

CREATIVITY AND THE CONTEMPORARY ECONOMY

Niina Koivunen & Alf Rehn (eds.)

Contents

Preface

1. Niina Koivunen & Alf Rehn: Introduction 7
2. Niina Koivunen: On Creativity, Art and Economy 13

Part I – Innovation in the Creative Economy

3. Grete Wennes: Art, Creativity and the New 35
4. Robert Austin & Lotte Darsø : Innovation Processes and Closure 55
5. Joseph Lampel & Nermeen Mustafa: The Emotional Nexus
between Products and Organizations: The Case of Perfume 83

Part II – Leadership in the Creative Economy

6. Anni Paalumäki & Johanna Virtaniemi: Leadership, Creative Work
and Experience: The Case of Design 113
7. Tanja Vilén: Creativity in Action: A Practice View on
Opera Production 129
8. Erika Sauer: Leading Creativity in an Ensemble 149
9. Olle Duhlin & Lars Lindkvist: Administrative Artists and
Artistic Administrators: The Case of Theatre 167

Part III – Change in the Creative Economy

10. Ralph Bathurst & Lloyd Williams: Boom and Bust in the Orchestra
Business 191
11. Kjell Arvidsson: Change and Stability Among Record Companies 209
12. Martin Harris and Victoria Wegg-Prosser: The Management of
Change at the BBC 1991 – 2002 231

Postscript

13. Alf Rehn: After Creativity 251

- About the Authors** 261

On creativity, art and economy

2.

Niina Koivunen

“If I create from the heart, nearly everything works;
if from the head, almost nothing.”

Marc Chagall

But who would want to reveal one’s heart? This is why creativity is so difficult; it exposes you, your inner and most intimate feelings, ideas, wishes, hopes, dreams, your soft spots, weaknesses, cravings, traumas, sadness, fears and vulnerability. Marja Soila-Wadman (2003) writes about the aesthetics of capitulation: to let go of control and surrender to the creative flow. And what if they don’t like me, me and my heart? Criticism against the products of one’s head is hard but can be met with corresponding cognitive methods; criticism intended against your heart is much trickier. It is lethal; it devours and suffocates you entirely.

Creativity of the heart for the purposes of art is one thing. Creativity for the purposes of business is quite another. I don’t intend to say that artists always create from the heart while business professionals would engage in cognitive creativity of the head, but there is a fundamental difference here that does separate these two fields from each other. And this something has been under scrutiny over the last 20 years in the academic field of art and business or arts management. Creativity and the arts go together, creation and recreation are inherent and natural parts of any art production or art organization, be it music, theatre, dance, opera, literature or poetry. We can easily relate to that, artists are bound to be creative. There is an abundance of literature on this, for example biographies of artists that address their sometimes complicated life stories and portray the art work.

Creativity and business is a much more recent combination that became popular with the writings of Richard Florida (2002), John Howkins (2002) and a few others. Some five or ten years ago creativity did not have much legroom in the curriculum of business studies or management textbooks. Nowadays, creativity

and innovation (Amabile et al. 2004, Mumford, 2003, Mumford & Licuanan, 2004, Rickards and Moger, 2006, Wilenius, 2004) are standard substances that must be taken seriously. Creativity is not only for artists, others must now be creative too; a requirement that can be hugely liberating for some and extremely demanding for others.

We are dealing with a difficult phenomenon here. Creativity is elusive, certainly mystical, romantic and often intangible, and is therefore difficult to measure or even grasp. It is something that should be studied and discussed but not analyzed to pieces. Somehow the head and the heart are involved, however matters of the heart are notoriously tricky. The creative person struggles with a challenge that is larger than life itself: is what I am doing going to touch someone's heart?

Research approaches to the topic

This chapter discusses the topics and themes revolving around creativity, art and business. The metaphysical dimensions of creativity are better left to other fields or researchers more inclined to study such phenomena, like Csikszentmihalyi (1990), but we in the field of business studies can certainly contribute to a recent societal discussion, namely that of the creative economy. Whether the economy or business organizations can be creative or not has been a topic of lively discussion. There is at least one significant contribution to be made to the debate on the creative economy, and that is the accumulated research findings and results from the field of art and business, art management and organization aesthetics. I will mainly draw on the Scandinavian research on the topic with a few additions from other countries.

Many stories exist about how the field came into being, and there are definitely as many narratives as there are storytellers, but one of the starting points can be traced back to the year 1985 when the SCOS conference (Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism) on Corporate Image was held in Antibes. A classic article by Vincent Dégot "Portrait of manager as an artist" (1985, reprinted in *Aesthesis* 2007: 1(2)) was first presented at that conference. Soon after that, publications such as Antonio Strati's (1989) "Aesthetics and Organizational Skill", "The Beauty of Social Organization" by Rafael Ramírez (1991), Pasquale Gagliardi's (1990) "Symbols and Artifacts: Views of the Corporate Landscape" and Pierre Guillet de Monthoux's (1993) "Det sublimes konstnärliga ledning. Estetik, konst och företag" came out.

The early- and mid-1990s then witnessed the publication of Dag Björkegren's (1992, 1993) studies on cultural industries, such as film and book publishing as well as Fitzgibbon and Kelly's (1997) edited volume on the central questions of arts management.

The new millennium brought along a considerable amount of doctoral dissertations in the form of thorough and extensive field studies on various art

organizations and their creative processes. Ivar Börkman's "Sven Duchamp or – expert on aura-production" began this new wave, followed by Emma Stenström's (2000) "Konstiga företag" and Saara Taalas' (2001) study on theatres and drama production. Grete Wennes' study on symphony orchestras came out in 2002 and was soon followed by two other studies on the same topic: Koivunen (2003) and Ann-Sofie Köping (2003). Later on, Ralph Bathurst (2006) also studied symphony orchestras in New Zealand. Jeanette Wetterström (2001) studied opera, Marja Soila-Wadman's (2003) doctoral dissertation dealt with film production and Katja Lindqvist's (2003) study focused on art exhibitions as projects. Erika Sauer's (2005) dissertation addressed emotions in leading a dramatic ensemble. In addition to studies of cultural organizations, Marjana Johansson (2008) studied cultural events and festivals in her study "Engaging Resources for Cultural Events".

While these dissertations were all products of the discipline known as management and organization, several dissertations were completed under the subject of marketing too. Annukka Jyrämä's (1999) study of art galleries was later on followed by Eeva-Katri Ahola's (2007) dissertation about consumption experiences in art exhibitions and trade fairs. Hilppa Sorjonen (2004) addressed marketing orientation in arts organizations.

An important contribution to the study of cultural industries is the edited volume by Joseph Lampel, Jamal Shamsie and Theresa K. Lant (2006) "The Business of Culture", which applies strategic perspectives on cultural industries, such as TV, Hollywood motion pictures, video games, pop music and new media. The book followed an earlier special issue that appeared in *Organization Science* (2000). Paul Jeffcutt and Andy Pratt (2002) have put together a special issue on creativity in cultural organizations. Jeffcutt and Pratt have also prepared an edited volume on the same topic that will be published in 2009. David Hesmondhalgh's (2002) "Cultural industries" also belongs to the essential readings. In Scandinavia, Daniel Hjorth and Monika Kostera (2007) have edited a book on the experience economy, "Entrepreneurship & The Experience Economy", which deals with quite similar phenomena, yet from the specific angle of entrepreneurship. Another important collection of articles is the end product of the Stockholm-based Fields of Flow project "Aesthetic Leadership", edited by Pierre Guillet de Monthoux, Claes Gustafsson and Sven-Erik Sjöstrand (2007). "The Art Firm" by Guillet de Monthoux (2004) can also be considered as one of the essential readings in this field.

This chapter discusses how the above-mentioned body of research might contribute to the discussions on the creative economy and help to address creativity in the context of the contemporary economy. First, the underlying assumptions of art and economy are evaluated and described. The conceptual mapping behind art management, cultural industries, creative industries and creative economy and the essential research fields that address these concepts are then shortly presented. This is followed by a meta-analysis of the main research results on

art organizations, which themselves provide excellent descriptions of creativity. Following this, the chapter analyzes further the main underlying assumptions of art and business in a section called ‘Dichotomies and Hybrids’.

Underlying assumptions of art and economy

Art is a mystery, and selling art is an even greater mystery.

Siri Hustvedt

Many researchers have pointed out how art and economy as concepts and areas of activity represent quite opposite values. Stenström (2000: 280) describes “how arts have been associated with creativity, chaos, aesthetics, subjectivity, uniqueness, change, beauty, luxury, body, freedom, femininity, form, mysteries, unpredictability, genius, multi-rationality or irrationality, imagination, feelings, intuition, etc. Business, on the other hand, has been associated with almost the opposite: commerce, control, effectiveness, repetition, practicality, structure, clarity, predictability, calculation, reason, rationality, etc.” It is evident that people who represent these two opposite poles, the artists and the managers, have a very different identity and view the world through a particular lens, be it artistic or commercial.

Art is traditionally expected to distance itself from ordinary, everyday life. Art represents self-expression in its highest form and being an artist includes becoming a vehicle for this creative process. As one musician put it, “We live in a fairytale world. Music is like an ongoing play, and we all live in the midst of these stories, dramas and mysteries. It is possible to be completely immersed in this world.” The myth of individual genius is very strong: artists are carriers of this divine creativity. According to this romantic notion, artists are genius and exceptional beings in every respect. A museum manager described some practical consequences of this myth of genius. According to her, many artists reason that as genius artists they are entitled to any kinds of behavior. Divas are often impossible to work with because they are incapable of descending to the level of others.

In my study of symphony orchestras (Koivunen, 2003: 94), this division (that musicians are artists and others are common mortals) was justified with the following logic. Musicians had dedicated their lives to music, and had chosen this because they love to play. Music was very internalized and personal for them. Managers had not dedicated their lives to music in the same way the musicians had, and neither had they dedicated their lives to their respective profession in a similar fashion. This puts them permanently on a different side of the fence. Musicianship or artistry is more of a vocation than a profession or career. It is a way of life and not just any job to make a living.

Such a romantic attitude to life is out of the question in the sphere of busi-

ness and commerce. If art is for the art's sake only, the same logic does not apply in business life where every activity is carried out for a specific and calculated purpose, if we are to believe the traditional textbooks of management. The business world is dominated by rationality, planning and control that targets an ever-increasing level of effectiveness, and this is a serious matter. Claes Gustafsson (1994) has described how business life and also the field that studies it – management and business administration – are penetrated by seriousness. This production of seriousness, the brilliant title of Gustafsson's seminal book, is the underlying logic of economy and business activity. The academic discipline of business administration is carved to educate people to become rationally behaving actors, "economic men and women" (ibid. 50-51, see also Rehn, 2007). The discipline emphasizes the importance of economic thinking, diligence, reason and responsibility. According to Gustafsson, few other academic disciplines are so utterly penetrated by normative thinking. One of these norms concerns instrumentality: business managers have to find solutions to practical questions. Once these solutions are found, they can always be developed to become even more effective.

These underlying assumptions behind art and economy are contradictory and clash violently. It follows that the challenging interplay between these two is a constant theme when studying art and business. How to do business with art and how to manage art? How to shape an art form into a successful business or at least an activity that supports itself? These fundamental questions extend into the very core of art organizations. Certainly many positive things can emerge from the interaction between art and business. Nevertheless, at the same time, the discussions largely circulate around the various difficulties resulting from this situation. There appears to be a particular dynamic in this interplay that I have described as "art as against business discourse" (Koivunen, 2003; 2007). Both tribes – artists and managers – construct a certain division and difference in their talk and actions. They clearly belong to different camps, have a different identity and logic of action. One particular feature of this interaction is, however, that art and artists try to resist management's attempts at control and other managerial activities, not so much the other way around.

There is genuine fear and concern among some artists that the market economy and commercialization could somehow tarnish the purity of art, that is so sacred and precious to them. In a recent study on painters' ideas (graduated from the Finnish Academy of Fine Arts in Helsinki) about economy and making a living as an artist, some rather drastic remarks were made (Heikkilä, 2008). The following comment: "we are more human beings than entrepreneurs" reveals that whereas artists by definition are good human beings, it is not quite certain whether entrepreneurs also belong to the same category. The artists also engaged in lively discussions when debating about the extremely fuzzy line between a work of art and a product. The main criteria for this differentiation seemed to be commercial success. Simply put, if the work of art sells, it becomes

a product. And that is the worst thing that can happen to an artist – to have his or her works of art labeled as products.

The ‘art as against business’ setting goes back a long way in history and has probably existed in some form or another as long as professional artists have existed (Koivunen, 2003, 2007). Artists have always had to earn a living in some way or another – a tiresome necessity in a life devoted to creativity and art. In Renaissance Italy the Catholic Church commissioned paintings and sculptures from particular artists, thus providing an income for those thus favored. In eighteenth-century Europe, royal families employed artists in their palaces, while in the following century wealthy merchants also began to patronize artists. More recently, some nation states started to see the possibilities of art for strengthening the national identity, and began to support artists. Today, many artists and art organizations look for sponsors in the corporate world (Balfe, 1993). In other words, the interplay between art and business is by no means new, but it continues to be interesting to observe what kinds of forms this interplay is taking in the present day.

Conceptual mapping: Cultural industries, arts management and the creative economy

Traditionally there has been a division between cultural industries and the arts. According to Galloway and Dunlop (2007: 18), Horkheimer and Adorno (2002) originally used the term cultural industries to refer to “industrially produced commercial entertainment – broadcasting, film, publishing, recorded music – as distinct from the subsidized “arts” – visual and performing arts, museums and galleries. This understanding underpinned the cultural policy initiatives of both the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Council of Europe.

In my experience, the research carried out in business schools or departments of management or strategy has mostly approached “cultural industries” from the perspectives of production processes, strategy, distribution or marketing efforts. In other words, the products of cultural industries have been treated almost as any products, with perhaps a little additional flavor in their artistic nature. Or as Towse (2003, in Galloway and Dunlop, 2007: 24) puts it: “cultural industries are those that mass-produce goods and services with sufficient artistic content to be considered creatively and culturally significant”. On the other hand, the research on “fine arts” or “art organizations” has focused on exploring how these complex organizations are run, managed and organized. Since most of these organizations are publicly funded, the sales and distribution of the artistic product have had less significance. The AIMAC conference (The International Association of Arts and Cultural Management), for instance, has been keen to investigate ways to improve the financing, marketing and management

of artistic activities within these organizations. The conference journal *International Journal of Arts Management (IJAM)* publishes both research articles and more pragmatically oriented articles.

These two research fields – cultural industries and arts management – are not entirely separate, but they do overlap and the same researchers can work in both fields. A more integrative approach that also brings in organizational aesthetics is represented by *The Art of Management and Organization* conference organized by the University of Essex Management Centre and their new journal *Aesthesis*. The *Nomadic University for Art, Philosophy and Enterprise in Europe (NUROPE)* also manages to include all of these three aspects – cultural industries, the arts and aesthetics – in their unique way of working as nomads across a variety of European locations.

So far so good – and then enter creativity, which causes major terminological clutter. In my understanding, the terms “creative industries” and “creative economy” emerged for three main reasons: political, economical and technological change such as the Internet and digitalization. Galloway and Dunlop (2007: 18) and Jeffcutt and Pratt (2002: 227) explain how the UK government branded the cultural industries as creative industries, thus signaling a contemporary policy focus on a sector that is engaged in producing novel cultural products. The creative industries are now defined in the following terms: “those activities which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property”. The following key sectors are included: “advertising, architecture, the art and antiques market, crafts, design, designer fashion, film, interactive leisure software, music, the performing arts, publishing, software and television and radio” (ibid., 227). Thus, the scope becomes significantly wider.

The economy and politics go hand in hand here. This policy change intended to create more business opportunities in the crumpling post-industrial economies where creativity would be the miraculous cure. The other aspect of this repositioning relates to culture; whereas culture is abandoned as elitist and exclusive, creativity is embraced as democratic and inclusive (Galloway and Dunlop, 2007: 18). In other words, creativity is within everyone’s reach. This “everything is creative” aspect can easily endanger the whole concept.

The latest technological changes including the Internet and digitalization also justified the emergence of creative industries. In a similar fashion to the cultural industries arising from technological advances of the early twentieth century, the creative industries are a product of technological changes of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century. The development of technology can also induce change in business models, as small creative businesses are applying technology in a way that threatens the established business models of the big commercial firms. It follows that culture has been subsumed within a creative industries agenda of economic policy, and in this process its distinctive aspects have been obscured, as state Galloway and Dunlop (2007: 19). Nowadays, in most people’s

eyes, cultural industries and creative industries are basically the same thing. The creative economy or creativity is for all, and thus for no-one in particular.

To conclude, these concepts continue to co-exist even though they overlap and can cause confusion.

Descriptions of creativity: The study of art organizations

This section ponders what the study of art organizations can contribute to organization studies in general, and in particular to our understanding of creativity. In my view these studies all deal with creativity, although that particular concept is seldom mentioned in the empirical settings. In other words, what may be routine for the artists, can be considered creative to others.

Researchers interested in art and aesthetics have crossed many borders. Many come from business administration or organization studies and have an interest either in the arts, such as visual arts, music, literature, drama, dance, or in the various theories of aesthetics, philosophy or art history - some even manage to squeeze in both perspectives. Ottensmeyer (1996: 190-191) crystallized the typical research questions as follows:

“The key questions seem to be: How might we bring art, artistry and beauty more explicitly into organization theories and management practices? For if we see people holding aesthetic values, organizations embodying aesthetic properties, and managerial work including an element of artistry, can we choose not to pay attention?”

The body of research on art organizations has produced an abundance of interesting outcomes. However, sometimes the ‘so what’ question still hangs in the air: why are the results interesting and to whom? To evaluate some of the central contributions of this stream of research I have identified the following seven outcomes. Each topic is discussed in more detail after the table 2.1.

Table 2.1. Central contributions of research on arts organizations

<p>1. Basic organization research on cultural organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identification of key actors and activities • analysis of organization structures and work processes • organization culture and traditions • more discipline than chaos
<p>2. Accounts of creative processes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organizing of creative processes • collective creativity (alternatives to myth of individual genius) • contextualized creativity • relationality

<p>3. Descriptions of emotions, sensuous perception and the body</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the role of emotions in organizations • sensuous perception, the five senses, the body
<p>4. Development of a practice and handicraft</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development of an artistic craft (craft of playing, musicianship, writing, painting) • handicraft • great passion and artistry involved, a lifetime education and practice to master such skills (in pursuit of perfection)
<p>5. Aesthetic capabilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • description of different aesthetic capabilities (aesthetic judgment, sense of rhythm, strive for beauty, improvisation) • an ability to notice and become aware of these intangible things, grasp and to verbalize ideas beyond the sphere of rationality • alternative to rationality
<p>6. Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how to perform in front of an audience • discipline and surrender, aesthetics of capitulation
<p>7. Implications for other organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not what parallels to draw between artistic and “normal” organizations but what can we bring home to our organizations? • inspiration and passion

1. Basic organization research on cultural organizations

Through such basic research we now have a much better understanding of organization life in various arts organizations. What appears from an outsider perspective or for an art consumer as something very mystical, often in reality consists of hard work, discipline and lifelong education and practice. Art organizations are like any organizations; people are involved in regular work and follow a rather tight work schedule. The daily routines are very clear; one has to attend rehearsals during the day and perform in the evening. Flexible working hours do not apply in most art organizations. Instead of chaos, researchers (Wetterström, 2001; Koivunen, 2003; Köping, 2003, 2007; Vilén, 2007) found discipline, traditions and routine that makes the show go on. Love for the art was naturally typical for both artists and managers in these organizations.

One standard theme of discussion is whether art organizations are more creative than other organizations in terms of ways of organizing. There are no clear-cut results on this. Organizing patterns may not be creative in any particular way – rather they are characterized by tightly-planned schedules. The work itself is creative or at least re-creative, as some musicians commented (Koivunen, 2003). A second typical topic is the managerial arrangements. Many arts organizations follow a dual leadership pattern – there is an artistic director and an administrative director – which poses certain challenges as well as advantages to the overall

management of these organizations. Third, the balancing between the commercial and the artistic, the management and the art, is a constant battle.

2. Accounts of creative processes

How to organize creative processes? This research provides many interesting descriptions and results about creativity not being an individual endeavor, but more collective in nature. Traditionally, creativity is often perceived as an individual ability, genius or a gift from God. Whilst this is certainly important, accounts of collective creativity are rare. An ability to work together with others in creative processes is, however, an intriguing phenomenon. We could speak of *an ongoing processual ability* (Koivunen, 2008) to work with others in complex settings.

There are some illustrational concepts of collective creativity that provide fresh alternatives to the myth of individual genius. Marotto, Roos and Viktor (2007) describe collective virtuosity in organizations with an example of peak performance in an orchestra. Jaana Parviainen (2002) uses the notion of kinaesthetic empathy to describe how dancers relate to each other in their performances. This notion would be a fruitful one to experiment with in other situations as well. Relational aesthetics is a concept suggested by Nicolas Bourriaud (1998/2002) and applied by myself (2008) to describe a recording process of contemporary classical music. In all these examples creativity is always contextual, not a universal phenomenon.

The conception of leadership as a relational activity (Hosking et al., 1995) appears, for example, in the work of several Nordic researchers who have studied the leadership practices of art organizations. These include Ann-Sofie Köping (2003, 2007) and Koivunen (2003) on symphony orchestras, Marja Soila-Wadman (2003, 2007) on film-making and Erika Sauer (2005) on theatres. In all these cases a relational perspective is adopted to describe the versatile nature of leadership in the complex art organizations concerned. This is an important alternative contribution to leadership studies which are often dominated by entitative individualism.

3. Descriptions of emotions, sensuous perception and the body

Virpi Leikola (1997) has studied the moment of creation and the emotions and feelings that arise at that moment in several artists. She describes intimacy, solitude, distance to others, and a need to be alone. The moment of creation is so intimate, about being so open with the soul that the distance and solitude are needed. It is very much about being present, with oneself, in the moment, in a particular time and space.

To be intuitive requires sensitivity. The ability to create means being present in a moment. It is like breathing, like love. Some artists feel heat and an accelerated pulse during the creative moment. Leikola also describes how the mind is moving the body and the body is moving the mind.

Erika Sauer (2005) has explored the role of emotions and leadership in building a theatre ensemble. She describes how emotional and bodily presence are required for a creative community to emerge and function. Sensuous perception and the body have also been studied by Parviainen (1998), Ropo and Parviainen (2001), Ropo et al. (2002) and Koivunen (2003) as one way of knowledge production: aesthetic knowledge. The need to study aesthetic knowledge production stems from the dominance of the rational paradigm to the study of organizations. The authors argue that social interaction is not only cognitive in nature but consists of bodily presence and sensuous perception too.

4. Development of a practice and handicraft

The development of an artistic craft (the craft of playing, musicianship, writing, painting) usually requires a lifetime education and continuous practice to master such skills. According to Paul Robertson (Young and Robertson, 2007), a violinist and the founder of The Medici Quartet, 10 000 hours of practice is required in classical music to master your instrument. Then you have to sustain the talent and practice to keep it up.

Silvia Gherardi (2001: 136) points out how practice connects knowing with doing. It follows that practice conveys “the image of materiality, of fabrication, of handiwork, of the craftsman’s skill”. Even though large part of modern work is intangible and virtual, there is still the element of handicraft that remains important. This is an important reminder and contribution of studies on arts organization.

5. Aesthetic capabilities

Many studies on art organizations have also provided excellent descriptions of aesthetic capabilities that the members of art organizations apply in their work. Everyone has such aesthetic capabilities; they are not limited to practicing artists only. It is maybe easier to depict and trace aesthetic capabilities in action in art organizations than in others, and that is one of the advantages of these studies. Aesthetic capabilities are many, such as *aesthetic judgment* (Strati, 1999), *sense of rhythm* (Koivunen, 2008, Holbek & Knutson, 2001), *strive for beauty* (Ramirez, 1991, Ladkin, 2008) and *improvisation* (Barrett, 1997), to name but a few. The sense of beauty as well as the strive for beauty are both very tacit capabilities, difficult to describe in words, as Taylor (2002) has also noticed.

The strive for beauty is a driving force not only for artists but for other professionals as well. Ladkin (2008) describes what comprises beautiful leadership. Guillet de Monthoux et al (2007) provide examples of different contexts in which beauty and aesthetic elements have an important role in organizational life, management or leadership. Ramirez (1991) states how the actual process of organizing can be beautiful.

An ability to evaluate things from an aesthetic point of view is a great asset to

any organizational member, managers even more so. An even higher state of aesthetic capability is the ability to verbalize aesthetic phenomena. As Steven Taylor (2002) has pointed out, aesthetic muteness (an inability to describe aesthetic phenomena) is very common and greatly limits organizational activities.

6. Performance

This can be useful for many in managerial positions. This is what one needs to do to perform with self-confidence in front of others. I don't mean that managers should engage in artistic performance or put on a show, but certain similarities do exist. Be relaxed, confident, embrace the audience, have a clear message, present it well, accept the applause. One has to surrender and yet be sensitive to the needs of others as well, all at the same time.

According to Richard Olivier (2007) there is an important difference between charismatic and inspirational leadership: charismatic leaders do what they do because of themselves, inspirational leaders are concerned for others. In other words, charismatic leaders often have narcissistic tendencies where things need to be carried out in a particular fashion just because they are of that opinion. Inspirational leaders use their personal qualifications to engage others and inspire and support them. There is a major difference between these alternatives.

Marja Soila-Wadman (2003) writes about aesthetics of capitulation in filmmaking. In sensitive filming situations, the actors have to surrender, to let go, to immerse themselves in the flow of action. This capitulation requires great courage, self-esteem, experience and trust between the actors and directors.

7. Implications for other organizations

It is quite common to draw parallels between art organizations and other organizations and analyze the differences and similarities. While this can be a useful endeavor, sometimes it could be more fruitful to simply be inspired by the arts and artistic performances. At the same time, there is usually something to be brought home to one's own organization from various art performances.

One thing worth mentioning, however, could be the inspirational and passionate attitude many artists adopt towards their profession. Would that not be useful in other organizations as well? For example, Taylor and Carboni (2008) suggest how artistic techniques and practices, such as expressive words, feelings and action can benefit other organizations as well.

Dichotomies and hybrids

In an earlier chapter I described the underlying assumptions of art and business and the juxtaposition of these two realms. Let me now analyze the dynamics of this interaction in more depth.

Dichotomies reproduce themselves

As dichotomous and stereotyped these assumptions of art and economy might be, they are still strongly produced over and over again in the artistic communities by artists themselves. It is difficult to ignore this even though one might wish for more integrative thinking and the coming together of these two unlikely partners.

In a recent seminar, organized by a media studies group at the University of Tampere in Finland in spring 2007, I gave a presentation about art and artists and their tendencies to resist business and management practices. There was a comment from the audience: "How refreshing and clear that someone is using such strong dichotomies." The underlying assumption in this comment was that I am rather old-fashioned to think like that, in an age of post/transmodernity in which everything is fragmented, the grand narratives are all gone and our individual identities are in constant flux. Obviously the theses of postmodern thinking are yet to reach the artists, at least some of them, since in my experience those dichotomies are very strongly produced and reproduced in the art field. Researchers have to be true to those they study. If I trace strong dichotomies, I have to write about them.

Another example of how the art field reconstructs the stability and traditions by emphasizing its separation from the business world and commercialization comes from the sub-field of comics in Finland. I was involved in organizing a scientific research seminar on cartoons that was attached to a two-day comics festival in Tampere. The festival was called Bubbles over Tampere and the seminar Bubbles over Tampere goes academic (<http://www.tamperekuplii.fi/>). The absolute highlight of the festival was the Finlandia Award, a prestigious art award in Finland, that was granted for the first time to a cartoon artist. This award brought a lot of media attention to the festival and to cartoon as an art form too, yet it resulted in a fierce public discussion and criticism within the comics community. The intriguing part of this incident was the fact that the arguments followed exactly the same pattern than in more established fields of art: commercialization destroys the purity of our art form, artists should not take part in such competitions that involve money, the award will compromise and tarnish our art. The subtext reads very clearly: commerce should stay out of our way, true art is only for those few who can truly embrace it. The Finlandia Award for comics had touched a nerve, something sacred and profound had been compromised.

It appears that the protagonists of "pure" cartoon art, representing a rather new form of art, engaged in similar discursive activities than members of other fields of art, such as classical music, literature and poetry. In this discourse, artists are the good guys who should neither get involved with anything remotely commercial that is produced for larger audiences nor mix with artists who are commercially successful. This is an intriguing phenomenon; the cartoon artists try to tap into the behavior patterns of classical artists and be more artistic than

the artists themselves in order to justify their art and prove that they too are real artists that should be taken seriously.

It seems that money is often dirty, but not always. According to Emma Vironmäki's (personal communication) interpretation, there is an interesting parallel to Mary Douglas' (1966) analysis of purity and dirt: the same element is dirty and dangerous in certain situations while pure in others. In Scandinavia and many European countries the arts are publicly funded by either the government, municipalities or private foundations. This money donated to the arts is considered legitimate and justified: the state should both educate and then provide for the artists. On the contrary, the money from the corporate sector raises many suspicions about whether the purity of art is now somehow endangered. In the United States the setting is vice versa: corporate money is acceptable whereas government funding has to be treated with certain caution. These are cultural variations on a common theme: money is dirty.

Contradictions create movement: Dialogues between art and business

Stability and change, order and chaos, freedom and control; we in the Western world are really fond of our dichotomies. We focus on differences instead of similarities, we want to see separation, dissection, a taking apart. Let that be so. What is a bit problematic, however, is the need to define a permanent state or a fixed definition that would freeze the opposites to a particular setting for good. Instead, it is more relevant to treat the contradictions or dichotomies as an inherent part of an ongoing process in which movement is created. It is precisely this tension, contradiction and paradox, a constant going back and forth between these opposites that keeps things alive and also improves them, and thus we should appreciate this process. We should not try to fix our ideas about art and economy but let them freely interact with one another and create new and exciting combinations, even hybrids.

In the 1990s the interaction between the realms of art and business meant quite often one-way traffic and involved transferring business ideas to art organizations (Wetterström, 1997). Books such as "From Maestro to Manager" (Fitzgibbon and Kelly, 1997) were published to help professionals in the cultural field to improve their managerial capabilities. Maitlis and Lawrence (2003), among others, have described the struggles of an art organization in creating an artistic strategy and the problems involved in this strategy work. My symphony orchestra studies also reveal how the orchestra managers and musicians too were quite comfortable in applying business terminology, such as strategies, customer orientation, marketing segments and positioning, in their talk. In Finland, this was part of a larger change of attitudes or even ideologies in public sector organizations which has been characterized by an enthusiastic adaptation of business ideals to improve the effectiveness of public sector organizations. Since many art organizations re-

ceive public funding, they too have been influenced by this trend. The culture of economy is indeed the *Zeitgeist* of the early 21st century.

Ideas have flown in the other direction as well: business organizations have been influenced by the arts and aesthetics. The aesthetization of economy involves, among other things, the increasing importance of brands, visual images and compelling narratives to boost certain products. Image is everything, as the famous slogan states, and the companies are willing to invest huge amounts of money to create favorable images and stories to support their products.

Hybrids

Although there are still often these two tribes, artists and managers, increasingly one meets people who have a foot in both areas. They can be called hybrids, professional mediators between these two worlds. In the field of art they are often called art managers or artistic directors, in the field of cultural industries they work as managers, agents, producers or promoters. Their educational background is often in some art form, but instead of becoming a professional artist they have decided to seek additional education in management or administration. Many also have extensive experience in the amateur or non-profit field, for instance they have been active in organizing cultural festivals or events. The cultural fields themselves are also increasingly overlapping or becoming hybrid, as Rehn (2008) points out.

There are also examples of rock band members, such as King Star (<http://www.kingstarband.com/>), who sat in my Master's thesis seminar and wanted to study in business schools for the sole purpose of getting a basic understanding of the principles of the business world. They want to manage their business affairs themselves and are prepared to establish their own music companies instead of trying to get a traditional contract with one of the major recording companies. In such a hybrid arrangement, the rock band becomes an enterprise that creates the music, plays and performs it and sells it as well.

Such a development is maybe part of a larger trend in which an increasing number of artists are considering the alternative of becoming independent of their contract partners. Particularly in the fields of music and literature there has been some rearrangements as many consider the recording and publishing companies too powerful and too commercially oriented to be able publish their particular type of art. Many new actors have thus entered the field that was earlier dominated by only a few key actors.

To conclude

This chapter has discussed large and ambiguous concepts such as creativity, art and economy and pondered their relationships to each other. Of particular interest has been the research carried out in Scandinavia that has dealt with the

management of art organizations and the interplay between art and business. The basic underlying assumptions and concepts have been explained and the research fields have been introduced.

What can be said about creativity? My answer is to look carefully at the research results on arts organizations. I identified seven themes that illustrate what creativity might be in other organizations as well: basic organization research, accounts of creative processes, descriptions of emotions, sensuous perception and the body, development of a practice and handicraft, aesthetic capabilities, performance and implications for other organizations. This chapter serves as an invitation to other researchers to evaluate and explore these outcomes and continue the discussion.

References

- Ahola, E.-K. (2007). *Producing Experience in Marketplace Encounters: A Study of Consumption Experiences in Art Exhibitions and Trade Fairs*. Helsinki: Helsinki School of Economics. A-299.
- Amabile, T. & Schatzel, E. & Moneta, G. & Kramer, S. (2004). Leader Behaviors and the Work Environment for Creativity: Perceived leader support. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1): 5-32.
- Balfe, J. (Ed.) (1993). *Paying the Piper. Causes and Consequences of Art Patronage*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Barrett, F. (1998). Creativity and Improvisation in Jazz and Organizations: Implications for Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*, 9(5): 605-622.
- Bathurst, R. (2006). *The Music of Organizations: An Aesthetic Ethnography*. New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Bourriaud, N. (1998/2002). *Relational Aesthetics*, France: Les Presse Du Reel.
- Björkegren, D. (1992). *Kultur och ekonomi*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Björkegren, D. (1993). Managing Art-Related Businesses. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 9(3): 175-87.
- Björkman, I. (1998). *Sven Duchamp – expert på auraproduktion*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Dégot, V. (1985, 2007). *Portrait of Manager as an Artist*. Paper presented at SCOS conference 1985, Antibes. Reprinted in *Aesthesis* 2007, 1(2): 6-42.
- Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fitzgibbon M. & Kelly A. (Eds.) (1997). *From Maestro to Manager: Critical Issues in Arts and Culture Management*. Dublin: Oak Tree Press.
- Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books.
- Galloway, S. & Dunlop, S. (2007). A Critique of Definitions of the Cultural and Creative Industries in Public Policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(1):17-31.
- Gagliardi, P. (Ed.) (1990). *Symbols and Artifacts: Views of the Corporate Landscape*. Berlin: de Gryuter.

- Gherardi, S. (2001). From organizational learning to practice-based knowing. *Human Relations*, 54(1): 131-39.
- Guillet de Monthoux, P. (1993). *Det sublimas konstnärliga ledning. Estetik, konst och företag*. Göteborg: Nerenius & Santérus Förlag.
- Guillet de Monthoux, P. (2004). *The Art Firm. Aesthetic Management and Metaphysical Marketing*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Guillet de Monthoux P. & Gustafsson C. & Sjöstrand S.-E. (Eds.) (2007). *Aesthetic Leadership: Managing Fields of Flow in Art and Business*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gustafsson, Claes (1994). *Produktion av allvar*. Stockholm: Nerenius & Santérus Förlag.
- Heikkilä, H. (2008). ”Se on vanhanaikainen se asetelma, ettei talous kuuluisi taiteeseen”. *Kuvataiteilijan ja talouden suhteesta*. Master’s thesis, University of Vaasa.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2002). *Cultural Industries*. London: Sage.
- Hjorth, D. & Kostera, M. (Eds.) (2007). *Entrepreneurship & The Experience Economy*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Holbek, J. & Knudsen, H. (2001). *Temporal pacing in innovation streams. Towards a concept of poly-rhythmic leadership*. In: In Search of Time. A conference on methodologies and recent developments of time research in management and in the social sciences, ISIDA, May 8-10, 2001, Palermo, Italy.
- Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T. (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hosking, D.-M. & Dachler, P. & Gergen, K.J. (Eds.) (1995). *Management and Organization: Relational Alternatives to Individualism*. Aldershot, UK: Avebury.
- Howkins, J. (2002). *The Creative Economy: How People Make Money from Ideas*. London: Penguin Books.
- Hustvedt, S. (2003). *What I Loved*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Jeffcutt, P. & Pratt, A. (2002). Editorial: Managing Creativity in the Cultural Industries. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 11(4): 225-233.
- Jeffcutt, P. & Pratt, A. (Eds.) (2009). *Creativity and Innovation and the Cultural Economy*. Routledge.
- Johansson, M. (2008). *Engaging Resources for Cultural Events – A Performative View*. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics.
- Jyrämä, A. (1999). *Contemporary Art Markets: Structure and Practice: A Study on Art Galleries in Finland, Sweden, France and Great Britain*. Helsinki: Helsinki School of Economics.
- Koivunen, N. (2003). *Leadership in Symphony Orchestras. Discursive and Aesthetic Practices*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Koivunen, N. (2006). Auditive Leadership Culture. Lessons from Symphony Orchestras. In Hosking, D.-M. & S. McNamee (Eds.): *The Social Construction of Organization*, (pp. 91-111), Malmö: Liber & Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Koivunen, N. (2007). The Processual Nature of Leadership Discourses. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 23(3): 285-305.
- Koivunen, N. (2008). The Recording of Contemporary Classical Music: Relational Aesthetics, and some Management too. *Aesthesis*, 2(1): 52-63.
- Köping, A-S (2003). *Den bundna friheten. On kreativitet och relationer i ett konserthus*. [The limited freedom. On creativity and relations in a concert hall]. Stockholm: Arvinius.

- Köping A-S. (2007). The Creative Compost: Playing and Conducting Musical Events. In Guillet de Monthoux, P. & Gustafsson, C. & Sjöstrand, S.-E. (Eds.) *Aesthetic Leadership: Managing Fields of Flow in Art and Business*, (pp. 15-32), Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ladkin, D. (2008). Leading Beautifully: How Mastery, Congruence and Purpose Create the Aesthetic of Embodied Leadership Practice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(1): 31-41.
- Lampel, J., Lant, T.K. & Shamsie, J. (2000). Balancing Act: Learning form Organizational Practices in Cultural Industries. *Organization Science*, 11(3): 263-269.
- Lampel, J., Shamsie, J. & Lant, T.K. (Eds.) (2006). *The Business of Culture. Strategic Perspectives on Entertainment and Media*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Leikola, V. (1997). Contextual Designer – The Inner Voice and the Passion in the Moment of Creation. *Design Journalen*, 4(1): 30-40.
- Lindqvist, K. (2003). *Exhibition Enterprising*. Stockholm: Stockholm University.
- Maitlis, S. & Thomas, L. (2003). Orchestral Manoeuvres in the Dark: Understanding Failure in Organizational Strategizing. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(1): 109-139.
- Marotto, M. & Roos, J. & Bart, V. (2007). Collective Virtuosity in Organizations: A Study of Peak Performance in an Orchestra. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(3): 388-413.
- Mumford, M. D. (2003). Leading for Innovation. Editorial, *The Leadership Quarterly*. 14: 385-387.
- Mumford, M. D. & Licuanan, B. (2004). Leading for Innovation: Conclusions, issues, and directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1): 163-171.
- Olivier, R. (2007). *Inspirational leadership. Henry V and the Muse of Fire*. London: The Articulate Press.
- Ottensmeyer, E. (1996). Too Strong to Stop, Too Sweet to Lose; Aesthetics as a Way to Know Organizations. *Organization*, 3(2): 189-94.
- Parviainen, J. (1998). *Bodies Moving and Moved*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Parviainen, J. (2002). Kinaesthetic Empathy. *Dialogue and Universalism*. 6/2002.
- Ramírez, R. (1991). *The Beauty of Social Organization*. München: ACCEDO.
- Rehn, A. (2007). *Vad är företagsekonomi*. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur.
- Rehn, A. (2008). Pop (Culture) Goes the Organization: On Highbrow, Lowbrow and Hybrids in Studying Popular Culture Within Organization Studies. *Organization*, 15(5): 765-783.
- Rickards, T. & Moger, S. (2006). Creative Leaders: A Decade of Contributions from Creativity and Innovation Management Journal. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15(1): 4-18.
- Ropo, A. & Parviainen, J. (2001). Leadership and Bodily Knowledge in Expert Organizations: Epistemological Rethinking. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 17(1): 1-18.
- Ropo, A. & Parviainen, J. & Koivunen, N. (2002). Aesthetics in leadership. From absent bodies to social bodily presence. In Parry, K. & Meindl, J. (Eds.): *Grounding Leadership Theory and Research: Issues and Perspectives*, (pp. 21-38). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing Inc.
- Sauer, E. (2005). *Emotions in Leadership. Leading a Dramatic Ensemble*. Tampere, University of Tampere Press.

- Soila-Wadman, M. (2003). *Kapitulatationens estetik. Organisering och ledarskap i filmprojekt*. [The aesthetics of capitulation. Organizing and leadership in film projects], Arvinius Förlag, Stockholm.
- Soila-Wadman, M. (2007). Can Artists be Leaders? Beyond Heroic Film Directing. In Guillet de Monthoux, P. & Gustafsson, C. & Sjöstrand, S.-E. (Eds.) *Aesthetic Leadership: Managing Fields of Flow in Art and Business* (pp. 72-88). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sorjonen, H. (2004). *Täideorganisaation markkinaorientaatio: markkinaorientaation edellytykset ja ilmeneminen esitystäideorganisaation ohjelmistosuunnittelussa*. Helsinki: Helsinki School of Economics.
- Stenström, E. (2000). *Konstiga företaget*. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics.
- Strati, A. (1989). Aesthetics and Organizational Skill. In Turner, B. (Ed.). *Organizational Symbolism*. New York: De Gruyter.
- Strati, A. (1999). *Organization and Aesthetics*. London: Sage.
- Taalas, S. (2001). *Producing Drama. Repertoire Decision-Making in the TTT Theatre of Tampere*. University of Warwick. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Taylor S. S. (2002). Overcoming Aesthetic muteness: Researching Organizational Members' Aesthetic Experience. *Human Relations*, 55(7): 821-840.
- Taylor, S. S. & Carboni, I. (2008). Technique & Practices from the Arts: Expressive Verbs, Feelings, and Action. In Barry, D. & Hansen, H. (Eds.) *Handbook of New & Emerging Approaches to Management & Organization*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Towse, R. (2003). Cultural Industries. In Towse, R. (Ed.). *A Handbook of Cultural Economics* (pp. 170-182). Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.
- Vilén, T. (2007). *New House, New Identity? De-aestheticization, Nostalgia and Identity in an Opera Organization After the Change of Place*. Paper presented at the 3rd Workshop on Art & Aesthetics for Organizing and Management: Plus One – Hooked on Feelings, Gattières, France, July 18-20, 2007.
- Wilenius, M. (2004). *Luovaan talouteen. Kulttuuriosaaminen tulevaisuuden voimavarana*. Helsinki: Edita.
- Wennes, G. (2002). *Skjønnheten og udyret: Kunsten å lede kunstorganisasjonen*. [Beauty and Beast: The Art of Leading Cultural Organizations] NHH, Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration.
- Wetterström, J. (2001). *Stor opera, små pengar*. Stockholm: Carlsson.
- Young, M. & Robertson, P. (2007). Leadership and Aesthetics. In Hague, D. & Marshall Young (Eds): *The Oxford Strategic Leadership Programme 1982-2007* (pp. 93-105). Oxford: University of Oxford.

Websites:

- <http://neumann.hec.ca/artsmanagement/aimac/> [Accessed 15 May 2008]
- http://mapage.noos.fr/journalcollection/res_en/journalcollection/ijam.html [accessed 15 May 2008]
- http://www.essex.ac.uk/afm/emc/art_of_management_and_organisati.shtm [accessed 15 May 2008]
- <http://www.essex.ac.uk/aesthesis/> [accessed 15 May 2008]
- <http://www.nurope.eu/> [accessed 15 May 2008]
- <http://www.tamperekuplii.fi/> [accessed 15 May 2008]
- <http://www.kingstarband.com/> [accessed 15 May 2008]