liverpool City of Culture		
2009					Scotland: Creative Scotland due to launch		