

## **LEADING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS: TRADITIONAL STYLES OR DIFFERENT REALITIES?**

**Loretta Inglis, David Cray & Susan Freeman**

*Working Paper 17/06  
June 2006*

**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT  
WORKING PAPER SERIES  
ISSN 1327-5216**



### **Abstract**

Despite the large amount of research into leadership available in academic journals, little relates to the roles leaders play in arts organizations, particularly the many small arts organizations which provide major contributions to arts performance, exhibition and education in Australia today. This paper explores leadership in small arts organizations, using in-depth interviews with four executives to discover who leads these organizations, and what style of leadership is considered appropriate. Our findings suggest that these organizations are usually led by more than one person with leadership often shared between an artistic director and an arts administrator. We also found that the dominant leadership style in these organizations appears to be transformational.

**This paper is a work in progress. Material in the paper cannot be used without permission of the author.**

## LEADING ARTS ORGANIZATIONS: TRADITIONAL STYLES OR DIFFERENT REALITIES?

### INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses leadership in small, nonprofit arts organizations. Recent leadership and organizational behaviour writings have emphasised the need for research to be more concerned with context (Bresnen, 1995; Bryman, Stephens and a Campo, 1996; Conger, 1998b; Hunt and Dodge, 2000; Rousseau and Fried, 2001; Shamir and Howell, 1999). Historically researchers have seen leadership as a function of an individual's characteristics and abilities (trait approaches) and actions (behavioural approaches) and have tended to disregard the context in which leadership takes place (Burns, 1978; Rost, 1991; Rost and Barker, 2000). While Perrow's (1970:258) view that leadership is "fully determined by the setting or the task" is seen as extreme, leadership research has tended to focus on abstract concepts removed from their context (Shamir and Howell, 1999). Gronn (1996:453) asserts that most leadership research has been dominated by categorical concepts of context where it is used as "mere background information about sampling and where the research was conducted". Although more importance is attached to context in some contemporary research, most leadership research still looks at individuals in isolation. Yet the increasing internationalization of business and the more diversified nature of work settings, leads to diverse behaviour from individuals and organizations. Ignoring context risks missing key factors which may assist in the further understanding of organizational leadership.

The particular context that this study addresses is nonprofit arts organizations, the majority of which are small, employing fewer than 20 fulltime staff. Hollister (1993) suggests that leadership research has been a neglected area in all nonprofit studies and a review of the more recent nonprofit literature shows that this has not changed as the main emphasis continues to be the governance and management of nonprofits as opposed to their leadership (Hudson, 1999).

Arts organizations form a large part of the Australian nonprofit sector. While exact figures are difficult to obtain, the Australia Council recognises over 1700 different organizations. Some of these are major performing arts or exhibiting organizations with multi-million dollar budgets, but most are small, cultural or regionally specific groups providing opportunities for artists and audiences in a range of dance, music, theatre, literature, new media arts and visual art/crafts.

For some time now the environment of arts organizations throughout the world has been shifting in reaction to changes in funding, governance and competition. Many arts institutions have seen their governmental grants reduced leaving them more dependent on donors, both individual and corporate, income from performances and exhibitions, and the efforts of volunteers. In many areas, especially those of marketing and fund-raising, this situation has demanded higher levels of professionalism and more attention to managerial as opposed to artistic or aesthetic issues (Sicca and Zan, 2005). Greater involvement with a wider variety of stakeholders has also led to pressures for arts bodies to be more accountable and more transparent in their governance procedures. Overall there has been a strong push to adopt procedures closer to those of profit-making firms. The pressure for visible change will impact most heavily on the leaders of such organizations. Current movements in the arts industries throughout the world have reshaped the roles of organizational leaders, forcing them, for example, to become more entrepreneurial (Mulcahy, 2003).

Yet, both administrators and those who study arts organizations are limited in their ability to deal with the problems induced by change due to a lack of empirical research into the area of arts management. While some functional areas such as marketing have received considerable attention from researchers (Rentschler, Radbourne, Carr and Rickard, 2002) there has been a dearth of comprehensive approaches to the problems of managing arts organizations. This is partly due to the lack of interest in the arts sector exhibited by management researchers. Even the nonprofit literature has little to contribute in the way of research into or guidance for the arts industry and the leadership literature offers little help at all.

## **LEADERS IN ARTS ORGANIZATIONS**

The body of leadership theory is immense. An extensive review of that literature leads to a summary of theory which may be relevant to nonprofit arts organizations. Leadership of any nonprofit organization brings challenges that are more complex than those in a for-profit institution (Dym and Hutson, 2005). Among those complexities, Drucker (1992) and Lyons (2001) suggest, are the fact that nonprofits have more stakeholders, their revenue generation is complex, they rely on volunteers to perform tasks, they have difficulties in judging organizational performance, and that they attach great importance to their values. Arts organizations appear to have particular difficulties. First, it is not always clear who leads an arts organization as leadership roles may be divided among several individuals, who may be artists, administrators, or arts supporters. Second, there is little information about the style of leadership which is appropriate. The roles of leaders in arts organizations are relatively unexplored as leadership is usually discussed in terms of best practice or the leading organization in a field, rather than relating to individuals in leadership positions (Tschirhart, 1996).

### **Who Leads?**

The nonprofit literature is quite definite that there is a difference between governance and management in nonprofits, defining the board's role as governing while management is concerned with the day-to-day running of the organization within the guidelines set by the board (Hudson, 1999; Lyons, 2001). However, much of the literature indicates that in reality, power and responsibility are not shared so clearly and who actually leads can be a source of conflict (Axelrod, 2005). A study of nonprofit boards recognised four distinct patterns of leadership in nonprofit organizations: CEO led, board led, staff led, or collective leadership (Bradshaw, Murray and Wolpin, 1992). Murray (1998) found that the most common pattern in the larger and well-established nonprofits is the CEO-lead, defined as organizations where decisions made by the CEO are simply ratified by the board. Smaller, and newer, nonprofits, especially those that are driven by volunteers are more likely to be board led with the CEO providing information and support only. Staff leadership is evident in professional bureaucracies such as hospitals, while collective leadership, where consensus is the ideal, is observed in self-help or advocacy nonprofits.

Which types of leadership are present in arts organizations is unknown but will depend on factors such as size, age, mission and structure. In these organizations, however, the providers of services, the artists, and particularly the artistic director are likely to have a strong influence on strategic direction and management. This situation is complicated by the fact that arts organizations often have an artistic director and a managing director or CEO (or similar roles). Sometimes these roles are performed by one person, but there may be two people leading the organization, but from different perspectives. The artistic director in an arts organization has traditionally had the dominant leadership role. For this individual it is essential that the artistic direction of the organization enhances his/her reputation among peers. This will result from the organization providing the best possible the artistic experience. The managing director's or CEO's role, on the other hand, is to establish and maintain the organization as an ongoing operation, and his/her reputation as a successful administrator depends on efficiency and effectiveness. The focus of a CEO is to ensure the financial security and long-term survival of the organization; the focus of the artistic director is more on short-term artistic recognition.

### **Style of Leadership**

Apart from these issues, there are questions of which style is appropriate for an arts organization leader. How does a leader best influence his/her colleagues and followers? The leadership literature on style, or behaviour, of leaders is complex. However, four styles appear to be relevant to leadership in arts organizations: charismatic, transactional, transformational, and participatory leadership.

### ***Charismatic Leadership***

The term charisma is commonly used to describe leaders who are able to have profound effects on their followers through the force of their personality and individual abilities (Conger and Kanungo, 1998). A charismatic leader is usually dominant within the organization, high in self-confidence, and has a strong conviction in the righteousness of his/her beliefs. Such leaders have a powerful effect on their followers, inspiring trust, devotion and a desire to emulate the leader's values, goals and behaviour.

Charismatic leadership is seen as particularly important for new and emerging organizations and also for those facing a significant change or crisis (Conger and Kanungo, 1998). Charismatic leadership centres on the characteristics and behaviour of the leader and his/her ability to lead the organization through growth or change. However, charismatic leadership also has negative effects on followers. Followers can develop an unhealthy dependence on the leader, diminishing their own ability for independent action. The desire to please the leader may also be seen as an obligation. This style is usually not appropriate, or less effective, in times of relative stability and open to challenge if the leader's decisions fail, or other more credible rivals for leadership appear.

Many arts organizations are founded by an individual with a passionate commitment to that particular art form and usually a sound reputation in the field. This individual is often extremely talented and strongly committed to the purpose of the organization. This pattern begins with the founder, and after the founder moves on, is perpetuated by the artistic director, usually employed because of ability and reputation, who influences others to follow the course of action he/she favours. These high levels of talent and commitment lead either the founder or the successor to be recognised as a charismatic leader. Arts organizations are likely to encounter problems if the charismatic leader departs, is seen to be making inappropriate decisions, or another strong individual challenges their position perhaps by championing a new style or approach.

### ***Transactional Leadership***

Traditional views of leadership effectiveness have focused on transactional leadership behaviours (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Transactional leadership views the leader-follower relationship as being based on mutually beneficial exchanges. The leader-follower relationship is characterised by the leader's use of rewards and discipline to ensure satisfactory performance. One dimension of transactional leadership is contingent rewards, where leaders clarify expectations and provide resources and support in return for effort on the part of the follower. Leaders may also manage by exception, by enforcing rules to avoid mistakes and taking corrective action if deviations from standards occur.

In one sense arts organizations embrace transactional leadership. To produce a theatrical performance, or launch an art display requires substantial operational planning. The effort required by both leaders and followers is considerable and detailed management is required. On the other hand, managing creative people and delivering cultural products requires great sensitivity, an emphasis on meeting deadlines and completing administrative tasks can cause conflict. Overuse of transactional leadership can lead to complaints of managerialism and interference with artistic freedom.

### ***Transformational Leadership***

Contemporary leadership research focuses more on the identification and examination of leadership behaviours that heighten followers' appreciation of the value of task outcomes, activate their higher-order needs, and induce them to transcend self-interest for the sake of the organization (Yukl, 2006). Transformational leadership is similar in some ways to charismatic leadership, but involves more supportive and task oriented behaviours than is typical of a charismatic leader. Transformational leadership behaviour, according to (Bass, 1998) includes idealized influence, or charisma, but also the inspirational motivation of followers by articulating a vision for the future. As well, Bass (1998) suggests, transformational leaders provide intellectual stimulation for their followers by encouraging the expression of new ideas and beliefs, and provide

individualised consideration, by dealing with their followers as individuals whose particular needs, abilities and aspirations are valued.

Proponents of transformational leadership argue that such leaders can convince followers to perform beyond expected levels as a consequence of the leader's influence (Avolio, Bass and Jung, 1999; Bass, 1998). Followers are willing to exert extra effort because of their commitment to the leader, but also because of their own intrinsic work motivation and the sense of purpose and mission that drives them to excel. Critics of transformational leadership suggest that it concentrates too much on leaders, and ignores situational variables, particularly with followers (Yukl, 1999a). This weakness may be of particular relevance in arts organizations where many of the followers are artists themselves who want to be part of an artistically worthwhile organization, to have their ideas valued, and their artistic abilities cherished.

### ***Participatory Leadership***

Participative leadership behaviour involves and includes followers in various aspects of the decision making process. The common meaning of participatory leadership is involving followers in decisions through consulting or holding meetings where information and ideas are exchanged before the leader makes the final decision. Another view of participatory leadership goes further, with leaders involving followers in all aspects of the decision process, including sharing decision-making power (Yukl, 2006). Participatory leadership behaviour includes group discussion sessions, one-on-one meetings, obtaining information from followers, asking opinions about decision alternatives or ideas about how strategies might be implemented.

Because of the need of individuals to be valued, the participatory style of leadership is also likely to be appropriate in arts organizations. These organizations usually include many employees and volunteers who are well-educated, interested and committed to the goals of the organization. Such participants usually wish to be involved in decisions which will affect them and wish to influence the progress of their organization. Their ability to be involved in decision making is important, as it is they who implement decisions and their support is, therefore, vital. The effectiveness with which members of an organization implement a decision depends on the extent to which there are committed to its success, and evidence clearly shows that people do support, and are motivated by, decisions they have helped to make.

While the participatory style may motivate organizational members, promote employee buy-in and speed implementation, this style, especially when applied to major decisions, can slow the organization's reaction time significantly. The consultation and discussion implicit in this style insure that processes move more slowly than under styles which allot more power to the individual. The types of organizations amenable to the participatory style are often more inclusive, thus increasing the number of individuals and groups who feel they have a right to be involved. This tendency is exacerbated in organizations with compressed hierarchies, a common structural form among small organizations, and particularly arts organizations.

### **Leadership Styles in Arts Organizations**

Each of the styles described above has its advocates, but many researchers now believe that successful leaders match their personal styles to the culture of the organization and the demands of its environment. The strengths and weaknesses of each style make it suitable in some instances but inappropriate or even deleterious in others. There is considerable debate on the extent to which individuals can change their own styles, but it is clear that a mismatch between an individual's leadership style and organization needs or context can result in disaster even for a leader who has previously been successful (Yukl, 2006). It is incumbent, therefore, on boards and committees that select leaders to understand the characteristics of contrasting leadership styles and their implications for organizations. Table 1 presents a summary of the four styles discussed above with details of their characteristics, strengths and weaknesses and applicability.

**Table 1: Leadership Styles**

<b>Style</b>	<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	<b>Applicability</b>
<b>Charismatic</b>	Single leader who relies on personal attributes	Promotes high levels of commitment; single, overriding vision	Can generate dependency; success depends almost solely on leader	Most appropriate in small, new organizations or those in crisis
<b>Transactional</b>	Leader-follower relationship based on mutual benefits	Leadership is routinized; transition between leaders is less disruptive	Followers become calculative in their commitments	Most appropriate in routine, bureaucratic organizations
<b>Transformational</b>	Leader inspires followers to move beyond self-interest	Focuses the organization on immediate problems	Concentrates on the leader and ignores situational variables, particularly followers	Appropriate where the organization requires significant change
<b>Participatory</b>	Leader involves others in decision making and other leadership roles	Promotes a sense of belonging; speeds implementation	Slows decision making and other processes	Appropriate in flat organizations with widely accepted goals

Adapted from Bass (1998), and Yukl (2006)

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study explores leadership in small arts organizations with the aim of discovering who leads these organizations, and what style of leadership is considered appropriate. The responses of leaders in four small organizations are examined. The organisations are a music festival and three orchestras. One is a training orchestra for young musicians, another, an orchestra which focuses on educating students in schools, and the third is a specialist orchestra. The four organizations have an equivalent fulltime staff of 10-20, though each employed casual and short-term contract staff as well at particular times of the year, and each had a number of committed volunteer workers. Although this sample focuses on music groups, the organisations are similar in size, management and leadership to most other small, arts organisations in every artistic sphere. Although small arts groups may have much in common with other small businesses, the fact that each organization involved volunteers and the complexities inherent in their management differentiates them from small for-profit businesses.

This is an exploratory study because there has been very little research into leadership in nonprofit organizations and even less into leadership in small, nonprofit, arts organizations (Kay, 1996). The study uses qualitative techniques, such as interviews, observation and document analysis as these appear to have the greatest potential in exploring, describing and explaining leadership in nonprofit organizations. The interviews were confined to individuals in senior management positions and the questions related to the management and leadership of the whole organization, rather than specifically to the management and leadership of the artistic endeavours of each organization.

Two leaders interviewed were titled the Artistic Administrator and two were titled the General Manager.

In-depth, semi-structured interviews were used to explore ideas of leadership with the respondents. Ensuring reliability and validity is contentious in qualitative research, hence the four criteria recommended by Bryman and Bell (2003) were used. These are credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. Credibility was ensured by having the respondents comment on and confirm the interview transcripts and the analysis of the data collected. Transferability was ensured by the depth of the data using different sources to achieve a rich description of each organization. Dependability was ensured through the use of an independent researcher to code the information. Comparison of the second coding and the writer's showed an interrater reliability of .82. Compiling a protocol for the case that included set research questions and schedules as well as analysing the data collected using relevant theory ensured consistency and dependability. Confirmability is hard to achieve in a small qualitative study of this nature, but objectivity, was maintained as much as possible. The limitation of generalizability imposed on qualitative research is recognised, but the results of this study may have implications for other small arts organizations.

## FINDINGS

Table 2 summarises the four organizations studied. Results from the interviews are presented under two headings, who leads and style of leadership. The first section identifies who leads these organisations, and the second section examines which of the styles of leadership discussed, charismatic, transformational, transactional and participative, appear to be used by the four leaders studied.

**Table 2: The Organisations Studied**

Organization	Age (years)	Interviewee's role	Number of permanent employees	Number of volunteers
Festival*	28	General Manager	15	50-60
Music in Schools*	60	Artistic Administrator	20	150-180
Training Orchestra*	48	General Manager	12	80-100
Specialist Orchestra*	30	Artistic Administrator	18	15

\* All pseudonyms

### Who leads?

The focus of much of contemporary leadership research is on an organization's chief executive officer (Bresnen, 1995). It is assumed that this individual will demonstrate and articulate the values and goals of the organization and it is at this level that the culture of an organization is defined (Bass and Avolio, 1993; Kotter, 1990; Schein, ; Schein, 1992; Yukl, 1999b). A few writers, nonetheless, have seen that power and leadership in these organizations is not necessarily the province of one person alone, but can be shared, dispersed, or distributed within organizations. Some writers suggest that there is a "board-executive dyad" operating in many nonprofit organizations (Golensky, 1993:177) while Bradshaw et al's (1992) recognised the four distinct patterns of leadership in non-profit organizations: CEO-led, board-led, staff-led, or collective leadership. The four organizations in this study were examined, to determine who leads small arts non-profit organizations, if there is a dominant leadership pattern in each, and to determine if any particular pattern is more common. In this study one organization appeared to be CEO-led while

the other three appeared to be led by a collective of, in one case, the artistic director and CEO, in another the CEO and Board Chair, and in the third by a group of five including the artistic director, CEO and an executive of three other managers. No organization was dominated by staff or the board. Table 3 summarizes the dominant leader in the four organizations using Bradshaw et al's (1992) framework.

**Table 3: Dominant Leaders in Organizations Studied**

Organization	CEO-led	Board-led	Staff-led	Collective leadership
Festival	--	--	--	Artistic Director, CEO and management team
Music in Schools	General Manager	--	--	
Training Orchestra	--	--	--	General Manager and Board Chair
Specialist Orchestra	--	--	--	Artistic Administrator and CEO

The Festival was run by a collective of the Artistic Director and General Manager (the CEO) together with an executive team which included three department managers. The General Manager was interviewed and stated, "We are all here to support the director in achieving his vision for the festival", but qualified this by saying that artistic directors "came and went" about every three years and the management team is "the anchor if you like, for the whole organization."

Music in Schools was led by its General Manager (the CEO) with its Artistic Director having a major say in artistic direction, but working under the direction of the CEO. The organization had tried to run without an artistic director after a time of employing many different individuals who had other responsibilities, or were busy overseas with limited time in Australia but, the Artistic Administrator reported in the interview, had decided "we needed a musician as artistic director". Eventually the organization accepted an individual in a part-time role overseen by the CEO.

The Training Orchestra was also led by its General Manager (the CEO), supported by a small administrative team and conductors on short term contracts, although it was clear there was a considerable involvement from the Chair of the Board. The General Manager, who was interviewee, praised the contribution of the Board Chair, saying, "She is great ... she is my mentor ...and acknowledged her contribution to strategic leadership." The General Manager spoke of the need to "manage upwards" and "harness the capacities of the board" which he found challenging as they were "accomplished professionals ... concert masters or partners in law firms". It was evident from his comments that the Chair was influential in day-to-day planning.

The Specialist Orchestra was led by both the Artistic Director and the CEO. The interviewee, the Artistic Administrator, reported that "They are kind of partners in a way. That relationship has to work or the company gets itself in a bit of a mess as has happened in the past". The respondent also commented that "It's always hard to serve two masters," and that the other staff found it difficult, and she personally found that "I sit at the cross-roads between the artistic and the management."

These cases suggest that leadership in small arts organizations is more likely to be shared between two or more individuals. The finding that three out of the four organizations are led by more than one leader is atypical of cases cited in the leadership literature, which, for the most part, focuses on a single organizational leader. The finding suggests that further research is needed to determine if this situation is the norm in small arts organizations. If this is the case, then more research is also needed to determine how this shared leadership operates. Gronn (2002), through his ideas on distributed leadership, suggests a model of how collective leadership might work, but there is a lack of processual studies of leadership generally, in the non-profit area and in arts organizations in particular (Conger, 1998a).

## What style of leadership?

A review of the leadership literature suggests that four styles may be relevant to leadership in arts organizations: charismatic, transactional, transformational, and participatory leadership. Table 3 summarises the leadership styles identified in the four organizations.

### **Charismatic**

There is no evidence that any of the four organizations were led by a single, charismatic leader. This is possibly a result of the fact that all four organizations studied were more than 28 years old, all were well-established and though all reported they had to work hard at fund-raising, all were relatively stable financially. As charismatic leadership is deemed to be most appropriate in small, new organizations or those in crisis it is not surprising that there is no single leader who stands out.

**Table 4: Styles of Leadership in Arts Organizations**

Organization	Charismatic	Transformational	Transactional	Participative
Festival	No evidence of Charismatic leadership in any organization	✓	No evidence of Transactional leadership in any organization	✓
Music in Schools		✓		✓
Training Orchestra		✓		✓
Specialist Orchestra		✓		✓

### **Transformational**

There is strong evidence from these four organizations that the leaders are transformational. Transformational leadership behaviour, according to Bass (1998), includes behaviours which demonstrate idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation. Idealized influence is demonstrated by leaders who display conviction; emphasize trust; present their most important values; and emphasize the importance of purpose and commitment with such leaders being admired as role models generating pride, loyalty, confidence (Bass, 1998). These aspects of leadership appeared very important to the leaders interviewed, with all interviewees stating that their organizations was, a leader in its field and revealing strong admiration for the other leaders in their organizations, particularly the artistic leaders, usually because they were “fine musicians” or “great conductors”, and two respondents said about their artistic director “we are lucky to have him”. All leaders, both administrative and artistic, however, demonstrate idealised influence by their commitment shown particularly by their willingness to work long hours in a position which did not reward them as well as positions in a for-profit organization. As one CEO put it “These jobs will never pay, you know, market rates – then these are wonderful jobs where you can combine the business acumen you picked up with a passion for the arts.”

Following on from that, it was also clear that a major reason the respondents expressed for working in these small arts organizations was the intellectual stimulation offered. Bass (1998) suggests that leaders provide intellectual stimulation when they encourage in others new perspectives and ways of doing things; and encourage the expression of ideas and reasons. All interviewees commented that they encouraged their followers to express their own ideas and participate in the planning of programs for the organization. As one CEO said, “People tend to stay for many years ... because there is something new every year”. At the same time she believed the turnover of artistic directors was positive because “it refreshes the program”. The CEO of the Training Orchestra stated that, “I always wanted very much to ... expose them to a range of experiences.”

The four respondents all clearly indicated that leaders in their organizations needed to have individualised consideration for each person who worked for them. Leaders demonstrating consideration deal with all their followers as individuals whose needs, abilities and aspirations are valued (Bass, 1998). The festival CEO said that she needed to “ensure that people have an environment which is really conducive to them doing their best and they want to do their best”. This was echoed by the CEO of the Specialist Orchestra who said emphasised having “a nurturing, training environment and I want to build people up”. Three of the organizations spoke of their organizations as “a family” (one’s website even used this term), “where you strive to bring out the best in people.”

Bass (1997:133) suggests that transformational leaders motivate by inspiring their followers. They do this by articulating a vision for the future, being optimistic, encouraging and challenging followers and showing them that their work has meaning. The respondents all emphasised the importance of the staff knowing their place in the organization and recognising how important their contribution to it was. “Everyone has to know their job, but also be prepared to do someone else’s job too because every job is important but we are a very small organization”, the CEO of the Training Orchestra said.

### ***Transactional***

Despite the fact that all four organizations were highly project driven, with deadlines to meet, key performance indicators to achieve for government and donor bodies, budgetary constraints, and high standards of performance, both administrative and artistic to meet, there was little evidence that the leaders were transactional with their staff.

Three organizations identified themselves as “a family”. “It’s a very small organization, so, has the characteristics of a small family ... it is more than just a job.” Three of the respondents talked unreservedly about the need to “trust people to do their jobs” and that a “directing, dogmatic style would not go down at all, not at all, and a sort really structured approach wouldn’t”. “You must be flexible with staff” the CEO of the Specialist Orchestra stated, “You can’t demand they do something one day, then ask them to work Sunday or late at night the next.”

### ***Participative***

When asked what style of leadership was most appropriate in these organizations, all those interviewed stated the need for consultation. “We are a democracy, particularly at orchestra level, everyone wants a say”. As one CEO put it, “There is a personal interest or investment that these people seem to have and I think that sort of creates a hot house environment in a small organization.” For this reason he felt that consultation, flexibility and communication were vital for leaders. “You can’t be a dictator”. Another stated, “We have the characteristics of a small family, and if somebody is sick or away, or having a personal crisis, then the team is not right and everyone is affected, so it is more than just a job.” The CEO of the training orchestra summarised his staff as “ten very passionate, opinionated, committed people” who needed to be included in decision-making.

## **CONCLUSION**

The leaders of all types of organizations face multiple challenges in their roles, but those heading small arts organizations frequently encounter contexts which differ markedly from the environments of businesses whose practices they are being urged to emulate. Although this study is limited to four cases of music organisations, their governance and leadership is similar to that seen in many other small, and large, arts organizations throughout Australia

In this study we have attempted to analyse leadership patterns in arts organizations. We conclude that none of these organizations have a single leader, but leadership is shared or even flows from a leadership collective. Leadership in each case includes, at least, an administrative CEO and an artistic director. We also attempted to match some recognized models of leadership with the

leaders of arts organizations. All four of the models discussed appear appropriate in some circumstances however it is evident that the arts leaders studied use a transformational style. Charismatic leaders do not appear to be suitable for these well-established organizations, and transactional leadership appears to be ineffective given motivation of the individuals who chose to work in these organizations.

This exploration of leadership in arts organization shows a need to move away from prescriptions to analyses of actual leaders' activities and styles. Future research should investigate their relationship to other leaders, and the characteristics of the organization and its environment which influence the appropriate leadership style.

It is unlikely that there is a single type of leadership which is suitable for all organizations, but those selecting leaders should be aware of the style of each candidate and what this implies for the arts organization. In particular it is necessary to consider the need for a leader to share leadership or at least, to work closely with another leader who is driven by different goals, and to consider the passion and commitment that distinguishes employees of such organizations. While some traditional leadership styles may be appropriate in arts organizations, this study indicates that the reality for these organizations is that leadership is often shared, and this brings different challenges for the leaders.

## REFERENCES

- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M. and Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational, and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 72: 441-462.
- Axelrod, N. R. (2005). Board leadership and board development. *The Jossey-Bass handbook of nonprofit leadership and management*. R. D. Herman. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York, Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist* 52: 130-139.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly* 17 (1): 112.
- Bradshaw, P., Murray, V. and Wolpin, J. (1992). Do Nonprofit Boards Make a Difference? An Exploration of Relationships Among Broad Structure, Process and Effectiveness. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 21: 227-249.
- Bresnen, M. J. (1995). All things to all people? Perceptions, Attributions, and Constructions of Leadership? *Leadership Quarterly* 6 (4): 495-513.
- Bryman, A. and Bell, E. (2003). *Business Research Methods*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bryman, A., Stephens, M. and a Campo, C. (1996). The importance of context: Qualitative research and the study of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 7 (3): 353-370.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, Harper and Row.
- Conger, J. A. (1998a). The folly of knowing an elephant by its tail: why the leadership field needs multiple levels of analysis. *Leadership: the multi-level approaches: Part B. Contemporary and alternative*. F. Dansereau and F. J. Yammarino. Stamford, JAI Press: 77-83.
- Conger, J. A. (1998b). Qualitative Research as the cornerstone methodology for understanding leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 9 (1): 107-121.
- Conger, J. A. and Kanungo, R. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. New York, Sage.
- Drucker, P. F. (1992). *Managing the non-profit organization: practices and principles*. Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Dym, B. and Hutson, H. (2005). *Leadership in Nonprofit Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Golensky, M. (1993). The Board-Executive Relationship in Nonprofit Organizations: Partnership or Power Struggle? *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 4 (2): 177-191.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership as a unit of analysis. *Leadership Quarterly* 13 (4): 423-451.
- Gronn, P. and Ribbins, P. (1996). Leaders in context: Postpositivist approaches to understanding educational leadership. *Educational Administrative Quarterly* 32 (3): 452.
- Hollister, R. M. (1993). Developing a Research Agenda for Nonprofit Management. *Governing, leading and managing nonprofit organizations: new insights from research and practices*. D. R. Young, R. M. Hollister, V. A. Hodgkinson and Associates. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Hudson, M. (1999). *Managing Without Profit*. London, Penguin Books.
- Hunt, J. G. and Dodge, G. E. (2000). Leadership deja vu all over again. *The Leadership Quarterly* 11 (4): 435-458.

- Kay, R. (1996). What kind of leadership do voluntary associations need? *Voluntary Agencies: Challenges of Organisation and Management*: D. Billis and M. Harris. London, McMillan: 131-148.
- Kotter, J. P. (1990). What Leaders Really Do. *Harvard Business Review* 68: 103-111.
- Lyons, M. (2001). *Third Sector*. Sydney, Allen & Unwin.
- Mulcahy, K. V. (2003). Entrepreneurship or Social Darwinism? Privatization and American Cultural Patronage. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 33 (3): 165-184.
- Murray, V. (1998). Governance of Nonprofit Organizations. *International Encyclopedia of Public Policy and Administration*. J. M. Shafritz. Colorado, Westview Press.
- Perrow, C. (1970). *Organizational analysis: A sociological approach*. Belmont, CA, Wadsworth.
- Rentschler, R., Radbourne, J., Carr, R. and Rickard, J. (2002). Relationship Marketing, Audience Retention and Performance Arts Organisation Viability. 7 2 (118-130).
- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*. Westport, CT, Praeger.
- Rost, J. C. and Barker, R. A. (2000). Leadership Education in Colleges: Toward a 21st Century Paradigm. *Journal of Leadership Studies* 7 (1): 3.
- Rousseau, D. M. and Fried, Y. (2001). Location, location, location: contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22 (1): 1-13.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco:, Jossey Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Shamir, B. and Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 10 (2): 257-283.
- Sicca, L. M. and Zan, L. (2005). Much Ado about Management: managerial Rhetoric in the Transformation of Italian Opera Houses. *International Journal of Arts Management* 7 (3): 46-64.
- Tschirhart, M. (1996). *Artful leadership: managing stakeholder problems in nonprofit arts organizations*. Bloomington : In, Indiana University Press.
- Yukl, G. (1999a). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly* 10 (2): 285-305.
- Yukl, G. (1999b). An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 8 (1): 33-48.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations*. New Jersey, Pearson Prentice Hall.