

## Title

**Towards an organisational model of cultural leadership for Australian Symphony orchestras**

## Author

Samuel J Cairnduff

## Occupation and affiliation of the principal author(s)

PhD Candidate, Deakin University (Australia)

Teaching Associate, Arts and Cultural Management Program, The University of Melbourne (Australia).

## Brief autobiographical note on the author(s) (50 words)

Samuel Cairnduff is a researcher and lecturer in arts and cultural management with an extensive leadership career in the cultural sector. He is completing PhD research at Deakin University, examining cultural leadership in Australian professional orchestras. He teaches at the University of Melbourne in the Arts and Cultural Management and Media and Communications programs and at Monash University in the Masters of Creative and Cultural Industries program.

## ABSTRACT

This paper examines the definition and enactment of cultural leadership in Australian orchestras, drawing from interviews with key artistic and administrative leaders. The findings suggest that orchestras struggle to define their cultural leadership role due to tensions between social and artistic objectives and diverse stakeholder expectations, hindering their ability to set a clear agenda. Orchestra leaders aspire to have a more significant role in social discourse, recognising its importance for their relevance and sustainability. The paper argues that cultural leadership is a dedicated organisational practice, requiring a new model capable of harmonising stakeholder expectations and creating deep community ties. Ultimately, the paper contributes to developing a new model of cultural leadership for orchestras that builds a unified sense of purpose and positively shapes enduring leadership objectives. The research highlights the need for a whole-of-organisation approach to creating effective cultural leadership in orchestras, moving beyond the individual leadership of executive directors, CEOs, or artistic directors.

## Keywords (up to 5)

Cultural leadership; symphony orchestras; arts leadership; social change; stakeholder relationships

## Introduction

There is a long and close association between leadership paradigms and the arts. Powerful symbols of leadership - conductors, choreographers, directors - and notable artists who have influenced culture and society have contributed to the idea that leadership in the arts can be a 'force for good' (Caust, 2018). Yet, despite its frequent use in the arts and cultural sector, the meaning of the term cultural leadership is subjective and often ambiguous. Indeed, Nisbett and Walmsley (2016) state, 'general opinion around the world is that cultural leadership defies definition'. This paper uses this contention as a starting point to investigate the role of cultural leadership in Australian professional orchestras; complex and multifaceted organisations that have struggled to define their cultural leadership role (Boyle, 2003).

Cultural leadership has been broadly described as the 'act of leading the cultural sector' (British Council, 2006, p.1), yet the term's intricacies prove to be more complex. In business studies, the precept that leadership is a highly influential component of business practice is reflected in an intense focus on leadership studies in management research (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1990; Kanter, 2014; Keskes, 2014) - often characterised as an 'obsession' (Vaughan, 1989;). The fixation with leadership took hold in the late twentieth century as corporate perspectives shifted. The concept of management was essentially reframed as *leadership*, indicating refocused priorities and values (Bolden, Petrov, Gosling, 2008; Kanter, 2014). Statements such as 'managers will develop a plan, leaders will develop a vision' (Kotter, 2008) are typical of such positioning. In this discourse, leadership is presented as a higher-order practice than management, as it is concerned with vision, values, and amplifying human capacity (Bass, 1995).

The intense focus on leadership and its prioritisation as a dominant business paradigm has been critiqued (Rosenhead, Franco, Grint, Friedland, 2019). Alvesson and Einola (2019, p.383) claim that contemporary leadership theory is characterised by 'shaky philosophical and theoretical foundations, tautological reasoning, weak empirical studies, nonsensical measurement tools, unsupported knowledge claims' and a 'generally simplistic and out-of-date view of corporate life'.

Connected to stakeholder and leadership theory, the notion of change management is considered a fundamental aspect of enterprise management (Friedman, Miles, 2002). Moran and Brightman (2001) argue the importance of understanding both external and internal stakeholder needs, and Burnes (2004), Rieley and Clarkson (2001) argue that change management is a fundamental aspect of leadership, and an essential management skill (Senior, 2006)

Leadership in cultural settings has been researched extensively (Caust, 2018; Byrnes, 2022), and much of the focus has been from an individual perspective, discussing leaders' qualities (Cray, Inglis and Freeman, 2007). Leadership research in business studies has grouped leadership behaviours into a series of styles, including transformational, transactional, charismatic, heroic and relational (Yukl, 2006; Burns, 1978; Bass, 1995). However, this has been shown to be an inadequate approach to considering arts leadership.

Cultural organisations often operate in a climate of uncertainty due to fluctuating financial pressures, which demands leadership to exert direction, purpose and rigour in management practice (Gill and Pratt, 2008; Bass and Stogdill, 1990).

The term 'cultural leadership' ostensibly became a preferable alternative to previous descriptors of cultural administration, 'arts management' or 'arts administration' during the early 2000s (Adler, 2006). This was largely due to Holden and Hewison's foundational work in embedding leadership of cultural institutions as a unique discipline rather than an arts-focused extension of business administrative or management functions (Hewison, 2004, 2019; Hewison & Holden, 2016; Adler, 2006). Yet, there are numerous interpretations of cultural leadership. Sutherland and Gosling (2010) use Heidegger's *Building, Dwelling, Thinking* paradigm (Heidegger, 1971) as a basis for framing cultural leadership as enabling engagement with cultural activity. Krug and Weinberg (2004) emphasise the cultural leader's ability to influence and negotiate with internal stakeholders, mediating organisational disunity through negotiation and trade-offs (Cray, Inglis and Freeman, 2007). Emphasising external engagement, Kay (2010) notes cultural leadership as a means of influencing government policy. In a similar but related view Bolden (2008) links cultural leadership with cultural diplomacy, arguing cultural leadership relates to and is vitally important for the success of '[not only] organisations but sectors, regions and nations'. In a related view but different approach, Ivey (in Jones, 2009) links cultural leadership to advocacy for a 'vibrant, expressive life' as a key tenet of cultural policy. Thus, the cultural leader is obliged to promote, maximise and maintain the visibility of access to culture, particularly in forums of legislation and policymaking.

The commonality between these diverse perspectives, is that cultural leadership implies a symbolic social function for arts organisations associated with influence across multiple environments and stakeholders (Adler, 2006). This framing of cultural leadership assumes a wider view of leadership from an organisational perspective rather than embodied in the capacity of an individual leader.

When examining an organisation's engagement with the broader social sphere, it is relevant to consider the evolving landscape of public expectations. Modern consumers increasingly expect organisations to demonstrate social responsibility, articulate and adhere to values that resonate with their communities, and actively participate in shaping social discourse. This is frequently performed by articulating company values (Sangoghdar, Bailey, 2022). Additionally, they place importance on authenticity as a value, both in interpersonal relationships as well as the organisations and brands with which they interact (Chatzopoulou, Kiewiet, 2020; Bhattacharya and Sen, 2004). These phenomena were closely associated with the Millennial or Generation Y demographic (Weber, Urick, 2017).

In terms of orchestras, there are several examples of orchestras actively modelling social change, effectively acting as a metaphor for broader society. Gall (2000) focuses on orchestras operating in the midst of extreme poverty. Using the Os Meninos de São Caetano [The Children of Sao Caetano] as an example, Gall (2000) demonstrates orchestras' capacity to enact radical social impact. The best-known exponent of this kind of impact is the product of Venezuela's *El Sistema* program, founded in 1975 by Jose Antonio Abreu, whose vision was to bring accessible art to the favelas of Caracas (Ranamrine, 2011). It should be

noted that these are exceptional examples, yet considering their practice informs a research approach to less high-profile case subjects.

This paper takes as its point of departure these various perspectives of cultural leadership and contemplation of the social role of orchestras as a starting point for its investigation. Drawing from interviews with key artistic and administrative leaders, this paper reflects the findings of a 2022-2023 study examining the definition and enactment of cultural leadership in 10 Australian professional orchestras. The paper addresses two research questions from the wider study:

- How do contemporary Australian professional orchestras understand their leadership role?
- How can the findings from the current research help build a successful model of leadership for Australian professional orchestras?

The paper is divided into five sections. After outlining the methodology and theoretical framework, the findings address both research questions separately. The final section brings together the findings and summarises the paper's recommendations.

## Methodology

Ten Australian professional orchestras were included in the study. Data were gathered through semi-structured interviews conducted with leadership representatives from the respondent orchestras; 20 interviews were conducted in total. The data were subjected to a thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). A semi-structured interview approach, led by open-ended questions, establishes and reinforces a conversational, friendly dynamic between interviewer and interviewee (Yin, 2009). Extended qualitative interviews allow for in-depth explorations of experiences (Kvåle, 2007), recounted through detailed and considered discussion (Geertz, 2008). The results were analysed and presented using a Grounded Theory approach (Glaser and Strauss, 2017). Interviews were conducted in person and via Zoom in June - December of 2022. Each interview was approximately 45 minutes long and was recorded and transcribed before being subjected to a thematic analysis.

A cross-section of orchestras was selected. Central to the group were 'state orchestras', which made up five of the ten respondent orchestras. State orchestras, founded by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) in the 1930s and based in the capital city of each state, are the most prevalent model of symphony orchestra in Australia (Morgan, 2011). In addition to the state orchestras, five orchestras operating under 'hybrid' models were included. Two part-time symphony orchestras with different operating models from the state orchestras were selected to provide an opportunity to identify a contrast in cultural leadership approach. The study also included three hybrid orchestras: two specialist ensembles and one that serves as the pit orchestra for seasons of the Australian national opera and ballet companies, also performing a limited annual standalone season.

## Theoretical Framework

The research developed a theoretical framework synthesising Institutional Theory (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1987), Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984), and Public Value Theory (Moore, 1997).

Institutional theory links organisational behaviour to context, positioning organisations as dynamic entities capable of creatively responding to their environments. Leadership is viewed as an organisational quality rather than an individual one. Institutional theory allows consideration of the orchestras' environmental context and influences. Stakeholder theory places the organisation at the centre of a 'hub and spoke' model, with constituent groups forming the spokes (Lewis, 2007). Value creation for all stakeholders is key, recognising that value takes various forms. Stakeholder relationships in cultural organisations involve social capital (Bourdieu, 1986), influencing strategy and planning. Public Value Theory (Moore, 1997) relates to demonstrable value creation for key stakeholders, particularly the public who contribute to funding. Value creation is important for Australian professional orchestras.

The theoretical framework sits at the nexus of these three theories. Orchestras have complex internal structures and unclear hierarchies (stakeholder theory), are prone to coercive and mimetic influences from other organisations (institutional theory), and are expected to generate public value as publicly funded institutions (public value theory). This intersection provides a robust framework to understand the implications of cultural leadership from both an orchestra-centric and broader social perspective.

## Findings

Considering the first research question: *How do contemporary Australian professional orchestras understand their leadership role?* The paper found that the respondents emphatically regarded cultural leadership as a key part of their orchestra's overall activity yet presented a range of framings of its precise definition. One respondent (VC) encapsulated the apparent complexity of defining such a commonly used term, stating he'd 'like to think that this would be a very simple thing to define or articulate' but that it was not. However, VC did believe that cultural leadership represented a 'broader discussion around purpose, value and relevance' that was central to the definition.

Some respondents were notably resistant to the term, evincing unease at its use and not wishing to see their work framed as cultural leadership. RE, who leads a hybrid orchestra, suggested 'cultural leadership' evoked a kind of grandiosity that made him uncomfortable; cultural leadership is a term he 'tended to swerve away from'. SP, who leads a hybrid orchestra, resisted thinking of what her orchestra did in terms of cultural leadership. She believed the term implied a patronising, patriarchal relationship between the orchestra and its stakeholders - particularly the broader community and artistic collaborators. SP preferred to position the orchestra as a 'collaborative interface', using terms such as 'partnering', 'co-creation' and 'exchange'. Another respondent, RJ expressed discomfort at an implied expectation his orchestra should contribute to matters of broad social change. He equated this expectation to a form of pressure that he believed to be incommensurate with the size, resources and influence of his orchestra. In RJ's view, the form of cultural leadership his orchestra performed was 'more *followership* than *leadership*'.

From the enquiry, two characteristics were evident. Firstly, their construction of a definition of cultural leadership reflected the basis of institutional theory: that organisations within the field will influence each other through what DiMaggio and Powell (1983) refer to as *institutional isomorphism*. This takes place through both a form of mimicry, as well as reaction to an evolving, dynamic operating environment (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Biggart and Hamilton, 1987). For example, the respondent orchestras had focused cultural leadership on certain areas of activity, e.g. amplifying the representation of female composers and establishing formalised policies to articulate their engagement strategies with First Nations Australians.

Secondly, the respondent orchestras regarded cultural leadership as concerned with performing a 'broader social role', i.e. one that went beyond their core performance activity, or 'more than' [just] 'creating music' (RE, RJ, SG, VC, CW). From a practical perspective, this belief is directly related to the fundamental principles of Public Value Theory (Moore, 1997), which is concerned with the means of demonstrable value creation for key stakeholders - in this case, the public who contribute to the organisation's funding. As publicly-funded, subsidised entities, symphony orchestras are required to justify funding by creating public value, submitting regular acquittals to their funding bodies demonstrating value creation against a range of criteria based upon determined social and cultural priorities. These impacts reach beyond 'core' activities of performing live concerts and recording and include contributions to social capacity building in areas like education and health, engagement with regional communities, as well as gender and ethnic diversity of employees (Australia Council for the Arts, 2022).

### **Internal tension about purpose**

From this definitional basis of cultural leadership in Australian professional orchestras, an influential internal tension became evident between artistic and non-artistic perspectives. The paper argues that this tension demonstrates a divergence in beliefs in the respondent orchestras about their orchestra's purpose. A key indicator of divergent beliefs about the orchestras' purpose was the prevalence of siloing in the orchestras: discrete stakeholder groups operating in relative isolation from their colleagues, characterised by a lack of communication, transparency, and trust.

### **Artistic perspective**

From an artistic perspective, some internal stakeholders believed the core purpose of the orchestras was purely to create music to the highest possible level. They characterised the orchestra as 'centres for excellence', subsequently placing excellence in musical performance as the focal activity of the orchestra. PS believed it was 'very much in the DNA of orchestral musicians to pine for excellence'. He went further:

In fact, to be simply brutal, they don't pine for excellence; they pine for *perfection*.

In this view, all other organisational objectives and pursuits, including education and community development programs, audience development, commercial revenue generation, advocacy and cultural diplomacy, were secondary to producing excellent musical performances.

The precept that orchestral performance is characterised as an elite practice, with individual and collective instrumental practice built around aspirations to excellence, is well-established (Talbot-Honeck, Orlick, 1998; Green and Gallwey, 1986). Yet a sense of elitism deters new audiences who feel that the experience of an orchestral concert is impenetrable (Dearn & Pitts, 2017; Kolb, 2000).

Thus excellence is juxtaposed with audience development; the consensus among respondents was that developing and retaining new audiences was a fundamental component of cultural leadership. Thus, the divergence between artistic and non-artistic perspectives represents a significant faultline in the respondent orchestras. This manifested in various forms of resistance to these activities, and other forms of inefficiencies, which the research termed organisational misalignment. PS connects this to a mindset he describes as the 'primacy of the artist': i.e., musicians' needs and expectations take precedence above all other concerns.

If I was a musician, and it's all about the art form, I might have a view that the government should just give us more money... If I'd had that [artform-centric] view and I was leading this organisation, saying, 'I don't know why people aren't coming, this artform is so important, the government should give us more money, then that would be my organisational mantra

Examples of organisational misalignment include cultural inertia: a lack of willingness to adopt change resulting in resistant attitudes and behaviours, and idealisation of former working practices and conditions. YA noted a tendency amongst some internal stakeholders to repeat company folklore - 'the legend of... whatever... myth-making' - as a means of expressing displeasure at undertaking activities deemed to deviate from the core artistic mission. Intertwined with these behaviours, respondents referred to the highly emotional nature of orchestras which led to interpersonal and interdepartmental issues that 'behavioural, cultural, sentimental and emotional' discourse about artistic activities rather than focusing on global company objectives. This manifested in insecurity and anxiety amongst internal stakeholders.

These change-resistant behaviours are directly connected to institutional theory (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Zucker, 1987) and constitute the concept of *normative isomorphism*. Normative isomorphism refers to the amalgamation and normalisation of attitudes and beliefs in the field as well as within the organisation, which make certain types of behaviours probable. In the case of the respondent orchestras, this is derived from a connection to the norms and practices of a former era - an era before Public Value implied the need for orchestras to undertake wide activities of engagement.

### **Non-artistic perspective**

The non-artistic perspective placed importance on pursuing a broader social role for the orchestras - beyond its core artistic role. This was partly due to overarching concerns of declining audiences for orchestras worldwide and the perceived need to determine and pursue means of remaining relevant to the communities in which they operated. Additionally, these respondents recognised a shift in public expectations of public and private organisations to articulate and enact organisational values; this was largely connected to performing activities beyond core musical performances. For example, they discussed the

orchestras' roles in recent social and political change in Australia, including the Marriage Equality plebiscite (2017) and the referendum for an Indigenous Voice to Parliament (2023). They believed that their orchestras' engagement in these issues was a fundamental, non-negotiable responsibility of cultural leadership. Many cited the example of the Sydney Symphony Orchestra, which, in 2017, initially stated that it would remain neutral in the debate before an intense public backlash led to a public statement of support for marriage equality. Respondents saw this as a watershed moment in understanding contemporary expectations of Australian professional orchestras.

## **Contributing to a successful model of leadership for Australian professional orchestras?**

### Harmonising purpose

The paper found that determining the meaning of cultural leadership for Australian professional orchestras emerged as a key challenge: divergence of purpose. Thus, the paper concludes that a key dimension of a successful model of cultural leadership should be harmonising *purpose* within the organisation. The term 'harmonising purpose', original to this research, involves accepting, integrating and communicating diverse perspectives across the internal stakeholder groups of the orchestra. The research contends that a shared understanding of diverse perspectives within the organisation will result in increased empathy and organisational commitment to cultural leadership objectives.

Respondents provided several examples of where this had worked to successfully resolve internal conflicts arising from conflicting perspectives. CW wanted to increase the regional presence of his orchestra by sending smaller groups of musicians to the regional areas of the state where his orchestra was located. There was resistance from within the musician body of the orchestra, who argued that smaller groups comprised the musical and brand integrity of the orchestra. CW executed an internal communications campaign to highlight the chamber series and smaller ensemble work that the orchestra had previously produced and how those activities hadn't compromised the integrity of the orchestra. As CW describes it, gradually, certain factions within the musician body started to see the merits of smaller group performances. By exercising diplomacy, characterised by empathy and clear communication, CW managed to harmonise his orchestra's purpose and achieve a cultural leadership objective.

Similarly, BJ, who leads a hybrid ensemble, encountered resistance from his orchestra when they were engaged to perform with a popular music artist. Musicians in the orchestra, reflecting the artistic perspective, resisted and expressed displeasure at this proposal. BJ addressed their concerns by presenting a clear explanation of the orchestras' current budgetary challenges and how the income earned from the commercial booking would contribute to achieving overarching company goals. BJ reported that, whilst musicians preferred to be playing canonical repertoire, they were more agreeable to the commercial engagement when provided with a truthful rationale. BJ believed that this example increased trust, improved communication and imparted a sense of agency for the musicians.

PS gave a similar example of a programming decision: 'Do we [play] the movies, or do we play the Mahlers right now?' In order to harmonise the agendas, PS believes orchestras need to 'change the narrative' - meaning the internal understanding and acceptance of the



agendas and the fundamental purpose of the orchestra. PS's approach to harmonising purpose is a complete narrative shift on what orchestra is for. Similarly, CW believes cultural leadership can emerge from an honest assessment of his orchestra's purpose from an externally-focused perspective:

We need to start thinking more broadly about what the [CW's orchestra] actually *is*, and what the community wants and what the community needs. Not about what we want to give to them.

YA believed that, in order to harmonise purpose, orchestras needed to fundamentally reconsider their identity. She posed the question, "What is the company":

Musicians will say the company is the orchestra [referring to the collective of musicians]. Another perspective is the company is an organisation that delivers musical experiences. And the orchestra is the vehicle through which the company delivers musical experiences.

One of the core tenets of stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1983) is that stakeholder value is measured in different ways, not necessarily financial. By recognising the value internal stakeholders place upon the organisation's purpose and concurrently recognising that perspectives differ between stakeholders, the research argues orchestras can make a positive step towards harmonising purpose, thus contributing to more effective cultural leadership within the organisation.

#### Authentic social participation

The research also found that a key factor contributing to a successful approach to cultural leadership in Australian professional orchestras involved intentional participation in broader social issues relevant to their audiences and broader stakeholder groups. The research terms this *authentic social participation*.

Respondents expressed an awareness that there was an increased expectation of their orchestras to engage with social issues. They noted a shift in both external and internal stakeholder expectations, which implied pressure to be more engaged with wider social issues. Most agreed that this was a broader social phenomenon, not restricted to the arts and cultural sector. They noted the additional expectation to demonstrate and align with contemporary concepts such as Social Licence to Operate (SLO) (Demuijnck and Fasterling, 2016) and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Carroll, 2016). As PS notes, 'this is a challenge [for organisations] across all society'. This aligned with the broader social shift in the expectation of organisations to articulate and demonstrate adherence to values (Sandoghdar, Bailey, 2022; Hollensbe, Wookey, Hickey, George, Nichols, 2014), further that this engagement should be authentic (Chatzopoulou, Kiewiet, 2020; Bhattacharya and Sen, 2004).

Some respondents reiterated that these expectations were clearly expressed by both internal and external stakeholders, profoundly influencing their approach to social participation. Others were less sure of the extent they believed their audiences wanted them to engage with social issues. As RJ said, 'I don't feel that our core audience is pushing us to

be particularly socially progressive'. Others indicated that, in some cases, this was more of an implied or assumed rather than actual expectation. RJ said:

We think they want us to take a position on these things [but really] ...there's quite a large chunk of the audience that will be absolutely fine if we just played Beethoven Brahms back every day all day.

Yet, other respondents were insistent that authentic social participation was the core responsibility of orchestras. BN, reflecting Gall, 2000 and Ranamrine, 2011's notion of orchestras as a 'metaphor for society', saw orchestras' role as modelling and demonstrating the evolution of broader social values, thereby setting an example:

All we're doing is actually reflecting the reality of the world and particularly of modern Australia, and we're just rebalancing all of the inherited biases, the cultural baggage of a whole century of orchestral development...So I think it's crucially important, actually, I guess, think [orchestras are] a platform... to lead in those areas and make it better, you know, address all of the injustice as the inequalities and raise awareness.

BN particularly referred to equality, diversity and inclusion and how this was encapsulated in the orchestral environment.

Whilst the belief that orchestras had a role to play in broader social issues was widely held among the respondents, they acknowledged the inherent challenges of this form of social involvement. The potential to divide, upset and lose stakeholder groups was seen as a significant risk. Further, they expressed a lack of clarity around which issues to engage with and how and questioned why orchestras would choose to address certain issues over others. VC said:

How do I go about determining what that stance should be?... Do I decide on behalf of the organisation how we feel about this? Is it a board responsibility? Do we have a majority vote of all employees of the company? How do we set, how do we settle on what the answer is? And then I began to go through, okay, we could go through and we can determine a development process. Okay, what about them on the subject of abortion where do we stand on that? What about capital punishment? What about.... you know, and the list goes - you know, what about voluntary euthanasia?

Finally, the absence of a formalised methodology for addressing social engagement was evident, with orchestras often taking a situational, instinctive, or ad hoc approach. This paper proposes this is an area for further research.

## Conclusion

This paper addressed the notion of cultural leadership in Australian professional orchestras from two perspectives. Firstly, it considered how orchestras define and determine the meaning of cultural leadership. Secondly, it considered how its findings can help build a successful model of leadership for Australian professional orchestras.

The paper found that, whilst there is no singular definition of cultural leadership, it is concerned with performing a 'broader social role'—one that goes beyond core performance activity. The paper argues that this motivation is connected to the concept of public value theory (Moore, 1997) and the expectation to create public value inherent to the Australian cultural policy environment. The paper also found that the respondent orchestras' conceptualisation of cultural leadership was highly influenced by their peer organisations' understanding and performance of the concept. This reflected the institutional theory concept of institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Biggart and Hamilton, 1987).

The paper concludes there are two key factors contributing to a successful model of cultural leadership. Firstly, the research found that cultural leadership performance was affected by the conflicting perspectives of internal stakeholders, primarily a tension between artistic and non-artistic perspectives. These resulted in a divergence in beliefs about the orchestra's purpose, which manifested in a range of behaviours that obfuscated and hindered the orchestra from performing a cultural leadership role. Respondents discussed navigating significant change resistance, cultural inertia and organisational overload, contributing to misaligned priorities. Whilst these are not unique to the orchestral milieu, the paper shows them to be characteristic of Australian professional orchestras. The paper concludes that a key factor of successful cultural leadership in Australian professional orchestras is harmonising the perspectives of the orchestras' purpose amongst its internal stakeholders. It finds that effective cultural leadership is performed through a whole-of-company, organisational approach rather than an individual approach.

Secondly, by acknowledging that orchestras both desire and are expected to be more involved in broader social issues. Beyond their inherent expectations to create public value, there is global pressure on organisations to articulate and demonstrate social values; Australian orchestras have been subject to and influenced by these expectations. Thus the paper concludes that a second factor of cultural leadership is authentic social participation. The paper finds that this area is characterised by inherent risk, and lacks an established or formal approach, thus would benefit from further research.

The findings of this research demonstrate that orchestra leaders want their orchestras to espouse clear cultural leadership. Many recognise that their sustainability is linked to taking a more active role in their communities and forging deeper connections with their diverse stakeholders. They also aspire to have a more significant role in social discourse and regard this as vital to their relevance and sustainability. Recent movements such as #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter have highlighted an increasing social expectation of organisations to actively articulate positions on social change. Orchestras have an opportunity to reinforce their engagement with discourse as a means of fortifying their place in society.

The research shows that cultural leadership is a dedicated organisational practice, differing from the individual leadership and managerial functions of executive directors, CEOs or the dedicated creative leadership of artistic directors. As such, this framing of cultural leadership requires a new model capable of harmonising myriad stakeholder expectations and creating deep ties to the orchestra's community. The conceptualisation of this form of leadership is shaped at a whole-of-organisation level, not restricted to embodying certain qualities in an individual leader.

Ultimately, the paper contributes to developing a new model of cultural leadership for orchestras that harmonises stakeholder expectations, builds a unified sense of organisational purpose and positively contributes to shaping and achieving enduring leadership objectives.

## References

Adler, N.J., 2006. The arts & leadership: Now that we can do anything, what will we do?. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(4), pp.486-499.

Alvesson, M. and Einola, K., 2019. Warning for excessive positivity: Authentic leadership and other traps in leadership studies. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(4), pp.383-395.

American Symphony Orchestra League. National Task Force for the American Orchestra, 1993. *Americanizing the American Orchestra: Report of the National Task Force for the American Orchestra, an Initiative for Change*. American Symphony Orchestra League.

Bass, B.M., 1995. Comment: Transformational leadership: Looking at other possible antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 4(3), pp.293-297.

Bass, B.M. and Stogdill, R.M., 1990. *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications*. Simon and Schuster.

Bhattacharya, C.B. and Sen, S., 2004. Doing better at doing good: When, why, and how consumers respond to corporate social initiatives. *California Management Review*, 47(1), pp.9-24.

Biggart, N.W. and Hamilton, G.G., 1987. An institutional theory of leadership. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 23(4), pp.429-441.

Bolden, R., Petrov, G. and Gosling, J., 2008. *Developing collective leadership in higher education*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.

Bourdieu, P., 1986. The Forms of Capital. In: J. G. Richardson, ed. *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press, pp.241-258.

Bourdieu, P., 2011. The forms of capital.(1986). In: I. Szeman and T. Kaposy, eds. *Cultural theory: An anthology*, 1(81-93), p.949.

Boyle, S., 2003. Achieving community ownership: The case of a regional symphony orchestra. *International Journal of Arts Management*, pp.9-18.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp.77-101.

British Council, n.d. What is Cultural Leadership?. [online] British Council. Available at: [https://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/media/uploads/files/Cultural\\_Leadership\\_2.pdf](https://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/media/uploads/files/Cultural_Leadership_2.pdf). [Accessed 15 October 2023].

- Burnes, B., 2004. Kurt Lewin and the planned approach to change: a re-appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(6), pp.977-1002.
- Byrnes, W.J., 2022. *Management and the Arts*. Routledge.
- Cairnduff, S., 2023. Arts organisations say they want to be 'cultural leaders' – but are they living up to their goals?. *The Conversation*, 13 October.
- Carroll, A.B., 2016. Carroll's pyramid of CSR: taking another look. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility*, 1, pp.1-8.
- Caust, J., 2018a. A force for good: arts leadership and the individual. *ArtsHub*, [online] 2 July. Available at: <https://www.artshub.com.au/news/opinions-analysis/a-force-for-good-arts-leadership-and-the-individual-255994-2359956/> [Accessed 23 October 2023].
- Caust, J., 2018b. *Arts Leadership in Contemporary Contexts*. Routledge.
- Chatzopoulou, E. and de Kiewiet, A., 2021. Millennials' evaluation of corporate social responsibility: The wants and needs of the largest and most ethical generation. *Journal of Consumer Behaviour*, 20(3), pp.521-534.
- Cray, D., Inglis, L., and Freeman, S., 2007. Managing the arts: Leadership and decision making under dual rationalities. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 36(4), pp.295-313.
- Cuyler, A.C., 2013. Affirmative action and diversity: Implications for arts management. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 43(2), pp.98-105.
- Dearn, L.K. and Pitts, S.E., 2017. (Un) popular music and young audiences: Exploring the classical chamber music concert from the perspective of young adult listeners. *Journal of Popular Music Education*, 1(1), pp.43-62.
- Demuijnck, G. and Fasterling, B., 2016. The social license to operate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136, pp.675-685.
- DeVereaux, C., 2006. Any way the wind blows: Changing dynamics in American arts policy. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 36(3), pp.168-180.
- DiMaggio, P. and Useem, M., 1978. Social Class and Arts Consumption: The Origins and Consequences of Class Differences in Exposure to the Arts in America. *Theory and Society*, 5(2), pp.141-161.
- Freeman, E.R., 1984. *Stakeholder Theory*.
- Friedman, A.L. and Miles, S., 2002. Developing stakeholder theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(1), pp.1-21.
- Gall, N., 2000. Rebirth of an Orchestra as Civic Beacon: São Paulo Orchestra. *Braudel Papers*, pp.1-15.
- Galvin, N., 2017. Sydney Symphony Orchestra board's dramatic u-turn on same-sex marriage. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 1 October.

- Geertz, C., 2008. Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In: T.S. Oakes and P.L. Price, eds. *The Cultural Geography Reader*. Routledge, pp.41-51.
- Gill, R. and Pratt, A., 2008. In the social factory? Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural work. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25(7-8), pp.1-30.
- Glaser, B. and Strauss, A., 2017. *Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Routledge.
- Goodman, R.M., Speers, M.A., McLeroy, K., Fawcett, S., Kegler, M., Parker, E., Smith, S.R., Sterling, T.D. and Wallerstein, N., 1998. Identifying and defining the dimensions of community capacity to provide a basis for measurement. *Health Education & Behavior*, 25(3), pp.258-278.
- Green, B. and Gallwey, W.T., 1987. *The Inner Game of Music*. Pan Macmillan.
- Hewison, R., 2006. *Not a Slideshow: Leadership and Cultural Value*. London: Demos.
- Hewison, R. and Holden, J., 2016. *The Cultural Leadership Handbook: How to Run a Creative Organization*. Routledge.
- Ivey, B., 2009. Ethnomusicology and the twenty-first century music scene (Seeger Lecture presented at the Society for Ethnomusicology Annual Meeting, 2007). *Ethnomusicology*, 53(1), pp.18-31.
- Kanter, R.M. and Bird, M., 2014. Publicis Groupe 2009: Toward a Digital Transformation. SSRN.
- Kay, S., 2010. Scratching the seven year itch: a commentary. In: S. Kay and K. Venner, eds. *A Cultural Leadership Reader*. pp.8-15.
- Keskes, I., 2014. Relationship between leadership styles and dimensions of employee organizational commitment: A critical review and discussion of future directions. *Intangible Capital*, 10(1), pp.26-51.
- Knight, H., 2015. Collaborative value creation: how arts and business organisations create value for society (Doctoral dissertation, Cardiff University).
- Kolb, B.M., 2000. You call this fun? Reactions of young first-time attendees to a classical concert. *MEIEA Journal*, 1(1), pp.13-29.
- Kotter, J.P., 2008. *Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*. Simon and Schuster.
- Krug, K. and Weinberg, C.B., 2004. Mission, money, and merit: Strategic decision making by nonprofit managers. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 14(3), pp.325-342.
- Kvåle, K., 2007. Do cancer patients always want to talk about difficult emotions? A qualitative study of cancer inpatients communication needs. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing*, 11(3), pp.224-231.
- Lewis, L.K., 2007. An organizational stakeholder model of change implementation communication. *Communication Theory*, 17(2), pp.176-204.
- Meyer, J.W. and Rowan, B., 1977. Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), pp.340-363.
- Moore, M.H., 1995. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard University Press.

- Moore, M.H., 1997. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. Harvard University Press.
- Moore, M.H., 2005, October. Creating public value through private/public partnerships. In X Congreso Internacional del CLAD, Santiago, Chile.
- Moran, J.W. and Brightman, B.K., 2001. Leading organizational change. *Career Development International*, 6(2), pp.111-119.
- Nisbett, M., and Walmsley, B., 2016. The romanticization of charismatic leadership in the arts. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 46(1), pp.2-12.
- Ramnarine, T.K., 2013. The orchestration of civil society: Community and conscience in symphony orchestras. *Ethnomusicology Forum*, 22(1).
- Reynolds, S., Tonks, A., and MacNeill, K., 2017. Collaborative leadership in the arts as a unique form of dual leadership. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, 47(2), pp.89-104.
- Rieley, J. and Clarkson, I., 2001. The impact of change on performance. *Journal of Change Management*, 2(2), pp.160-172.
- Rosenhead, J., Franco, L.A., Grint, K. and Friedland, B., 2019. Complexity theory and leadership practice: A review, a critique, and some recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(5).
- Sandoghdar, A.L. and Bailey, C., Meaningful work.
- Senior, B. and Fleming, J., 2006. *Organizational Change*. Pearson Education.
- Smith, M., 2010. *Arts Funding in a Cooler Climate*. Arts & Business.
- Stogdill, R.M., 1974. *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research*. Free Press.
- Talbot-Honeck, C. and Orlick, T., 1998. The essence of excellence: Mental skills of top classical musicians. *Journal of Excellence*, 1(1), pp.66-81.
- Vaughan, E., 1989. The Leadership Obsession: An Addendum to Mangham's 'In Search of Competence'. *Journal of General Management*, 14(3), pp.26-34.
- Weber, J. and Urick, M.J., 2017. Examining the millennials' ethical profile: Assessing demographic variations in their personal value orientations. *Business and Society Review*, 122(4), pp.469-506.
- Yin, R.K., 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 4th ed. Sage.
- Yukl, G., 2006. *Leadership in Organizations*. 6th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Zapata-Barrero, R., 2016. Diversity and cultural policy: cultural citizenship as a tool for inclusion. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 22(4), pp.534-552.
- Zhou, N., 2017. Sydney Symphony's neutrality on marriage equality is 'craven' – Leo Schofield. *The Guardian*, 28 September.
- Zucker, L.G., 1987. Institutional theories of organization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 13(1), pp.443-464.

