# Occasional Paper #27

## From Arts Management to Cultural Administration

*by Patricia Dewey*

Presented at the 29th annual Social Theory,
Politics, and the Arts Conference, 2003

## Arts Policy Program
## Occasional Paper Series

# *From Arts Management to Cultural Administration*

**Patricia Dewey (pdewey@uoregon.edu)**
**Arts and Administration Program**
**University of Oregon**

**The Shift from Arts Management to Cultural Administration: What's in a Name?**

It may be simply stated that "modern arts management is based … on the mediation of internal artistic expression with the external public" (Bendixen, 2000, p. 12). However, while the basic function of mediating between artists and the public has existed for over 2,000 years, the rise of arts management as a specialized academic field and profession began in the second half of the twentieth century, primarily in North America and Europe. The proliferation and growth of professional arts organizations and public art agencies over the past 35 years created a significant demand for effective management. Arts management came to be generally understood as the management of professional nonprofit or public arts and culture organizations. In more recent years, however, arts managers have come to be employed in a wide range of non-profit and for-profit organizations in music, theater, opera, dance, museums, literature, arts/humanities councils, presenting organizations, service organizations, theme parks, broadcast media, the film industry, and the recording industry (Evard & Colbert, 2000; Byrnes, 1999, p. 1-25). This broadening range of professional opportunities for arts managers reflects the widening scope of organizations and institutions now being considered as part of a more inclusive cultural sector. As Sikes (2000) states, "arts administrators have a better chance of future employment if they understand they are in the culture industry" (p. 92).

There is a growing perception in the nonprofit professional arts that training needs to be adjusted to changing conditions in the cultural sector. *Culture*, in its current and most widespread use, "describes the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity" (Raymond Williams, as cited in Chong, 2000, p. 291). Broadly defined, the *cultural sector* may be viewed as "a large heterogenous set of individuals and organizations engaged in the creation, production, presentation, distribution, and preservation of aesthetic, heritage, and entertainment activities, products, and artifacts" (Wyszomirski, 2002, p. 187). The cultural sector is represented by the fine arts (e.g., non-profit or public sector professional organizations), commercial arts (e.g., entertainment industries), applied arts (e.g., architecture and industrial design), unincorporated arts (e.g., amateur groups), and heritage arts. Major changes are affecting the cultural sector around the world and suggest an urgent need for new skills in cultural administration.

In North America, the terms *arts management*, *arts administration*, and *cultural management* are currently used interchangeably. The European equivalent term typically translates to "cultural management" in English. Arts administrators may be becoming more aware of the differences between traditional fine arts management and more broadly construed cultural administration, as the focus on fine arts (i.e., "high", non-profit, heritage, public sector arts) widens to be more inclusive of the entertainment industries, applied arts, media, and amateur arts. Indeed, it is becoming increasingly understood that management of the fine arts takes place within a broader context of cultural policy and administration.

But what is causing this shift from arts management to cultural administration in North America and Europe? What might the broader context of cultural administration imply in terms of new skills and capacities required of professionals in the field? And to what extent is current formal arts administration education suited to meet changing demands in the cultural sector?

This paper begins by positing that four major paradigm shifts are taking place which affect or produce systemic change in the cultural sector. In this paper, a *paradigm* is considered as "a generally accepted understanding of how select assumptions, conditions, values, interests and processes are interrelated; what goals are desirable and feasible; and what outcomes are expected" (Cherbo & Wyszomirski, 2000, p. 9). The four paradigm shifts are introduced to present a conceptual framework for analyzing constant change taking place in the cultural sector. Then, five change management capacities are proposed for cultural administrators to be able to proactively respond to these paradigm shifts. Finally, the evolution from arts management to cultural administration is discussed with regard to curricular considerations for formal education in the field.

## Systemic Change in Cultural Administration

Leaders in the field of arts policy and management in North America and Europe are becoming increasingly aware of major changes taking place throughout and around the cultural sector and an urgent need for new skills in cultural administration. "Change management" has been a buzzword at conferences and symposia in the field, and is evident in many professional associations' and organizations' mission statements. Multiple textbooks, papers, articles, and reports published in the field of cultural policy and arts administration currently discuss managing change as a major factor for ongoing successful development of the fine arts, commercial arts, applied arts, amateur arts, and heritage sector.

According to Wyszomirski (2002), "a decade of profound change following three decades of significant growth, has brought the nonprofit arts and cultural sector to the recognition of a need for even more change and a more positive attitude about accommodating and adapting to the environment. Articulating, integrating, and routinizing the emergent financial, administrative and political paradigms are now the task at hand" (p. 215). A significant problem in cultural policy and administration, however, is that extant research does not appear to fully address what, exactly, the causes and scope of change in the cultural sector are and what, precisely, these new challenges and opportunities might require in terms of new management capacities.

In a background paper prepared for a recent symposium on *Creative Industries and Cultural Professions in the 21st Century*, Wyszomirski (2003) identifies "…four factors that are generally acknowledged to be shaping not only the creative sector, but the entire economy and society. Rapid technological advances, globalization, shifts in general population demographics, and a generational turnover in key professions and leadership have all dramatically changed the world we live in during the past decade" (p. 26). These four factors of change are leading to ongoing change in fundamental societal contexts, as reflected by norms, values, public preferences, technological and economic opportunities and constraints, and consumer behavior patterns. It may be argued that these factors of change are manifested in four major paradigm shifts which are affecting or producing **systemic change** in the cultural sector. It is important to note that systemic change takes place very differently in the diverse sociopolitical and economic environments of various regions, nations, municipalities, and communities. Indeed, the interaction of global trends and national or local contexts may lead to a distinct constellation of challenges and opportunities for the cultural sector in any given geopolitical region.

Despite local variation, it may be generally proposed that, first, the **world system** is shifting, due to the force of globalization. Local adaptation through *global interculturalism* or *glocalism* may be the preferred response. Second, a shift in the **arts system** is taking place as boundaries blur among the fine, commercial, applied, unincorporated, and heritage arts. The sector's scope is broadening from a concern with fine arts to *a more inclusive interest in "culture,"* consisting of all five areas of artistic activity. Third, a shift in the **cultural policy system** is resulting from a growing awareness that national and international policy constraints, incentives, and assistance strongly affect the administration of arts organizations. As such, the cultural sector's *spheres of activity are expanding* from a focus on the organizational sphere to also include a focus on national and international policy. Fourth, changes in economic

assumptions and resources are causing a shift in the **arts funding system**. New funding models reflect *changes in the mix* of public vs. private and earned vs. contributed income.

Despite the demands of these systemic changes, however, current formal arts administration education – evident in curricular content of member programs of the Association of Arts Administration Educators (AAAE) and European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres (ENCATC) – seems to still focus on (1) *the domestic environment*; (2) *the fine arts sector*; (3) *organizational administration*; and (4) *outdated arts funding models* (Source: AAAE and ENCATC websites). Also, while major textbooks and references used in formal arts administration education have recently begun to briefly address topics such as the importance of change management skills and an international orientation in arts management, instructional materials concentrate primarily on traditional administration of domestic fine arts organizations (Byrnes, 1999; Colbert, 2000; Kotler & Scheff, 1997; Pick, 1999; Radbourne, 1996).

Each of the four emerging paradigms of relevance to cultural administration in North America and Europe are now discussed in detail.

*The Changing World System*

An extensive body of literature exists on the forces, causes, and outcomes of *globalization*, although no generally accepted definition of the term appears to exist. Cultural administrators may find it helpful to consider globalization as a force that evokes a tension between homogeneity and heterogeneity in the dialectic of the global and the local. Further, an era of globalization may be considered as "the dominant international system that replaced the Cold War system after the fall of the Berlin Wall" (Friedman, 2000, p. 7). Globalization may also be understood as *complex connectivity*, which refers to "the rapidly developing and ever-densening network of interconnections and interdependencies that characterize modern social life" (Tomlinson, 1999, p. 2). Scholte (1999) argues that globalization requires a paradigm shift in social analysis toward a world system studies approach, in which "a researcher can adopt a world system methodology without necessarily endorsing a Wallersteinian analysis of the modern capitalist world economy" (p. 19). "A world system concept suggests that, on the one hand, local relations deeply divide nation-state-country societies while, on the other hand, international regional and global relations deeply interconnect nation-state-country societies" (p. 20). Of particular interest to individual interested in cultural policy may be publications of leading current scholars following the Weberian tradition, such as Samuel Huntington, Francis Fukuyama, and Robert Putnam. For example, Huntington (1996) argues that "culture and cultural identities,

which at the broadest level are civilization identities, are shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration, and conflict in the post-Cold War world" (p. 20).

As Finnemore (1996) argues, nation-states should be seen as "embedded in an international social fabric that extends from the local to the transnational" (p. 145). The fact that the nation-state can no longer be considered as the sole or even primary actor in the globalized world system suggests a major paradigm shift for the cultural sector. Wyszomirski (2000, p. 80-81) identifies six possible outcomes of the trajectory of the forces of globalization on the arts and culture sector: *Americanization*, *homogenization*, *repluralization*, *commodification*, *globalism*, and *glocalism*. For resistance against the negative effects of Americanization, homogenization, and commodification to take place, a society must be able to take an external cultural influence and adopt or adapt it to suit the community's own frame of reference and purposes. Friedman (2000) refers to this critical filter as the ability to "glocalize."

The effects of globalization in the cultural sector typically refer to the impact of global popular culture, Americanization, or Westernization. It may be argued that the only feasible means to attain a positive balance in the global-local cultural tension is through a *hybridization* approach, which with respect to cultural forms may be defined as "the ways in which forms become separated from existing practices and recombine with new forms in new practices" (Pieterse, 1995/2000, p. 101). The process of achieving such a global/local dynamic is often referred to as *glocalism* or *global interculturalism*. The main point is that, regardless of a community's chosen response to globalization, the global world system must be taken into account. It is no longer possible to focus solely on the domestic environment, ignoring a diverse range of transnational actors and norms that may have dramatic influence on a nation's cultural environment, organizations, competition, and public preferences.

*The Changing Arts System*

Over time, human creative expression has led to a thriving, vibrant, and dynamic cultural sector. As Cherbo and Wyszomirski (2000) explain, "certain art forms take precedence in each era; the functions art serves will vary along with the meanings and values associated with them; the arts are produced, supported and distributed in various ways; the range of artistic activities and their stratification among the population according to time and place as well as in the ways they are linked to power and government, and the ways they are taught" (p. 3-4). Culture and the arts are vital to the world's advanced economies, which are transforming from information-based systems to creativity-based systems (Venturelli, 2000). Five distinct segments of the cultural sector can be defined as shown in figure 1.

**Figure 1:** *The Fine, the Commercial, the Applied, the Amateur, and the Heritage Arts*
(Modified from Chartrand & McCaughey, 1989, p. 47)

| Art Segment | Operating Rationale | Status of Artist | Status of Organization |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Fine Arts** (High Arts) | Art for art's sake Public purpose of the arts | Professional | Non-profit or Public Sector |
| **Commercial Arts** (Entertainment) | Art for profit | Professional | For Profit |
| **Applied Arts** (Industrial Design) (Architecture) | Art for potential to enhance profit | Professional | For Profit or Public Sector |
| **Amateur Arts** (Unincorporated) | Art for self-actualization | Amateur | Voluntary |
| **Heritage Arts** | Public purpose of the arts Commodification of heritage | Professional Amateur | For Profit Non-profit or Public Sector Voluntary |

The fine (or "high") arts are described in figure 1 as a professional activity in which, in the United States, the dominant organizational form of production combines the professional artist and the nonprofit corporation. Fine arts organizations in other countries are often part of the public sector. Each major fine arts discipline (visual, performing, literary or media) can be divided into subdisciplines, each of which has its own generally recognized standards of professional excellence. Management of fine arts organizations has traditionally been, and continues to be, the main focus of formal arts administration education.

A paradigm shift may be witnessed in the arts system, however, in that the arts segments, disciplines, and subdisciplines are no longer considered as isolated, independent art forms. "Currently, systems thinking is developing with regard to the arts and culture because of a growing awareness of the intersect ions and linkages among nonprofit arts, entertainment, and the unincorporated arts" (Cherbo & Wyszomirski, 2000, p. 15). *Creative America*, a 1997 report published by the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities, states that "amateur, nonprofit and commercial creative enterprises all interact and influence each other constantly" (p. 3). As boundaries blur between the various arts disciplines, new forms of public/private and for-profit/non-profit partnerships and initiatives are beginning to emerge (Seaman, 2002). A recent trend reflecting this systemic shift may be seen in the increasing number of conferences and publications pertaining to broadly defined cultural industries or creative industries that have recently appeared in North America and Europe (Mercer, 2001; Wyszomirski, 2003). With this shift, a new sector-wide focus on creativity is being emphasized – and sometimes replacing – the prior policy emphasis on "artistic excellence."

*The Changing Cultural Policy System*

Reflecting shifts in the world system and in the arts system described above, "the policy arena is broadening to encompass the high, popular, and unincorporated arts, whether nonprofit or commercial, and deepening to include a number of issues that touch upon the activities of many arts disciplines and are invested in many federal departments and agencies and levels of government" (Cherbo & Wyszomirski, 2000, p. 13). It may be argued that arts administrators are becoming increasingly aware of the national and international policy frameworks in which they are operating. Throughout the cultural sector, the levels of activity are expanding from the organizational level to also include a focus on national and international policy. This paradigm shift may be most readily witnessed in areas such as cultural heritage and preservation, cultural diplomacy, international touring and presenting, and intellectual property rights issues. However, the elements and constellation of this nascent cultural policy paradigm are not yet readily apparent (Wyszomirski, 1995, 2002).

A key element of the new cultural policy paradigm seems to be the important community role of culture and the arts, in terms of education, community building, urban development, audience accessibility, and generation of social capital (Weil, 2002; Mercer, 2001; Bradford et al., 2001; Strom, 2001; Harrison & Huntington, 2000; Adams & Goldbard, 2001). As Cliche (2001) explains, a "creativity governance and management" concept of cultural administration is now emerging which goes beyond artistic creation to be viewed as

> … the foundation of our creativity and progress including economic, political, intellectual and social development. This more open concept of culture implies the participation, at least in principle, of a wide range of decision-makers, promoters and managers in the formation, production, distribution, preservation, management and consumption of culture at all levels of society. It also implies a host of institutions and regulatory frameworks to support such a broadened system of governance (2001, p. 1).

The nature of the emergent cultural policy paradigm in the United States and abroad is uncertain at present, but it is to be expected that spheres of activity in this paradigm will have to include organizational administration, national policy, and international diplomacy. Individual and organizational involvement is expanding to include all three spheres, evident in proactive activities in policy entrepreneurship, policy influence, heritage, national identity, cultural identity, social enterprise, and cultural diplomacy.

*The Changing Arts Funding System*

A growing recognition that the arts and culture is a legitimate and worthwhile element of society, and is as deserving of governmental support as other sectors, developed throughout the world's industrialized countries in the second half of the twentieth century. Government financial

support for the arts expanded in North America and Europe in the 1960s and 1970s, as part of a dramatic growth of government spending for social programs generally. In the 1980s, massive deficit financing of social programs came to an end, and the arts sector had to adjust to an era of retrenchment (Cummings & Katz, 1987, p. 364-365). Mulcahy (2000) points out that European government subsidies for the arts have declined in recent years and that many European nations are considering expansion of privatization and searching for alternative sources of arts support. When compared with Europe, the American system of cultural patronage is, in effect, much broader and stronger than may be evident at first. Also, although federal support for the arts in the United States has decreased over the past decade, "state and local arts councils have increased their composite support and demonstrated their institutional and political resilience in sustaining the nation's cultural infrastructure" (Mulcahy, 2000, p. 139). With ongoing change due to recent budget cuts – even elimination – of state and local funding for the cultural sector in the United States, the composite mix of funding will continue to require ongoing assessment and adaptation. Budget cuts and governmental restructuring in countries with a heritage of lavish cultural patronage are forcing these nations to search for new models of pluralistic arts support. Indeed, as early as 1987, Cummings and Katz asserted that, due to common political pressures and economic forces, cultural policies and arts funding tools of the Western industrialized nations have tended to converge over time. This trend appears to be continuing as policy transfer, best practices sharing, and lessons learned from abroad continue to influence policymakers throughout the world.

As Wyszomirski (2002, p. 189-191) notes, the 1990s brought significant changes in patterns of American non-profit arts organizations' revenues and in practices of financial supportes of the arts, leading to new challenges and opportunities for fundraisers. "Overall, the amount of money contributed to the arts and culture increased from just under $10 billion in 1995 to $11.7 billion in 1999. However, even through the dollar amount increased, the sector's share of giving decreased from 7.6% in 1989 to 5.8% in 1999" (p. 191). In Europe, the 1990s brought major new challenges through broad systemic efforts to privatize arts organizations and decentralize central policy (van Hemel & van der Wielen, 1997; Wesner & Palka, 1997), leading to an (intended) expansion of non-governmental support for the arts – such as corporate sponsorship and foundation grants – in many European nations.

The key issues and assumptions regarding arts funding in the United States are identified by Seaman (2002) as "(1) private vs. public funding; (2) 'earned' vs. 'unearned' income; (3) public national vs. state vs. local funding that is endemic to the complex 'division of labor' that characterizes a federal system; (4) for-profit vs. non-profit arts organizations; and (5) successful

and financially wealthy producers of 'popular' culture and mass entertainment vs. financially vulnerable producers of live, high quality, 'real' art" (p. 7). Such distinctions also exist within Europe, with the European Union, nation states, provinces, and local communities serving as the relevant units of analysis. Additional issues affecting arts organizations may include ongoing revisions in accounting and reporting standards, an increased concern of funders for evaluation and program outcomes, the establishment of new trust funds and organizational endowments, an emerging concern with protecting and exploiting intellectual property assets, as well as possibilities for e-commerce and e-philanthropy. New arts funding models must reflect these changes in economic assumptions, resources, and issues. They must take new patronage systems and changed means and tools of arts funding into account.

With the scope and nature of systemic change demonstrated through the four paradigm shifts as substantiated through this literature review, the paper now turns to an overview of five change management capacities that may be called for in order for cultural administrators to be able to proactively respond to systemic change taking place in the cultural sector.

## Change Management Capacities in Cultural Administration

The interaction of systemic change and local contexts may require certain capacities (functions) and skills that are particular to the specific national and local environment. In general, however, it may be proposed that the following five change management capacities may be important in response to systemic change in the cultural sector:

1. *managing international cultural interactions* – competencies to negotiate international touring and presenting, cultural trade, and cultural tourism;

2. *representing cultural identity* – the way in which the cultural sector is treated as an element of foreign policy, diplomacy, and intercultural exchange; also the capacity to maintain local identities, pluralism, and diversity in the face of global cultural forces;

3. *promoting innovative methods of audience development* – for example, cultivating entrepreneurial partnerships between the fine arts and segments of the cultural sector; treating the fine arts as a member of the creative industries; encouraging innovative marketing, education, and outreach programs; dealing constructively with changing audience demographics; and using technology to develop audiences of the future;

4. *exercising effective strategic leadership* – a constant strategic awareness and entrepreneurial focus on environmental demands in all three spheres (international, national, organizational) of the cultural policy system, both proactive and reactive policy advocacy involvement, and skill in negotiating coalitions and alliances; and

5. *fostering a sustainable mixed funding system* – the capacity to increase earned and contributed revenues within each representative context.

To understand the range of skills and competencies required of cultural administrators, it is important to note that these five capacities do not replace established skill sets; rather, these capacities are largely adding skill requirements in response to changing demands. New systemic demands and the need for new change management capacities suggest a requirement for new training approaches. Such training approaches would need to find a way to educate cultural administration leaders in both "global" capacities or functions (i.e., the change management capacities listed above) and "local" skill sets particular to the specific environmental context in which they are working.

There may be a mismatch between changing demands in the cultural sector and characteristics of current formal arts administration education as indicated in figure 2. The five change management capacities are placed in this figure as they might most closely correspond with changing demands in the cultural sector, but these competencies would often imply more than one issue focus. As such, multiple interlinkages and interdependencies should be considered.

As illustrated in figure 2, a shift in the world system due to the forces of globalization may call for capacities in managing international cultural interactions and in representing cultural identity – capacities that are neglected in the current domestic focus of arts administration education. Similarly, with multiple changing cultural administration opportunities due to a broadening and more inclusive concept of culture, a focus solely on management in the fine arts sector would be insufficient. Funding systems for the arts and culture vary dramatically according factors such as cultural policies of the nation or community, historical patterns, institutions, and overarching public preferences, but new patronage systems and tools of arts funding must be taken into account throughout the world. Cultivating a sustainable mix of public vs. private and earned vs. contributed revenues is a major challenge for cultural administrators everywhere. Finally, the most nascent and unarticulated of the paradigm shifts – that of the shifting cultural policy system – might invoke the most critical changes in arts administration education, as cultural administration leaders in the future might be increasingly required to function effectively in organizational, national, and international spheres of activity.

**Figure 2:** *Managing Systemic Change in the Cultural Sector*

| Focus of Current Arts Administration Education | Paradigm Shifts (Systemic Change) in the Cultural Sector | Changing Demands in the Cultural Sector | Proposed Capacities for Managing Systemic Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Domestic focus** | Shift in the **world system** due to globalization. | The impact of **globalization**, with *glocalism* and *global interculturalism* as a preferred filter to global forces. | **Managing international cultural interactions (ICIs)** |
| | | | **Representing cultural identity** |
| **Fine arts sector** | Shift in the **arts system**: a growing awareness that boundaries are blurring among the fine, commercial, applied, heritage and amateur arts. | The sector's **scope is broadening** from "arts" to "culture." The former emphasis on *quality* and *access* is broadening to include *creativity*. | **Promoting innovative methods of audience development** |
| **Organizational administration** | Shift in the **cultural policy system**: a growing awareness that national and international policy influences affect arts organizations. | The sector's **spheres of activity are expanding** from the organizational sphere to also include a focus on national and international policy. | **Exercising effective strategic leadership** |
| **Outdated arts funding models** | Shift in the **funding system**: changes in economic assumptions and resources. | **New funding models** reflect changes in mix of public vs. private and earned vs. contributed income. There are new patronage systems, as well as changed means and tools of arts funding. | **Fostering a sustainable mixed funding system** |

## Curricular Considerations for Cultural Administration Education

In this paper it is suggested that four major paradigm shifts – the world system, the arts system, the cultural policy system, and the arts funding system – may be observed in the cultural sector in North America and in Europe. These paradigm shifts would signify systemic change in the cultural sector, and would indicate a major shift from arts management to cultural administration. As demonstrated in figure 2, the broader context of cultural administration would imply the need for change management capacities that might correspond with the four paradigm

shifts.  These changing demands would not eliminate the need for the traditional focus of arts administration education, but would introduce additional skills, capacities, and competencies that may be increasingly required in twenty-first century cultural administration.

How might formal arts management education respond to the demands of systemic change and the need to develop change management capacities in future leaders in the cultural sector?  Traditional curricular content is already packed with course requirements in areas such as arts management, development, marketing, human resources, arts policy, financial management, legal issues in the arts, information management, cultural theory, and research methods (Martin & Rich, 1998;  Hutchens & Zöe, 1995;  Fischer, Rauhe & Wiesand, 1996;  Dewey & Rich, 2003). Introducing additional coursework that focuses on specialized skill sets needed to react to changing environmental opportunities and constraints may not be the optimal educational response.  Instead, it may be proposed that future educational approaches utilize *metaskills*, or metaphorical approaches to cultural administration.  Sikes's (2000) metaphorical *warrior*, *explorer* and *architect* system, for example, might be implemented in the development of strategic leadership, audience development, and revenue generation capacities.  Designing curricula and instructional materials that would correspond with such a metaskill approach may prove useful in conceptualizing and developing a systemic capacity building approach to cultural administration education (Dewey & Rich, 2003, p. 25-28).

Constant systemic change in the cultural sector calls for ongoing adaptation in change management capacities needed to proactively respond to challenges, opportunities, and constraints in the domestic and international cultural sector.  This paper has introduced a theoretical construct for conceptualizing and responding to change in the cultural sector, but much remains to be done in adapting formal arts management education to meet changing demands in cultural administration.

# References Cited

(AAAE) The Association of Arts Administration Educators.  Website: www.artsnet.org/aaae/

Adams, D., & Goldbard, A.  2001.  *Creative community:  The art of cultural development*.  New York:  The Rockefeller Foundation.

Bendixen, P.  2000.  "Skills and Roles:  Concepts of Modern Arts Management." *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 2, no. 3, p. 4-13.

Bradford, G., Gary, M., & Wallach, G., eds.  2000.  *The Politics of Culture*.  New York: The New Press.

Byrnes, W. J.  1999.  *Management and the Arts*, 2nd edition.  Boston:  Focal Press.

Chartrand, H. H. & McCaughey, C.  1989.  "The Arm's Length Principle and the Arts: An International Perpective – Past, Present and Future,"  in *Who's to Pay for the Arts?  The International Search for Models of Arts Support*,  M. C. Cummings, Jr., & J. M.D. Schuster, eds. New York:  ACA Books, p. 43-80.

Cherbo, J. M. & Wyszomirski. M. J.  2000.  "Mapping the Public Life of the Arts in America,"  In *The Public Life of the Arts in America*,  J. M. Cherbo & M. J. Wyszomirski, eds. New Brunswick, NJ:  Rutgers University Press, p. 3-21.

Chong, D.  2000.  "Re-readings in Arts Management."  *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, Vol. 29, no. 4, p. 290-303.

Cliche, D.  2001.  Culture, governance & regulation.  In *Recognising Culture:  A Series of Briefing Papers on Culture and Development*.  Ottowa:  Department of Canadian Heritage.

Colbert, F.  2000.  *Marketing Culture and the Arts*, 2nd edition.  Montréal, Presses HEC.

Cummings, M. C., & Katz, R. S., eds.  1987.  *The Patron State:  Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan.*  New York:  Oxford University Press.

Dewey, P., & J. D. Rich.  2003.  "Developing Arts Management Skills in Transitional Democracies."  *International Journal of Arts Management* Vol. 5, no. 2, p. 15-28.

(ENCATC) European Network of Cultural Administration Training Centres.  Website: www.encatc.org

Evard, Y., & Colbert, F.  2000.  "Arts Management:  A New Discipline Entering the Millennium?"  *International Journal of Arts Management*, Vol. 2, no. 2, p. 4-13.

Finnemore, M.  1996.  *National Interests in International Society*.  Ithaca, NY:  Cornell University Press.

Fischer, M, Rauhe, H., & Wiesand, A. J., eds.   1996.  *Training forTomorrow (I):  Arts Administration in Europe*.  Bonn, Germany:  ARCult Media.

Friedman, T. L.  2000.  *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*.  New York:  Random Books.

Harrison, L. E., & Huntington, S. P., eds.  2000.  *Culture Matters:  How Values Shape Human Progress*.  New York:  Basic Books.

Huntington, S. P.  1996.  *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*.  New York:  Simon & Schuster.

Hutchens, J., & Zöe, V.  1985.  "Curricular Considerations in Arts Administration:  A Comparison of Views from the Field."  *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, Vol. 15, no. 2, p. 7-28.

Kolter, P., & Scheff, J.  1997.  *Standing Room Only:  Strategies for marketing the Performing Arts*.  Boston:  Harvard Business School Press.

Martin, D. J., & Rich, J. D.  1998.  "Assessing the Role of Formal Education in Arts Administration Training."  *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society,* Vol. 28, no. 1, p. 4-26.

Mercer, C., ed.  2001.  *Convergence, Creative Industries and Civil Society:  The New Cultural Policy*.  Culturelink Special Issue 2001.  Zagreb, Croatia:  Institute for International Relations.

Mulcahy, K. V.  2000.  "The Government and Cultural Patronage,"  in *The Public Life of the Arts in America*,  J. M. Cherbo & M. J. Wyszomirski, eds.  New Brunswick, NJ:  Rutgers University Press, p. 138-168.

Pick, J. & Anderton, M.   1996.  *Arts Administration*, 2nd edition.  New York:  E & FN SPON.

Pieterse, J. N.  1995/2000.  "Globalization as Hybridization,"  in *The Globalization Reader*,  F. J. Lechner & J. Boli, eds.   Malden, MA:  Blackwell Publishers, p. 99-105.

President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities.  1997.  *Creative America*. Washington, DC:  PCAH, February 1997.

Radbourne, J.  1996.  *Arts Management:  A Practical Guide*.  Sydney, Australia:  Allen & Unwin.

Seaman, B. A.  2002.  *National Investment in the Arts*.  Washington, DC:  Center for Arts and Culture Issue Paper.

Sikes, M.  2000.  "Higher Education Training in Arts Administration:  A Millennial and Metaphoric Reappraisal."  *The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society*, Vol. 30, no. 2, p. 91-101.

Strom, E.  2001.  *Strengthening communities through culture*.  Washington, DC:  Center for Arts and Culture Issue Paper.

Tomlinson, J.  1999.  *Globalization and culture*.  Chicago:  The University of Chicago Press.

Van Hemel, A., & van der Wielen, N., eds. 1997. *Privatization/Désétatisation and Culture: Limitations or Opportunities for Cultural Development in Europe?* Conference Reader for the CIRCLE Round Table, June 11-14, 1997. Amsterdam: Boekman Foundation / Twente University.

Venturelli, S. 2000. *From the information economy to the creative economy: Moving culture to the center of international public policy.* Washington, DC: Center for Arts and Culture Cultural Comment Series.

Weil, S. E. 2002. *Making Museums Matter.* Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Wesner, S., & Palka, A., eds. 1997. *Challenges for Cultural Policy and Management in Central and Eastern Europe: Proceedings of and International Symposium.* Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, Culture Committee.

Wyszomirski, M. J. 1995. "Federal Cultural Support: Toward a New Paradigm?" *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, Vol. 25, no. 1, p. 69-83.

Wyszomirski, M. J. 2000. "Negotiating the Global Maze Artfully," in *Proceedings of the 2000 Barnett Arts and Public Policy Symposium*, W. Lawson & M. Wyszomirski, eds. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio Arts Council and The Ohio State University College of the Arts, pp. 75-85.

Wyszomirski, M. J. 2002. "Arts and Culture," in *The State of Nonprofit* America, L. M. Salamon, ed. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, p. 187-218.

Wyszomirski, M. J. 2003. "The Creative Industries and Cultural Professions in the 21st Century: A Background Paper, " in *Program of the 2003 Barnett Arts and Public Policy Symposium*. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University College of the Arts, p. 26-43.