Teaching Arts Management:
Where Did We Lose the Core Ideas?

Aleksandar Brkić

ABSTRACT.
In light of the need to start clearing the methodological confusion in the field of arts management, this article provides a critical overview of the teaching curricula in the field. Distinction is made between programs that copy directly from business management; programs that focus on the technological process of producing an artwork (usually run by practitioners); those that interlink cultural management and cultural policy (highlighting the role of public governance as a higher principle); and programs that focus on an entrepreneurial approach to arts management, connecting it to issues of creativity and innovation. The author calls for clear goals to educate administrators and arts or cultural managers. The suggestion is made to follow what I call the Janus syndrome: looking toward managerial and economic realities but primarily focusing on the arts—the aesthetic and the social aspects of the field. A question is raised about the position of art in arts management curricula, as well as the organization of undergraduate and postgraduate studies in the field.

Any work of art "quoted" by publicity serves two purposes. Art is a sign of affluence; it belongs to the good life; it is part of the furnishing which the world gives to the rich and beautiful. But a work of art also suggests a cultural authority, a form of dignity, even of wisdom, which is superior to any vulgar material interest; an oil painting belongs to a cultural heritage.
—John Berger (1972, 135)

In academic programs in the field of arts management in Europe, it is common to begin with an overview of the history of management using a list that many lecturers know by heart: Taylor, Fayol, Follet, Mayo, and Maslow. After that, some "spices" are added, such as Adorno, Horkheimer, and Bourdieu. But is the subject of the arts anywhere on the list? And have we ever really decided what the core essence of arts management is? Or did we simply lose it somewhere along the way?

Practicing—and at the same time teaching—arts management has resulted in a great deal of methodological confusion in Europe (Şuteu 2006), which could be defined as preparadigmatic (Mercer 2006). Of course, the origins of the confusion are closely linked to confusion in the field, which is not yet properly constituted (Evrard and Colbert 2000) or, perhaps, does not even exist as such, hiding under the veil of multidisciplinarity (Chong 2002) or posing a dilemma that flirts with sociology and etymology. Is arts or cultural management (as an academic discipline or practice) as narrow as the arts or does it encompass a wider concern with ways of life (Matarasso and Landry 1999)? Do the terms include the creative activities of intellectuals—especially artistic activity (Williams 1983)—as well? Apart from these questions, we must admit that the knowledge base of the field is still unclear. Accomplishments within the field's history of research are not valued enough, and, most important, arts management is still trying to position itself between theory and practice.

There have always been tensions among the many actors in the field. Professionals sometimes lack practical knowledge, academics fight for a stronger scientific approach, "raw managers" treat cultural management as just one area of concentration derived from general management, and administrators insist on procedure over substance. Rarely does anyone in the field take an approach that deals primarily with the social contextualization of art or the processes of creation and innovation.

The goal of this article is to map the paths taken by researchers trying to define the field/discipline of arts management, while also raising the question of the position of art and artistic, creative, and innovative processes in research and teaching practices.

The Same as Managing Anything Else: Copy from Business

Ultimate excellence lies
Not in winning
Every battle
But in defeating the enemy
Without ever fighting.
The highest form of warfare
Is to attack
Strategy itself.
—Sun Tzu, sixth century BC (2002, 14)

Every new discipline has to work on its roots to create a strong foundation and form connections with related disciplines. In order to position itself as an "ancient discipline," business management, for example, incorporated the works of Sun Tzu's Art of War into curricula used for teaching strategic planning at the corporate level. Perhaps the only encounter students of business management have with the word art during their studies is in juxtaposition to the word war. It is also worth noting that military vocabulary has become very popular in the business world as well as in master of business administration (MBA) programs where corporate strategy is taught.

The juxtaposition of art and war in ancient history also figures into courses such as the History of Management module in the master of science program at Cass Business School in London. It makes use of Socrates' dialogues with Nicomachides, as contextualized by Shafritz and Ott in Classics of Organization Theory under the title "Socrates Discovers Generic Management." The text provides justification for the theory of generic management. The following excerpt is worth noting:

Nicomachides was angry with the decision of the Athenians who have chosen
Anthistenes, a successful chorus manager, and not him, a brave soldier of
Athens, to become a member of magistrates:

"Do you say, then, Socrates," said he, "that it is in the power of the same man
to manage a chorus well, and to manage an army well?"

"I say," said Socrates, "that over whatever a man may preside, he will, if he
knows what he needs, and is able to provide it, be a good president, whether he
have the direction of a chorus, a family, a city, or an army."
(Xenophon, qtd. In Shafritz and Ott 1996, 38)

The promotion of generic management theory in the context of general management became a popular path followed by a generation of ambitious managers and politicians, such as Boris Tadić, the current president of the Republic of Serbia. During the 1990s, he taught philosophy in a Belgrade high school, and then, after the political changes in Serbia in 2000, his first role in the government was as minister of telecommunication. During a guest lecture at the Faculty of Dramatic Arts in Belgrade, while answering a student's question about his qualifications for that position, he cleverly used a generic management theory to defend himself (Tadić 2001).

Notably, Byrnes starts his research on management and the arts by defining management as an art, and in this context, he sees art as "an ability or special skill that someone develops and applies" (2003, 45). Throughout the text, Byrnes raises questions that are interesting for the problematization of teaching practices of arts management. Rather than focusing on arts management, for example, he writes about general business practices. Information specific to the arts sector, in fact, is treated merely as an add-on, rather than as the core of his presentation. What is most questionable in his treatment of arts management, however, is his use of the terms efficient and effective within the arts management context. He ignores, for example, how difficult it is to define these terms in the context of the arts. This creates a problem when we seek empirical measures for evaluating arts and culture projects or organizations, because there are not enough real indicators to support statements that something is efficient or effective.

What has put Byrnes on the shelf with other authors who write about arts management when they mean entertainment and business management (with some creative value added) is his support for

Schermerhorn's old and industrial definition of a manager as "a person who is responsible for the work performance of one or more people" (1986, 7) with no mention of what this means in the context of the arts. Byrnes adds that "the skills required to successfully create a performance event are the same skills required to run a successful business" (2003, 9). This approach has been criticized, however, for its limitations for successful arts management. His textbook, which has been used as a learning tool in arts management programs internationally, follows established business management practices by adopting case study teaching methods and reducing scientific analysis to managerial style disciplines, thereby "emptying them of context" (Şuteu 2006, 25). If we look at it this way, arts management could easily be part of MBA studies with only slight changes needed when it comes to applications in a new art context. According to some authors, such a possibility may be inevitable if we start working with "artertainment" instead of art (Bullen 2004). However, it may not be what is needed if we truly intend to establish a unique field called arts management.

How Things Work: Art Production Processes

Managerialism should be a tool rather than an end; a method rather than an absolute; a rule of thumb rather than a tablet of stone; a system of analysis rather than a panacea for every problem. If applied without discrimination, it threatens to swamp the very activity that it is, overtly, intended to support. It is the servant not the master. It is a necessary part of our lives but it is not sufficient in itself to make a good arts centre or to allow great art to be created.
—John Tusa (1997, 38)

One of the oldest approaches in arts management is focused strictly on the technological processes of the production of an artwork, especially when it comes to collaborative work (e.g., theater and film). In this case, training comes close to more purely professional, vocational training but is elevated to higher academic rank within the university. In such training, the focus is on even the smallest details of the processes of techniques that must be taught, though generally it is concentrated on only one artistic discipline (e.g., theater production courses) and teaching only the craft of that particular art discipline. These practices are more typical in Central and Eastern Europe (Lukic 2006; Dundjerovic 1993) but are also found in the United States (Langley 1990; Jackson 1995), the United Kingdom, and in other environments where the teaching staff are more likely to be practitioners from the field; often they lack academic and pedagogical experience in arts management or any other field. The primary characteristic of their methodology—if we can call it that—is to coach students by drawing on their own practical experiences, which may not necessarily be the best, or even adequate, practice.

The problem is that this is a very narrow path for teaching the field of arts management because it does little to empower students to create, lead, or manage. Instead, this type of training only prepares students to apply their skills—in practice—to a very focused professional environment that has already been constructed by someone else. They are not prepared, therefore, to engage in a new way of doing things. The lack of economic, managerial, and leadership skills does not allow them to go much further than what they have been given. And if students focus too narrowly, for example, on just theater management, they are not capable of working very easily in other areas of arts management, because the knowledge they were given is not easily transferable.

Interlink: Cultural Policy and Cultural Management

Cultural management is intimately related to cultural policy and is all about creating opportunities for people in the culture sector to develop and implement their ideas.
—Milena Dragicevic–Sesic (qtd. in Willemars 2001, 10)

One of the dominant European approaches (Dragicevic-Sesic and Dragojevic, 2005) highlights the role of public governance as a higher principle with which arts management (or cultural management, as it is often called in Europe) is closely interlinked. In the European context, cultural management cannot be separated from cultural policy. Global factors are a consideration when we look at the connection between management and policy, but cultural management in the national/European context and its national markets still has to be closely connected with cultural policy. Though it is beginning to change, this stands in contrast to the U.S. approach, where, in the past, arts managers have tended to ignore the connection between day-to-day practices and policy. In Europe, however, there exists an understood need to influence the policy process. Students are taught to be proactive when it comes to policy issues, regardless of the particular area of management (e.g., theater management, film

production, art galleries, or cultural centers) in which they work. On the side of artists and cultural operators, there are high expectations in terms of cultural policy. This gives these artists an important role in the overall development of society. This principle is also supported by some of the French writers, as can be seen in the theory of cultural engineering (Mollard 1999). Critical reflection and analytical thinking along with interdisciplinary approaches and integration with social sciences is more important for this school of thought, even if the results are not the product-oriented skills that are generally expected of future arts managers.

Entrepreneurial Style: Working Together with Creativity and Innovation

Creativity is so commonly being invoked nowadays that its meaning has been cheapened and diffused. Once it meant first of all the Divine Creation, the deistic enterprise to make the whole world from scratch. At the other end of the spectrum we encounter fashionable egalitarian populism: everyone is creative, everyone could be creative, it is not more than an act of strong will.
—Dragain Klaic (2007)

The fact is that creativity and innovation (as a unified concept) is one of the most recent business and arts management fads. Nevertheless, debates and research that are exploring entrepreneurship in the arts, the relation between arts and innovation or creativity, and the main role of the arts manager are getting closer to the core of the field. That core essence includes trying to defend the role of art in society, redefine its relevance for the new era, and prevent it from becoming too ephemeral a part of our lives.

Entrepreneurship as a process can be divided into three types—individual, intrapreneurial (within an organization), and organizational (Cornwall and Perlman 1990). All three types are closely connected to the arts management field. Individual entrepreneurship is a common style because of the nature of some of the artistic disciplines (visual arts, design) and the tendency to integrate an artist and arts manager in one person (many individual artists end up managing their own careers). Organizational entrepreneurship is connected to all syncretic artistic disciplines (theater, film), while an intrapreneurial style can be suitable for large cultural and artistic organizations, such as museums and cultural centers, that may also foster and support partly independent subunits.

For the development of his idea of cultural entrepreneurship, Hagoort points out the connection between the strategy-making process and the entrepreneurial style that suits the cultural/artistic sector (2000). This is evidenced by the importance that general management thinkers give to entrepreneurial style as one of the main characteristics of artistic leadership (Mintzberg 1989). What is even more significant, in the context of the arts, is that the successful entrepreneur also requires an emotional commitment (Cornwall and Perlman 1990).

Engaged social process is one of the main threads of entrepreneurship, with interpersonal intelligence being a very important component (Chong 2002). Charismatic leadership, goals that become ideology, personalized recruitment, and rituals and symbols instead of rules and procedures are recognized as practices of an innovative organization (Van de Ven 1986). While general management sees these practices as a major threat to the stability of the organization, in the world of arts management they can be an important differentiator, connecting the organization to the idea of the institutionalization of charisma (Weber 1956). Still, the perception of the artist—which emerged from the Renaissance—as an individual creative worker engaged in some suprahuman creative task remains widespread today. Even so, it is not possible to abstract artistic creation from the social, economic, and political context (Wolff 1981).

Innovation represents a new idea that may be a recombination of old ideas, a scheme that challenges the present order, a formula, or a unique approach that is perceived as new by the individuals involved (Van de Ven 1986). It is connected primarily at the organizational level. In contrast, creativity is considered to be a quality expressed on the individual level, so one organization can be innovative, for example, by supporting creativity among its members or employees. Cultural production systems, in fact, are characterized by a constant and pervasive tension between innovation and control (DiMaggio and Hirsch 1976).

Creativity management is an issue of primary importance for the arts management sector. However, there is often confusion in differentiating between creativity management and creative management

(Fitzgibbon 2001). This includes investigations into such problems as managing attention, the process of managing ideas into good currency, and the structural problem of managing part-whole relationships (Van de Ven 1986). Diversity, emergent strategy, a virtual absence of planning, and a steady weakening of direct managerial authority over operations are all associated with creativity (Mintzberg and McHugh 1985), but these theories are rarely thought of as appropriate in the context of arts management programs because they draw upon business management curricula as their source. In an effort to reduce risk, business management does not give a significant role to these theories. Instead, they are treated as exceptions—the path taken by crazy adventurers where success is a possibility rather than a necessity. Thus, innovation is the most frequent argument presented in favor of public funding (Fitzgibbon 2001). Significant questions include: How does innovation work? What will bring about increased innovation in contemporary society? How can we evaluate innovation? Is it possible to intervene in order to encourage innovation? Answering these questions could be crucial for the development of a new generation of arts managers. The question of relativity of innovation is what makes it an even more controversial concept (what is innovative to one person is not necessarily innovative to someone else).

A Quest for the Core Essence

There is an assumption that the arts are oppositional to sports and science. The arts represent a feminine response, in contrast to other—namely masculine— activities used by management to enhance productivity, including outward bound weekends, and elite athletes on leadership, motivation, stress management, and team dynamics. Whereas the arts are viewed as soft and easy, science is viewed as serious, challenging, and difficult—but not creative. Of course, this represents a fundamental misunderstanding of the artistic process, and minimizes the creativity associated with scientific work.
—Derrick Chong (2002, 55)

Arts management is not only about management; it is primarily about the arts. A "Janus syndrome" of looking both ways should be followed, but the view toward managerial and economic aspects of the field is something arts managers have in common with general managers, while the view toward the artistic, the aesthetic, and the social is the main factor that differentiates arts management from the field of general management. In a 2000 report by the Interarts Foundation, the first compulsory area for cultural management training programs is artistic skill, followed by cultural/technical, vocational/ planning, organizational, team-building/promotional, and communication skills. The emphasis on artistic knowledge as a primary focus is important if arts management is not to be simply a case of "management plus the arts" as discussed above.

Syncretic artistic disciplines—even the ones that were considered exclusively individual from the perspective of programs at art universities—are in need of artistic teams. In recent years, interdisciplinary artistic practices have tended to involve close collaborations among teams consisting of different types of artists, managers, technicians, and designers (e.g., composer and director Heiner Goebbels in theater; young film directors such as Cristian Mungiu and Stefan Arsenijevic working in the system of European coproductions). This tendency questions the view that artistic training is reserved only for artists and breaks with the Renaissance notion of lonely individual artists as divinely inspired leaders and creators of art.

When it comes to academic curricula, there should be clear goals to educate administrators (implementers) or managers (independent leaders), either in arts management (sector-oriented culture organizations) or cultural management (interdisciplinary forms of activities). Until now, the field has been successful in training administrators, while the training of managers is improving with the current educational reforms on the European level. However, the education of arts and cultural managers needs a much wider approach in the context of contemporary challenges.

Another challenge is the tendency to offer arts management programs at the graduate level without adequate preparation at the undergraduate level. This undermines the field and will have consequences for the arts sector. The new realities of the field demand more intensive training. One-year master's programs are just a scratch on the surface, and two-year master's programs are only enough to make a small upgrade in the skills of students coming from the political, organizational, business, or social sciences, providing them with only a general understanding of the issues and challenges in the field. A better strategy for two-year master's programs is to target artists who already possess a developed

sense for the arts and aesthetics, as well as students of arts management who have completed their undergraduate courses. The course of study in such programs should be based on the concepts of interdisciplinarity and an intercultural approach to institutional and project management, with the added objective of developing students' research abilities. These skills provide artists with additional tools for expressing themselves alongside scholars and policy analysts, while also giving them the ability to be their own managers and establish competent artistic teams along with arts managers. For future arts managers, arts management degrees should be an opportunity to develop scientific approaches to their work, but the degrees should also provide some knowledge of contemporary artistic and cultural movements through participation in interdisciplinary team projects and contact with multiple perspectives of intellectual analysis. Steps in this direction can already be seen through the influence of professional societies like the International Association of Arts and Cultural Management (AIMAC), the European Network for Cultural Administration Training Centres (ENCATC), and other conferences and networks that are shaping arts management into a more mature scientific discipline both in teaching and in practice.

Undergraduate studies should incorporate some artistic training for arts managers where students work with artists as an integral part of a creative team. Some arts professors have considered this an amateur approach, but time has proved them wrong. The purpose of such training is to make future arts managers aware of the importance of collaboration in the artistic process and reduce the skepticism (sometimes deserved) many artists hold toward our profession.

Many of the concepts that are currently offered to students during their undergraduate studies should be redefined. Some of the concepts included might be the relationship between intimacy and commitment in an artistic team or the means for fulfilling a multiplicity of shared needs, including that of having fun—something it is almost impossible to imagine as part of a business school curriculum (Lyon 1974). Another valuable concept relates to the intangible aspects of work in the artistic environment, such as interpersonal relationships characterized by informality, friendship, and "la logique de l'amour" (Chiapello 1994, 394).

The question of the environment of arts management courses is also important. Questions have always been raised as to why these courses are not offered in departments of political or organizational science; in fact, in many universities they are. However, arts management students should always be taught within the same environment as art students. That is because in the professional life of arts managers—though their closest partners will be politicians and business managers—their closest affinity will always be to artists, their fellow creators. In the case of arts managers, they are the creators of institutional and project programs, but they are creators nonetheless.

Issues such as defining the core essence of the field of arts management should be at the center of academic discussions and need to influence the teaching curricula in the field. If we must take something from business management, it should be the ability to listen to some of its background voices telling us to rethink everything (Mintzberg 2005).

KEYWORDS
arts management, arts management theories, Janus syndrome, methodology, teaching curricula

REFERENCES
Berger, J. 1972. Ways of Seeing. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
Bullen, A. 2004. 2015: Brave new artist . . . or Z., a future tragedy, part 1? Paper presented at the annual conference of the European Council of Artists, Amsterdam.
Byrnes, J. W. 2003. Management and the arts. London: Elsevier / Focal Press.
Chiapello, E. 1994. Les modes de controle des organisations artistiques. PhD diss., Univ. de Paris.
Chong, D. 2002. Arts management. London: Routledge.
Cornwall, R. J., and B. Perlman. 1990. Organizational entrepreneurship. Boston: Irwin.
DiMaggio, P. J., and P. M. Hirsch. 1976. Production organization in the arts. American Behavioral Scientist 19 (6): 735–52.
Dragicevic-Sesic, M., and S. Dragojevic. 2005. Arts management in turbulent times: Adaptable quality management—Navigating the arts through the winds of change. Amsterdam: European Cultural Foundation / Boekmanstudies.
Dundjerovic, A. 1993. Menadzment u pozoristu. Belgrade: Muzej Pozorisne Umetnosti.

Evrard, Y., and F. Colbert. 2000. Arts management: A new discipline entering the millennium? International Journal of Arts Management 2 (2): 4–13.

Fitzgibbon, M. 2001. Managing innovation in the arts: Making art work. London: Quorum Books.

Hagoort, G. 2000. Art management: Entrepreneurial style. Utrecht: Eburon.

Interarts Foundation. 2000. The cultural manager as key agent for local development. Barcelona: Interarts Observatory.

Jackson, Z. 1995. The gallery management manual. New York: Consultant Press.

Klaic, D. 2007. Creativity: Another crowded bandwagon? From divine creation to creative industry. Paper presented at the ELIA Teachers' Academy conference, Brighton, Eng., July 12–14.

Langley, S. 1990. Theatre management and production in America. New York: Drama Book.

Lukic, D. 2006. Produkcija i marketing scenskih umjetnosti (Organizacija, planiranje, proizvodnja i marketing u kazalistu). Zagreb: Hrvatski centar ITI-UNESCO.

Lyon, E. 1974. Work and play: Resource constraints in a small theatre. Urban Life and Culture 3 (1): 71–97.

Matarasso, F., and C. Landry. 1999. Balancing act: Twenty-one strategic dilemmas in cultural policy. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing

Mercer, C. 2006. Foreword to Another brick in the wall: A critical review of cultural management education in Europe, by C. Şuteu. Amsterdam: Boekmanstudies.

Mintzberg, H. 1989. Mintzberg on management: Inside our strange world of organizations. New York: Free Press.

———. 2005. Developing theory about the development of theory. In Great minds in management: The process of theory development, ed. G. K. Smith and A. M. Hitt, 355–72. London: Oxford Univ. Press.

Mintzberg, H., and A. McHugh. 1985. Strategy formation in adhocracy. Administrative Science Quarterly 30:160–97

Mollard, C. 1999. L'ingénierie culturelle. Paris: PUF.

Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr. 1986. Management for productivity. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley.

Shafritz, M. J., and F. J. Ott, eds. 1996. Classics of organization theory. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.

Şuteu, C. 2006. Another brick in the wall: A critical review of cultural management education in Europe. Amsterdam: Boekmanstudies.

Tadić, B. 2001. Interview by A. Brkić. Faculty of Dramatic Arts, Belgrade.

Tusa, J. 1997. For art's sake. Prospect, January, 36–40.

Tzu, S. 2002. The art of war. Trans. and ed. J. Minford. London: Penguin Classics.

Van de Ven, A. H. 1986. Central problems in the management of innovation. Management Science 32 (5): 590–607.

Weber, M. 1956. Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1978.

Willemars, V. 2001. Cultural management and the market: Perspectives from Serbia and UK: Interviews. Beyond Borders 1. Amsterdam: European Cultural Network.

Williams, R. 1983. Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society. Rev. ed. London: Fontana.

Wolff, J. 1981. The social production of art. London: Macmillan.