Academic training in cultural management in Europe: making it work

CONTENTS

Academic training in cultural management in Europe: making it work
Corina Suteu

DISCUSSION PAPER[1]

Introduction

The following paper will only address a limited part of the complexity of issues related to the academic training in cultural management regarded from a comparative, European perspective. Its aim its to highlight a number of key topics of concern and offer a broad perspective to further specialized debate. The perspective chosen is related in many aspects to the author's background. As director of a MA course in European cultural management for the last eight years, but also as cultural operator in Europe, she is very much aware about the importance of the present momentum to revise and reshape the reflection dedicated to a discipline that only academically gained generalized legitimacy ten to fifteen years ago in the whole of European countries.

Thus, we propose to consider in the following demonstration aspects related to:

a/ the evolution of the cultural organizations between the 50s and today and, accordingly, from art administration to cultural management

b/ the delimitation of the specific professional category of 'cultural manager' and, accordingly, the difficulties in curricula building, as well as the relation between the discipline's training contents and the traditional academic disciplines content and formats in different European countries.

c/ general evolution of the meaning of, on one hand, 'cultural space' and, on the other business management training, identifying the potential bridges and limitations that the bringing together of two opposed functional logics might have as consequence in defining and teaching a 'young' academic discipline

d/ general overview of the findings of European researchers about the subject and a present state of affairs that brings cultural management forward today more as a strategic, visionary, area based kind of academic competence as compared to a former purely utilitarian and technocratic one.

e / the most frequently posed dilemmas that preoccupy the specialized circles are going to be listed in the end, as kick of pretext for a fruitful discussion.

---

[1] This working paper contains some of the material included in the study *Boekmanstichting and the University of Amsterdam* commissioned to me last year. Inside the study, subjects are treated in a much more extensive way and many other issues are developed; the present paper is only aiming to offer a general and incentive background to the hopefully rich and stimulating discussions in March.

1   General Context

1.1   Some historical steps

The emergence of academic training in 'cultural management' in Europe is strongly related to the cultural organization phases of evolution in post war Europe.
These phases are:

We would observe, first, that art organizations are a 'must' of the society East and West in Europe after the second world war. Consequently, substantial public subsidy, that requires substantial staff for both venue and project administration is needed.

This 'boom' of cultural equipment creation is determined, in Western Europe, also by the Pop culture movement in the 60s and the drive towards alternative culture, combined with a rich offer of more traditional nature. Governments start considering the investment in leisure/cultural activities as important and intergovernmental organizations (Council of Europe, UNESCO) participate actively to raise awareness about the cultural cooperation aspect at a decision making level as a condition for insuring stability in a newly pacified Europe.

In the same period, in Eastern Europe, cultural infrastructures and equipment start being built and created as main 'instruments' for the communist propaganda and as strong community symbols of the successful power apparatus. Thus, the 60s are a decade of infrastructure explosion for the cultural domain and, accordingly, for the administrative and executive related professions necessary to coordinate and stabilize the artistic field.

On a second level, markets 'explode' for culture after the 60s both West, where the leisure industry, alternative industry and cultural industries emerge, together with democratization of culture logic (France) or deep liberalization of the cultural markets(UK and in the East), where the market is automatically acquired: theater tickets are sold through factory party cells and museums and galleries are programmatically visited by pupils and students, cultural manifestations are obligatorily attended and paid by the working class and the offer is always 'matched' to an obligatory consumption within the communist system.

Late seventies come with new dynamics. Cultural consumption is stabilized and an incentive regression is to be felt about the public support. In the same time, Southern Europe and Northern Europe start boosting their development. The international cooperation logic gains more and more strength among cultural operators within that emergent space. The 80s seem the peak of this positive and multilateral, open, evolution.

The fall of Communism is still far, therefore East and West function as isolated, strong cooperation takes place in between the countries within the same circle, on one side and on the other of the ideological iron curtain.

Last, but not least, from a purely institutional point of view, what is witnessed after the 80s, is a shift from the purely sector divided, traditional approach on the arts, as music, dance, fine arts, theater, heritage..., to a more global domain (emergence of cultural centers, interdisciplinary events, cultural institutions with transversal focus - center for contemporary arts, cultural cooperation institutes and foundations, media organizations...etc) or, putting this in other terms, from 'specialized cultural institutions' to 'multipurpose and multifunctional ones' [1]

---

[1] Boylan, Patrick, « Resources for training in cultural management and administration of cultural institutions », a pilot study for UNESCO, 1999-2000, pg 8

1.2　From art administration to cultural management: a profession is born

A gradual change occurs in the West from a generally legitimated meaning of what artistic activity historically is, to an explosion of cultural industries, strongly related to media, the market logic and the new technologies (the culture of elite turns into the culture of people and of leisure). Art administration becomes thus only a category within the broader cultural management field and a new system of interrelations is established between the artistic education and the management of the cultural institution and of the cultural space.

In the same period, in Eastern Europe, more and more 'megalomaniac' cultural events start taking place, as ideal support for efficient youth propaganda. These events need important infrastructure and staff, collective efficiency and performance in the artistic equipment.

Until the 80s, art is supposed to be mainly administrated, because largely state supported, but starting with the end of the decade 'all over Europe, the once relatively sharp distinction between public and private sectors is becoming blurred'[1]. Stable cultural institutions see emerging a large number of cultural projects, international events, the logic of quick evolution finding in the 'project pattern', in the so called 'event', a much more flexible structural identity and therefore a less heavy infrastructure unit.

Some examples to support this:
Concerning Portugal, Maria Calado, the deputy mayor for culture in Lisbon writes: 'the evolution of the cultural sector in the last ten years (since 1990) have almost entirely brought about by new business dynamics in the areas of cultural interventions and cultural industries. They have led to new professional profiles...' [2]

In France, the study realized in 1997 by Jaques Rigaud on behalf of the Ministry of culture, points out three new priorities that should mark the redesign of future French cultural policies (one of the most state subsidized culture in Europe!). They are: autonomy, contract based agreement, assessment obligation.[3] His approach is directed to a 'desacralization of the State' on behalf of a logic of autonomous action and empowerment of the individual cultural actor. Author of numerous articles and books about French Cultural policy, Rigaud is speaking about autonomy without diminishing the state's role, on the contrary. His idea is to enable the heavy French administration to operate in a more flexible way, in accordance to cultural practices, but preserving the same state owned and protective framework for the cultural activities.

Theoretician of the so called 'l'exception culturelle francaise'[4], the author formulates in fact through this approach a possible compromise with the liberalized and much more grass-rooted system of Nordic and Anglo - Saxon countries. It seems anyway a revolutionary perspective for the very centralized and exclusively top down oriented French traditional approach.

---

[1] « In from the margins », ed. Conseil de l'Europe, English version, 1997, pg 58

[2] Include, technical report under the framework of Leonardo da Vinci programme, EU, Interarts Observatory, 2000, Calado, Maria, « The global situation in Portugal and the case of Lisbon », pg 29

[3] Rigaud, Jaques, « Pour une refondation de la politique culturelle », la doc. francaise, Paris, 1997, pg 13

[4] Rigaud Jaques, « L'exeption culturelle », ed Grasset, Paris, 1995

For the Netherlands, the Director of the cultural policy directorate of the Dutch ministry of Culture, Education and Science, was observing in his speech during the conference 'Management of change'(Graz, 1998)[1]: 'Over the years in which I worked for my department I have seen how, with some difficulty along the way, financial, legal and administrative qualities, as well as managerial know how, have gradually come to be recognized as essential....that within cultural institutions too, not only people with the necessary artistic vision are needed, there must also be those with business and financial skills, and that these people must be seen as equals. At least, this is the case if the subsidizing body wishes to avoid unpleasant financial surprises or worst'.

A comprehensive and relevant approach to this issue is to be found also in the pilot study professor Patrick Boylan realized on behalf of UNESCO in 1999-2000: 'Resources for training in the management and administration of cultural institutions'. Based mainly on museum and heritage management training provision in some EU countries, US and Canada (with some central European examples) study points out to what extent the intrusion of pure management logic transformed the traditional cultural institution: 'The steady decline in public funding (at least in relative terms against expanding demand or usage, and even in absolute terms in some cases) means that cultural institutions frequently need far more than a few specialists in fundraising and marketing in some new central department or unit. There are new and ever increasing pressures on staff at all levels to become actively involved in marketing or the fundraising process, if only in relation to their own project, while the (welcomed) trend towards more decentralized and democratic styles of internal management places new pressures on middle level professional staff in particular'[2].

In Central Europe, before the fall of communism, countries like Hungary and the Czechoslovakia start developing public/private incentive policies for the cultural manifestations. The same happens in Yugoslavia. As for Albania, Poland and Romania, the state subsidies persist, but the cultural organizations start being obliged to 'produce' also other types of 'sellable' objects. Artistic unions are requested to bring income and the national theaters start producing within their workshops different merchandise (artisan-like ones) so that the institution can survive in the middle of the most 'community' run type of socio-economical order [3].

These examples show us to what extent we can no longer speak after late 80s about art administration, but more and more about the 'entreprise culturelle' and consequently, to what degree art organizations are less administrated(state governed) and more and more 'made operationally independent', therefore subject to a management logic (autonomy, leadership,
innovation..)[4]. The apparatus of private sector - strategic plans, performance indicators, marketing strategies starts being applied broadly to the cultural institutions in different European countries.

---

[1] « Management of change », Cultural aspects of European integration and the Enlargement of the EU, Kulturkontact, Austria, Graz, July, 2-4, 1998

[2] Boylan, idem, ibidem, pg 5

[3] Data about it is extracted from interviews in the framework of different colloquies and interviews with Central and eastern European policy experts, as well as policy papers published by the evaluation of Cultural policies program, CoE

[4] « In from the margins », idem, ibidem, pg. 59

And because 'in modern society there cannot be legitimacy without a certain degree of professionalism' the emergence of arts professions spawned a large number of training opportunities, proving that culture had its own skills, whether they be artistic, technical or administrative.[1]

The profession of cultural manager is born!

1.3 Defining the specific competence of a cultural manager: a problematic issue

Above mentioned phases of institutional development bring us to consider and identify several difficulties in delimiting the professional category and the 'competence' requested from a 'cultural manager' ; competence to be accordingly translated into a training content. And to be approached and formulated through most adapted methodologies.

First, we would observe that culture, management and education are self delimited domains of competence in themselves. On one hand, management is generally regarded as a competence related to economy and, on the other, culture and education to humanities. Within Europe (EU and beyond), cultural policies and education policies were functioning until recently completely independently and almost no collaboration existed between these two territories. It was in early 2000 that synergism started to be envisaged, both at national level in EU countries and at the level of the EU commission itself, as a result, no doubt, of recent international evolution, the radical mutations of national cultural policies and educational policies and the return of arts and humanities in the core of learning curriculum all over Europe.[2]

Second, we note the fact that administrative infrastructures of European countries are very different and rooted in well established traditions. For understandable reasons, we will try to identify simple typologies, but we must be very careful, as sometimes subtle differences and characteristics are what counts more, when dealing with a discipline related to culture. Having informed insight and a pertinent view both on the need for diversity and of quest for a common perspective is complicated without a long term engaged comparative research. This gives a rather fragmentary aspect to the unitary content we try to seize. It is not quantitative information that is lacking, on the contrary, but the qualitative and comparative analyze and interpretation from European point of view.

A third difficulty is raised by the fact that difference between context in Eastern and Western Europe remain very important, whatever the political and integrative European discourse says. Integration and harmonization actions are engaged top down, so that there is weak organic growth and adjustments are rather 'patchy'. Late dynamics of standardization of educational models in Europe (*see 'Bologna process'*) imply formal, not content harmonization, or the key of learning processes relies very much on the quality of the content. Of course, everyone agrees that diversity has to be preserved, so that no unique content should be taught. In the same time, at a purely formal level, the process has already

---

[1] « In from the margins », idem. ibidem, pg 59

[2] see Council of Europe project, « Culture, creativity and the young » and related surveys, Council of Europe, Direction Générale IV, 1997

been engaged, without previous examination and re-conceptualization of the type of components to fill in the 'standard boxes'.

Last difficulty, the fact that in Europe we deal with only few main contrastive formats in higher education, but content filiations, influences and similarities are far from being obvious. There is a secrecy and reluctance to admit that some 'dominant cultural models' had imposed and inspired through history, both culture and education in Europe, according to the cyclical redesigning of Europe's map and according to broader macro economic and social developments. From this point of view, an endeavor to study the 'archaeology of educational systems' would be a daring and useful project.[1] We would surely find strong similarities of educational infrastructure models between Austria and the former Austro Hungarian states even during and after the communist period, we will recognize Nordic countries model in the cultural and educational policies of the Baltic states and strong German and Russian influences in Bulgaria! [2]

Not to speak about the complex task to classify from comparative perspective Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and Netherlands, for example. Of course, structural classification is handy, but we believe that awareness about 'invisible' links and influence are also important in successfully dealing with the chosen topic.

Other elements appear as relevant:

Culture and education were only recently recognized as legitimate action lines of the European community [3]. Even so, as the Ruffolo report underlines in 2000,[4] the Council of Minister of EC does not match their declarations about the importance of culture for the European integration process with the resources allocated to the domain. In the same time, education and culture recently became a common field of concern within the EU policy and we can hear in the discourse of the culture and education high representatives the impulse addressed to the cultural sector to come together with education, as a 'binding element', in twinned effort, trying to forget years of separated action.[5] But cooperation between the grass rooted initiatives and the actors of both fields is yet far from being efficiently engaged.

Moreover, we have like a memory problem in the cultural field, as if we take everything all over again, making it seem as new, and it is a real handicap to see how many positive actions and programs launched functioned, stopped, were forgotten and reinvented, sometimes in worst conditions. Action in cultural cooperation is also very uncoordinated and we can observe that in spite of poor resource, no serious endeavor is made to allocate

---

[1] suggestion of R. Picht, rector of European College, Bruges, during the symposium « Transferring European culture », proposals for cultural and academic initiatives in an enlarged Europe »r about educational policies at EU level, 18-21 November, 2003

[2] Bulgarian review (national report),national cultural policies, in the framework of Council of Europe program, Strasbourg, 1997, pg. 19

[3] art 128 of Maastricht Treaty(1993), becoming art 151 of the Amsterdam treaty(1997)

[4] Ruffolo, Giorgio, Introduction to report, « Unity in diversities, cultural cooperation in the EU, www.europarl.eu.int/meetdocs:committees/cult/default_en.htm

[5] Van der Pas, Nicolas, (Director Education and Culture EU) speech, Efah/ECF meeting, Brussels, 2002

them better and in a more complementary way. But this is probably the issue of another essay on cultural activity itself.[1]

Last, but not least, the capacity to determine a transparent and 'readable' methodological and pedagogical chart for the different aspects of the cultural management domain is what concerns us today. Thus, the specific delimitation of content, the preconditions for the creation of a 'European' syllabus for cultural management and the development, within, of strategic, international and area based competencies are key matters of concern.

1.4 How *academic* credentials would render legitimacy to a cultural manager

A study published in 1992 by Rod Fischer and Ritva Mitchell in the framework of CIRCLE[2] and with Council of Europe support makes a number of important observations about the issue of the quest for professional legitimization of cultural management, out of which we selected the following:

a/ The distinction operated between Anglo-American and Continental model of professionalism. The former emphasizes the capacity of self-employed practitioners to coordinate their organizational setting(accordingly, the 'value of expertise' in this model is provided by the markets). The latter emphasizes the academic credentials to attain a leading positions(the value of professionalism is depending on education and status).

b/ The dialectic specialist/generalist training and academic education / practical experience, with the conclusion, in 1992 that 'there is a tendency of formal licensing of arts managers and cultural administrators'- at least a tendency for 'accredited diploma' in Europe. The specialized academic training in cultural management has created professional closed groups: librarians, curators, conservationist..., but this process cannot be applied to 'generalist cultural management'. There cannot be a homogenous 'occupational group - closed shop type' with the same standardized training (from a generalistic perspective)

c/ The observation that no academic training would be able to produce 'ready made managers': however high the level of competence, a cultural manager would be submitted to ongoing contradictory demands from external factors: the market, public authorities, artists, audiences and internal ones: colleagues and other cultural organizations.

d/ Last but not least, even in the USA, the profession's 'accreditation' system finding itself still, after 25 years of specialized vocational training, in full development.[3] Researchers stress that the development of accreditation 'leaves many unanswered questions' and that ' it

---

[1] The European Forum for the Arts and Heritage (EFAH) and the Interarts Foundation are currently undertaking a "Study on Cultural Cooperation in Europe in Various Cultural and Artistic Fields", on behalf of the European Commission (public services contract n° DG EAC/48/02).

[2] « professional managers for arts and culture ? the training of cultural administrators and arts managers in Europe -trends and perspectives, CIRCLE publication no. 4, Arts council of Finland, Helsinki University print, 1992,pg. 25-29

[3] Within the report « Informing cultural policy », ed. Center for Urban Policy research, New Jersey, 2001, Mark Schuster is putting forward, as one of the findings of the debate taking place 7th of December, that « the majority of arts administrators have little or no exposure to formal training in USA, pg 225, appendix

is difficult and may even be impossible to develop universal training models for apparently similar occupational groups of cultural administrators and arts managers.'

What we can add to these findings is that the gradual redistribution of accent in Europe from the 'capacity to implement' cultural policies and to administrate the public domain to the capacity to manage and lead autonomous cultural organizations (as showed in the former chapter) didn't correspond to an immediate replacement of the classical administration training provision with more adapted and specifically labeled ones (even less so in the countries in Europe with heavy public administration infrastructures, like France, Germany, Italy or Spain).

Therefore, the training opportunities for the cultural public sector (public administration or administration of important public subsidized cultural organizations) as well as for the private cultural sector(cultural industries, leisure industries) is still taking place either in the specially designed professional bodies - like the Arts training network in England (formed by the four regional training centers in UK), like the adult training agencies in France, Netherlands or Austria, dedicated to professional or vocational education or, for the academic level, within subsidiary specialization of purely administrative, commercial, polytechnic or artistic academies.

Therefore, freshly nominated in 2003 director of Avignon Festival (37 years old) is a graduate of a Business school in France (ESC de Rennes), specialty 'pure marketing' and he is replacing a graduate from the very reputed ENA (Ecole Nationale D'Administration). Director of the ECF (European Cultural Foundation) in Amsterdam is a Philosophy and German literature graduate and the director of 'Tate gallery' graduated Oxford University-History of arts. It is true that the Deputy of the Avignon festival is a graduate of MA in cultural management of Paris Dauphine and the secretary general of IETM (Informal European Theatre Meeting) -is a Warwick MA in cultural policy graduate, but it can as well just be a coincidence! No indicator, at least not for the moment, encourages us to believe that a graduate from a specialized academic course will have more access to high level functions than someone who studied pure economics, administration or the arts and humanities and wanted to work further in management of the cultural organization. On the contrary, the high percentage of 'feminine' component in training programs for cultural management witnesses about the discrete belief that it is not the certificates and diplomas in this discipline that will provide career high hierarchical positions that a male audience would ambition for. This is, of course, an empirical observation, but some relevance relays in it!

We observe, thus, a 'tension' between the training provision of a traditional nature (in administration, business, arts) and those of 'cultural management', as identified discipline. The differences in profile of competencies requested of these categories in different European countries are not clear or indicative for the professional labor market or a strong criteria in recruitment.

What still proves very important in Europe is (as the distinction in CIRCLE study pointed out) academic credentials, but the criteria is more the reputation of the academic institution (whatever its dominant profile, in humanities, technologies or arts...) than the specialized label of the diploma in 'cultural management'. The immediate consequence is that the more reputed the higher education institution a MA course in Cultural management is created, the greater success it has, irrespective of the real 'quality' of the proposed program. Vice versa, whatever original a course or program might be, if the academic institutional authority is

weak, students will not come, or the course director has to display an important effort to bring them in!

A second consequence is that diplomas for cultural management will have(in correlation to the profile of the academy they belong to, either artistic or academic dominant(art academy, humanities university) technical, marketing, administration dominant(School of administration, Polytechnics, business schools), scientific, political economic dominant(political sciences, sociology, economy, urbanism)

Surprisingly enough, it is to notice that almost all traditional academic sciences, from Architecture to sociology and from business to philosophy , feel legitimate to open cultural management subsidiary specialization, each rendering a particular 'flavor' to this domain of competence but not taking into account any exclusive specificity of it.

There are very few 'Chairs' of cultural management at European level.

Hence, addressing the higher education programs in cultural management in Europe we have to take into consideration that also alternative training at different national levels continued to produce qualified cultural administrators according to a traditional way. If <u>cultural management</u> appeared and slowly imposed as a specific competence under the pressure of a quest for status and for professional legitimization, the art administrators and cultural managers trained through the classic higher education (purely administrative, marketing or art and humanities specialization) did not disappear!
Neither did their training provision.

2   SPECIFIC CONTEXT

Commenting upon training of academic or professional nature for cultural management in Europe has also to take into account some phases of the 'functional' evolution in the meanings of culture in the last decades ; and the new interpretations and dynamics it was subject to.

We have to briefly consider, complementarily, the developments of management theories along the latest decades and accordingly, the specificity of 'cultural management' as academic discipline.

2.1   Culture

'Men may live more truly and fully in reading Plato and Shakespeare than in any other time, because then, they are participating in essential being and are forgetting their accidental lives' (Bloom, 'The closing of the American mind')

In 1972, during a symposium organized under the auspices of UNESCO, the European Cultural Foundation and the French Ministry of culture taking place in Arc et Senans (France), a group of researchers, intellectuals and policy makers launched a reflection which aim was to deliver prospective thinking about cultural development in Europe. The conference was concluded by a document, known under the title of the 'Arc and Senans declaration'.

Here are its conclusions:
The heavy responsibility which has fallen on to our shoulders (cultural operators and mediators at different levels of action and decision) and the technical possibilities now at

society's disposal make it necessary and possible to bring about a reversal of policy, with the following aims in view:

- to replace passive consumption by individual creativity
- to break the constrictive hold of technology so as to allow room for human responsibility
- to replace democratization of inherited or elitist culture by diversity of cultural expression founded in social pluralism
- to give priority to restoring harmony between man and his environment
- to substitute for a cultural system aimed at reproducing the present state of affairs a system directed towards protecting groups and individuals whose creative abilities offer the best means of coping with the situations created by the shock effect of the future.

Even though we are of those convinced that this type of text would not have immediate impact on the cultural operational level, its content is revealing, we believe, about the attitude and prospective drive that was accommodating those years in what cultural action in Western Europe was concerned. We would describe consequently the 70s as a 'visionary decade', determining the step stones of further measures, which the coming decade strive to bring to implementation ('the pragmatic decade of the 80s') and the following(the 90s) had to readjust and radically reconsider according to the historical events taking place (fall of communism, enlarged Europe, international re mapping...).[1]

If cultural policies start to be radically redesigned in the 90s, definition of the cultural domain remains unchanged as well as endeavor to render better visibility and comprehensive role to culture.

Thus, UNESCO's definition of culture, in 1981 being: 'ensemble of distinctive spiritual and material characteristics (intellectual and affective) which describes a society and a community. Culture comprises arts, humanities, but also lifestyles, fundamental rights and traditions, beliefs and scales of value'[2] does not differ too much from to Edward Taylor's[3] definition, in 1871.

Researcher Jean Pierre Warnier, in 1993 accordingly compares culture to a 'social compass'[4], the key orientation instrument without which people would not know where they come from and were they go to. The 'Ruffolo report' in 2001, states in its turn: 'the establishment of Europe as a cultural unit, one that is both diverse and distinct, is a fundamental aspect of the political project relating to European unity'.[5]

---

[1] Weber, Raymond, introductory paper for a seminar for professionals, 2001, Grenoble Observatory for regional cultural policies, France

[2] UNESCO world conference on cultural policies, 1982, in French, in original, Mexico

[3] Warnier, J. Pierre, « La mondialisation de la culture », ed.de la découverte, Paris, 1999, pg 5

[4] Warnier, idem, ibidem, pg 5

[5] Ruffolo, G., idem, ibidem

Since this crucial 1970s drive to giving space to a new approach regarding the role of culture facing the modern challenge, some processes seem to have been engaged successfully. The most striking and important for our perspective are the following:

1) Culture as a system

Researchers put forward today a notion of 'cultural system', as 'knowledge cycle', including subsystems, like education, information, sciences, arts, ethics, religion and memory (heritage) and recognize the cultural dimension of other social systems (languages, migration, environment, economy)[1].

2) Culture as a process

Synthesized in the findings of researcher Ken Robinson, who produced in 2000 three criteria definition proposals for culture: 'sector definition' (as process of 'intellectual and social refinement'), 'elite definition'(opposition high art/popular culture) and 'social definition'(as general shared beliefs, customs and values)[2] the cultural processes engage a need to support the reintroduction of humanities in primary education core curricula as a precondition for successful 'learning for being'. This researcher points out in the same time to what extent culture, in what he calls 'a biological sense', implies growth and transformation and underlines the fact that values are in some cases absolute, in all national circumstances and therefore not negotiable, but also that there is value in diversity and this is how societies can share on the basis of their grass rooted differences.

3) Interrelating culture and education policies

Third, an interesting orientation is to bring together research on educational policies and cultural policies, as the spring for social development at regional and local level. From this point of view, interesting fields of exploration were developed in Spain, within the UNESCO chair for cultural policy and cooperation of the Girona University, by Alfons Martinell, in collaboration with the 'Interarts observatory'in Barcelona. This trend, specific to Southern approach to cultural and educational policies is also encompassing the interest for the regional and local dimension, as a key for naturally preserving diversity, by emancipating, in the same time, spiritual and human development at manageable scales. This dimension also relates to breaking the 'clustered' notion of culture and relating it to other social or economic domains, determining thus a better visibility of its impact for the general social and economic welfare.

4) Role of culture in human development (assessment tool)

Related to the latter, researcher Colin Mercer highlights in his book 'Towards cultural citizenship: tools for cultural policy and development', the need for a 'cultural capital assessment tool', providing 'indicator sets' that relate the 'role of culture in forming capacities for human development' and enabling us today to 'position the cultural indicators in the main stream of public policy debate and implementation'[3], in the sense of bringing

---

[1] Meyer Bisch, Patrice, « Gouvernance culturelle et culture démocratique », document d'introduction, CDCC, Delphes, Council of Europe , 2001, pg. 4

[2] Robinson, Ken, « All our cultures », Creativity, culture and education, NACCE report on behalf of UK government, London 2000, pg. 40-42

[3] Mercer, Colin, « Towards cultural citizenship, tools for cultural policy and development », ed.the bank of Sweden tercentenary foundation, 2002, pg. 59

cultural policy 'in from the margins' of governmental concern, in the sense formulated by the Council of Europe in 1997.

5) Culture as creativity

Last, but not least, the late publication under the title 'Creative Europe'[1], produced by ERICarts in 2002, gathers a sample of case studies with symbolical value as to the institutional environment framing cultural innovation and artistic creativity in Europe today, with accent on the new instruments of governance and management that foster the cultural processes. We fully consider this study as the most direct and adapted response, thirty years later, to the last measure the 'Arc et Senans declaration' was formulating (finding ways -to substitute for a cultural system aimed at reproducing the present state of affairs a system directed towards protecting groups and individuals whose creative abilities offer the best means of coping with the situations created by the shock effect of the future).

'Creative Europe' also puts forward some other relevant conclusions. Among them, the observation that ' innovative management of creativity' is, in the arts and cultural sector, defined differently than it would be in the business sector. Study underlines, based on the data gathered: 'Arts organizations and especially cultural projects need a special type of managerial capacity. Their executive leaders and managers must, in addition to organizational and economic skills, know the arts and artistic world. There is evidence from our case studies that a two person combination or a combination of a chief executive and an 'expert panel' could offer a good alternative. Yet these skills can also be in the possession of one and the same person'.[2]

This 'Ianus syndrome' (two faced profile characteristic) of cultural management competence proves to be a key recurrent topic in our demonstration.

To conclude, the cultural space became, in the last thirty years, from a space of confinement, a system of interrelations and processes, including different leveled approaches to art and playing various roles and uses (sometimes even contradictory ones) but also rendering original dimensions to the social, economic or political spheres. In the same time, creativity, as related to artistic and cultural production, became a key notion for the renewal of both educational (Robinson) and leadership approach (creative Europe) as well as an inspiring everlasting source of diversification for the markets. Therefore, the delivery through a learning process (be it academic or other) of the cultural management discipline, given its double profiled characteristic and the complexity of the task, means today to learn cultural operators how to assume prospective responsibility.

It is them who have to be the 'actors of change' in the newly designed landscape European 'unity in diversity'. But future change requires present attention. And 'present attention' has to be formulated by learning schemes which promote interactive methodologies and forward looking contents.

Is this the case of academic training for cultural management today?! And is the role and the function of the leader of the cultural organization sufficiently taken seriously by the rest of the community of professionals?! And of academics?! We should try to find together several keys to answering these complex questions.

---

[1] Creative Europe, ed. Erikarts, Bonn, 2002, pg. 297, 298

[2] Creative Europe, idem, ibidem, pg. 298

2.2   Management

Author of bestseller *'Guide to the management Gurus. Shortcuts to the ideas of management thinkers'*[1], Carole Kennedy*, gives the following definition to management (quoting a French author): 'action, art or way running an organization, planning its development, directing and controlling it in all domains of the entrepreneurial activity'[2].

The book highlights that, starting with the sixties, two main types of management were identified in the opposition between the 'authority governance'(X theory) and the 'democratic governance'(Y theory) *(McGregor thesis).*

Pointing out that the 'key issues of management' are as few as key themes in fiction, author also stresses that the most important developments in management theory after the 90s are related to notions like 'individual empowerment', 'intellectual capital', 'knowledge management', 'leadership', 'reengineering', 'basic skills', the evolution in two decades being from an idea about a purely organizational approach to management to a more behaviorist one, where the human factor and behavior are the keys to changes, adaptation and effectiveness.

If the 60s are practicing a management 'of power', the 90s are practicing one of 'trust', adapted to the new notions of 'democratic governance' and de-localization, team work and free circulation of information. The organizational system and the neutral, objective processes of change it is submitted to, become less dominant in management theory than the 'human factor', the 'human potential' and creativity. Notions like 'healing enterprise'[3] or 'management of complexity', 'ethics of management'[4] emerge. Individual coaching appears, training is focused more on the needs of the individual than on the stereotype objective of efficiency as described by the old taylorist era.

As to the learning contribution of Business schools today, Eric Cornuel, General Director of the European Foundation for management is observing they have generalized in the last decade, on one hand the 'study case approach' and, on the other, the tendency to completely reduce the 'scientific' approach of managerial disciplines, thus emptying them of content. The result, says Cornuel, is that 'there is no longer any intellectual contribution that the management schools provide to the private or public decision makers or simply to the society in its whole'[5]. We are very far from the period when 'fathers of management theory' like Fayol[6] or Taylor[7] were inspiring important organizational and functional revolutions at all levels of human activity.

It would be therefore more than welcome to regard a possibility of revisiting the purely managerial approach and 'smoothen' it through cross fertilization with humanistic and cultural domains. Like in the case of the successful postgraduate diploma launched in

---

[1] Kennedy, Carole, « Toutes les théories du management » ed Maxima, Paris, 2002

[2] Kennedy, idem, ibidem, definition of Raymond Alain Thiétard

[3] Hurstel, Pierre, Ernst & Young, L'entreprise réparatrice ou le nouvel épanouissement,, ed Maxima, Paris, 2002

[4] Le Goff, Jean Pierre, « Les illusions du management », ed la Découverte, Paris, 2000, pg 138, 139

[5] Cornuel, Eric, Le monde/emploi, 21 janvier 2003, « A quoi peuvent bien servir les écoles demanagement ? »

[6] Fayol, Henri- French engineer, defining the five main principles of industrial management ; he is considered to be the first theoretician of management and administration of enterprise

[7] Taylor, Frederick, W., inventor of « scientific management », preaching the « most efficientway » to achieve the task.

2001 by the University in Lucerne (Switzerland) and addressing the leaders, managers and administrators over 40 years old coming from all types of enterprises(services, industry, commerce...) and combining management and philosophy.[1] But this is a restricted and exceptional example, to be reproduced by Oxford school of economics recently.

For the time being, the discipline of 'cultural management' limits itself to adapt a certain number of traditional notions of management training by simply adding some sector specific ones and not engaging in any more innovating endeavors like the formerly quoted.

We can sum up by saying that, while the *cultural dynamics* evolved in Europe giving space to a creative organizational logic and to emergent innovation as inter related to other sectors, *management theory* evolved to giving place to the individuality, 'the healing enterprise', putting forward more than ever awareness about the human factor and its divers potentialities. In the same time, macro dynamics at European and global scale determined administrative and managerial specific ways to deal with the cultural aspects ; therefore notions like 'ethics of management' 'management of complexity' become necessary assets of the management sphere definition.

But redesigning learning contents is a hard task and therefore, the degree of integration of these new dynamics in the learning processes is much slower than the impact of the processes on the overall institutional and social realities. Moreover, the generalization of a superficial 'technocratic' approach in management learning, as highlighted by Eric Cornuel, combined with the observations of researcher Ken Robinson: the 'employers and others emphasize the need for the qualities and aptitudes which academic qualification are not designed to produce: powers of creativity, of communication, of empathy and adaptability, and social skills'[2], brings us to consider that academic qualification alone is no longer enough.

2.3   Cultural management from a 'tool-kit' kind of approach to the strategic instrument for new cultural policies and practices in Europe

This being said, let us consider some elements from what we would call a traditional perspective for the definition of the cultural management domain, as theorized by researchers and academics in Europe in the last decade.

We will first observe from the existing supply of recent studies and policy papers that generally, as long as regarded from the 'professional' angle, 'art management/administration or cultural management/administration' can be more easily defined as a compact competence, a sort of 'tool-kit' ensemble of identified concrete competencies, to be declined according to skill charts but also to be regarded as flexible qualification, progressing and reshaping its content rapidly.

---

[1] LA LIBERTé, journal,« Le Courrier », Suisse, 24 juillet, 2002

[2] Robinson, Ken, idem, ibidem, pg. 20

Thus, the CIRCLE study already quoted is putting forward in 1992 the five 'skills categories', as identified by Practical arts in its publication 'Route to recognition'[1]. They are:

- administration /organizational/financial ;
- entrepreneurial, /development/ Marketing/Promotional skills;
- Creative /generative/Performing skills;
- Teaching/education/training skills;
- Technical and support skills.

To each of them correspond occupational categories ranging from arts administrator to gallery technician.

Explaining that above categorization is not elucidating the diversity of occupations a cultural manager could perform, neither the multifaceted aspect of his requested skills, the study endeavors to propose, based on the only available research (Anglo-American) a synthetic grid of professional profiles.

In 1998, the European conference in Graz under the title: 'Management of change - Questions of qualification and Employment in the context of the reforms in Public cultural administration', formulates the following keywords framing the debate about training for cultural administration in future Europe: 'management of change, coordinate cultural organization within European enlargement context, assume creativity, train the trainers, qualify for new tasks'.

We find, in 2000, within the INCLUDE report[2], another quantitative approach for skills description, as presented in the report's introduction, listing compulsory areas to be included in training for cultural management programs (Artistic, culturology skills/Technical, vocational skills/ planning, organizational, team building skills(soft and hardware management)/ Promotional and communication skills), and also, as listed by Franco Bianchini[3] the '10 key skills for successful cultural management' within local territory; or, as presented by the skills chart proposal of Alfons Martinel[4] and the one figured out by Ismo Porna's in his findings regarding the Finnish situation.[5]

Martinel's, Porna's and Bianchini's charts introduce the strategic, policy dimension, the international cooperation dimension(networking, partnership), as well as the 'contextualization' skill and interdisciplinary need.

In bringing about and providing the above quoted high level expertise to this comparative exercise, the ENCATC network, through its coordinator (Isabella Schwarz) and vice president (Lidia Varbanova) as well as other members had an irreducible input.

---

[1] CIRCLE study, 1992, idem, ibidem, pg. 25

[2] INCLUDE, technical report, idem. ibidem, introduction by Isabelle Schwarz in collaboration with professor Lidia Varanova on behalf of ENCATC(European Network of Cultural administration training Centers)

[3] idem, ibidem, pg 15

[4] idem, ibidem, pg 63-65

[5] idem ibidem, pg 44-46

Last, but not least, the 'Creative Europe' executive summary in 2003 states that the changing processes taking place in Europe 'would foster a changing paradigm for 'creativity governance' and of style and instruments used in the management of creativity and innovation in culture'. The study is a call for taking this processes into account also by the training centers dealing with cultural management and policy in Europe.

What we retain out of the extensive versions of the above quoted materials is:
- the use of a Anglo-American terminology as related to the discipline of cultural management
- a 'flu' still persisting between the notions of cultural management and administration, art management and/or administration
- the gradual shift from internally defined abilities(coordination, team building, promotion...) to externally determined ones(interdisciplinary, management of change, ability to contextualise...) and from the so called 'tool-kit' kind of approach to a 'elaborated / visionary', area based one.
- the growing influence of the international, the strategic and the technological dimension as related to identified skills requested(networking, communication technologies, cultural policies at local and national level)

The 'Include' study own findings and conclusions are relevant in the framework of these observations:

The study underlines several aspects. First, it identifies out of comparative analyze of 11 training centers in Europe, the main skills that course directors consider essential. They are: The ability to deal with different types of cultural agents (sponsors, public administration, artists...)/ team coordination/ multitasking in small team and managing of multiple priorities/ designing realistic implementation schedules/ discourse and speech skills/ leadership skills and negotiation skills[1] ; in the same time, study observes that there is small if not no correspondence between these needed skills and the priority given inside curricula.

Second, the study highlights the following important missing aspects:
- deficit in interrelating culture with other sectors (economic-tourism, new technology
  or social- education, employment, health, social cohesion)
- deficit in training the trainers
- deficit in training for exercising context reading and flexibility (the training of minds, not of abilities only)

Third, study concludes that 'combining cultural awareness with technical know how '(idem, ibidem, pg. 67) is what characterizes all curricula design in academic and professional training at European level, but methodologies strive to attain some contradictory objectives. These are:
- holistic approach
- bottom-up approach
- streamlining approach

---

[1] idem, ibidem, pg 72

Everyone seems to agree, though, that the discipline evolved as a result of the important development the cultural organization went through in Europe, between the 50s to 70s and 80s to 2000 on one hand and the rapid diversification of professional competencies at vocational and interdisciplinary level, which brings about the need to provide through training more and more various skills.

Which puts forward the question of how much of a critical regard a student in cultural management would develop, if his or hers context reading capacities are not encouraged in most of the curricula design?! Training the cultural managers as such seems therefore to be insufficient if a whole complementarily of training levels and audiences related to the cultural act are not themselves involved and made aware about the challenges of cultural development as related to social and economical development.

As we were already observing in the beginning of this chapter, the general synthetic classification of abilities, profiles and needed skills is very handy and attractively transparent from a purely 'professional' perspective. However, as soon as we descend on the national ground of European countries, this limpidity becomes quickly blurred by the often radically different meanings that different European cultural systems allow to the skills related to 'cultural administration/management'. What would 'fundraising skills' mean in France and what in UK or Germany or Poland in 2003, what leadership and team building capacities are to be taught to a Dutch, a Fin or a Serb context today - I seriously doubt the content for these abilities is the same for all above quoted examples.

This is indeed why the international but also area based as well as the strategic dimension of cultural management syllabus becomes today unavoidable to any 'basic skill' acquisition learning process. As well as the development of 'critical capacities' adapted to the existing environment one is practicing within. This is why, from our comparative, European, perspective, we should try to tackle the chosen issues by mainly trying to identify common, but also irreducible national characteristics and highlight the complementary character of cultural management training in different European countries and regions, according to distinctive methodological attitudes and learning patterns. As soon as identified and presented in detail, these differences are to nourish the further reflection about common methodologies and academic content design for this discipline.

2.4   Ongoing dilemmas

2.4.1   Suggested criteria for transparent content design
Professor Patrick Boylan considers in 2002 that generally, academic curricula in cultural management has evolved in the direction of the British 'chart of management skills'[1]

This might respond to what researchers like Andreas Wiesand asserted, some 15 years ago, considering at that time that cultural management is just a 'imported' Anglo-Saxon term.[2] and also confirm the use of the term of 'inginérie culturelle' in France, rather unusual for the traditional French academic approach.

---

[1] Boylan, Patrick, ENCATC survey and database of European cultural management programs, policy paper on behalf of UNESCO, 2003

[2] Cf. Mario d'Angelo, « La formation au management dans le secteur culturel »(Italie, GB. RFA), rapport intérmédiaire, sept., 1989, pg 43, interview on behalf of ZfK, Bonn

What is also common, to European cultural and scholar milieus in relation to the cultural management as academic discipline could be synthesized in the following dilemmas:

For the professionals, the discipline, by becoming 'academic', can only miss the very important practical aspects, without which, any theoretic knowledge is useless.
For the academics, the 'pragmatic', 'know-how', managerial aura of the discipline gives it a low level degree of conceptual content, therefore the scientific approach and the theoretical seriousness seem weak and the methodological approach 'vulgar'.
For pure managers, cultural management is directly derived from basic managerial competence, completed with some cultural and artistic knowledge.
For administrators, the legislative and bureaucratic competencies prevail to any real competence of the cultural domain.
For humanists(historians, sociologists, philosophers) and artists one should first acquire a solid academic preparation in arts and humanities and only secondly specialize in the managerial issues...

Is there a way to bring all these opinions together?! And by what means?!
Practice proves it that all above listed approaches and ways to consider the content of the 'cultural management' specialization can be correct. There is not one better than another. The important thing, however, is to well identify the type of activity related to the cultural organization that one would like to perform and chose one's training accordingly.
Will one's occupation be about more administrative or more visionary stuff. Will it be about contracts with artists or programming events and promoting them. Will it be about prospective vision or technical execution. Will it be in traditional arts or cultural industries...etc.
What is sure, is that in all of these cases, both managerial and sector specific competence will be required in balanced degrees. As well as the capacity to 'read the context', to master the territorial needs, to have a strategic vision, to network and relate to other socio-economical domains and to seize the global dynamics.

From a professional perspective, what characterizes the domain of the cultural enterprise or organization is precisely the 'un quantifiable', ambiguous status of a given competence. And the need for practical experience in the sector.
From a European perspective, what differentiates the competence scale is the profile of a cultural organization in a given national context and its function and meaning in this specific context (Western Europe, Southern Europe, Northern Europe, Eastern Europe), as well as the relation to the territorial area of a cultural entrepreneur(working in a 'big' European metropolis or a small village).

These should be the real criteria of skill chart definitions!
And the incentive basis for curricula design.

2.4.2   The long life learning aspect
Another aspect is that, in order to prepare someone and accompany his professional development in cultural management, the domain of competencies has to be capable of quick redesigning and retraining formats. Thus, the term of *professional development* seems much more adapted than the one of 'academic qualification'. Defining this discipline means

to consider what kind of occupation someone will further have, more than what kind of profession. The academic diploma will only be an intermediary step, among others, to acquire professional recognition. This is also a characteristic that other academic traditional disciplines do not share with cultural management.

Supplementary recent parameters have to be taken into account, like the notion of 'European added value', as well as recent ideas that spread and disseminated at European level (Europe of intellectuals), but also at artistic level (Europe of creators), at community level (Europe of diversities of cultures) as well as at political level (Europe of new democracies).

The cultural management discipline has to face the recent dynamics touching to European cultural organizations and policies, like: DESCENTRALISATION and PRIVATISATION at national levels and, at European level, ENLARGEMENT. All these dynamics are interrelated and they strongly brought about for the European civil society a sense of culture as an issue, because related to identity, roots, past... and the cultural organization as a material expression of what culture stands for.

2.4.3   Terminology

A terminological clarification is also a matter of debate. It concerns the very multipurpose terms: 'art manager' and 'cultural administrator'.

The CIRCLE study observes the still present interchangeable relation between these terms and opposes 'art manager' to 'cultural administrator', explaining that in certain European countries the term art manager or cultural administrator will not be employed for functions like artistic director or intendant, that delimitation between these terms is still difficult and that 'originally the use of these terms as dependent on the hierarchical level, tasks of the person and financial basis of the organization he works for'[1].

In what <u>our</u> terminological choice is concerned we would be for the distinction between: first, *administrator* (as implementer of policy measures, limited in his decisions and dependent on hierarchical guiding lines) and manager (as independent leader, coordinator, fund-raiser and planner) and art administrator/ manager (dealing with a still traditional perspective of the cultural organization) and the cultural manager (dealing with the evolved forms and dynamics of the cultural project, event, organization, program...etc ;)

This empirical opposition is rooted in our observation that traditionally it is the art administrator that preceded the art manager and the more general category of cultural manager(cultural administrator) as defined today. Administrating the different artistic sectors was the initial act of coordinating the cultural domain. It is only at a late stage this became *managing the cultural organization*, as we were stressing in the beginning of this paper.

For us, the administration domain will therefore imply the 'passive' implementing of cultural policy, while management will imply 'active coordination' and leadership of the cultural enterprise.

It is true however, that content of competence for these categories are still intermingling in different national realities in Europe and evolution are still taking place indeed. Therefore an <u>exclusive</u>, 'scientific' terminological delimitation would be, for the time being, risky and even impossible.

---

[1] Circle, 1992, idem, ibidem, pg. 26-28

Our findings drove us to the conclusion that new competencies in cultural management emerged, first and foremost, in tune with a general trend in Europe and leading from 'administrating culture' to 'managing it' and from a 'narrow sense' of running the cultural organization, to a broader and complex sense of leadership. This seems to be confirmed if we take into account definitions like the ones given by Serb researcher and international expert Milena Dragicevic: 'each cultural initiative needs quality management, but cultural management is more than running a cultural project or a cultural organization. Cultural management is intimately related to cultural policy and is all about creating the opportunities for people in the cultural sector to develop and implement their ideas', by British consultant Christopher Gordon: ' Fundamentally, cultural management is about being accountable for and making the best use of available resources to promote and share cultural production with the public'[1] or Finnish academic Ismo Porna: 'the cultural manager is to function as a professional producer, public or private, in promoting and strengthening local and regional activities'.[2]

What is sure, is that defining this discipline today still remains one of the main challenges of both the professional and academic milieus. And this 'mysterious touch' is maybe what makes it so fashionable and attractive, despite frequent and sometimes founded criticism.

3   In guise of conclusions: a list of *HOT* questions

Many critical comments and analysis are still, of course, to be added to the previous. It is however obvious that, to the ambiguous character of the discipline, and to its complex emergence and legitimization, the redesigning of academic educational structures (see the Bologna process) taking place today at European level has brought forward a new challenge. Both for national systems as at a European level.

This brings about even more the need to try and find answers on questions like:

1/ Is there inflation of academic and professional training in cultural management or, on the contrary, is there a lack of adapted training for the discipline at academic level? Who evaluates the existing provision and according to what standards at national levels?

2/ What organizations and regulators insure the assessment of the professional sector needs at a national and a European level. Are networks like ENCATC or the Naric/ENIC or NETCULT network adapted instruments of this kind of assessment?

3/ How should one address the international dimension, the strategic dimension, the area based dimension in curricula design and how are these methodologies to be given a 'harmonized' European common denominator? What good practices exist at national levels from this point of view and how can they be made available at a broader scale to the rest of academic community?

---

[1] V Villermars, beyond borders magazine, ECF, June, 2001, « cultural management and the market », interviews, pg 10, 11

[2] INCLUDE, idem, ibidem, Porna, Ismo, « The case of Finland », pg. 39

4/ what initiatives are really trying to bridge the gap in cultural management academic training between Eastern and Western Europe and how should these initiatives be strengthened and sustained?

5/ Which centers deliver training for trainers in this discipline?

6/ What are the centers that provide useful comparative research and match it with the academic training?

7/ How could the intergovernmental institutions (UNESCO, CoE, UE) and specialized networks provide better support to expertise and comparative research and under what kind of adapted form?

8/ Last but not least, are conditions ready today to engage: redesigning of training contents in accordance with the harmonization process and with the need to preserve diversity and specificity ; establish academic excellence criteria ; revise the learning methodologies according to the new role of the cultural enterprise and of the cultural manager as both cultural values promoter and institutional leader.

The former questions are aimed to help us better understand to what extent existing academic training corresponds to the present needs of cultural operators.

*****

Corina Suteu, is an expert in European cultural policies and cultural management courses and is currently president of ECUMEST and head of the Cultural Management Unit (IHT- Nantes). She was Director of the European masters degree in cultural management of Dijon Business School in France and initiated and implemented the MA programme ECUMEST for Eastern Europe and the Policies for Culture ECF/ECUMEST program. She was president of the Forum of European networks. She works regularly as an expert for the OSI network, the European Cultural Foundation, the Council of Europe and UNESCO. She also is a lecturer for the IEP Lyon (DRECI), Observatoire des Politiques Culturelles et IEP Grenoble, Paris VIII, college de Bruges, Salzburg seminar, MA of intercultural management in the Balkans/Belgrade and collaborator of the Boekman Foundation.