1 Developments in organisation theory and organising music

Nic Beech, Stephen Broad, Ann Cunliffe, Celia Duffy and Charlotte Gilmore

The intention behind this book is to bring together two fields – music-making and organisation theory – in order to explore what might be learned. Learning may proceed in various directions within and between the fields. Within fields we are concerned with learning between alternative traditions and genres. For example, the learning between punk and indie music might entail small-scale translation, whereas ideas moving between large classical orchestras and small folk bands may need considerable adaptation. Similarly, within organisation theory, insights from storytelling may integrate easily with those from metaphorical analysis, while the movement is potentially wider between complexity theory and aesthetics. Learning between fields may require a degree of imagination and creativity, and ideas originating in one field may become generative in another as connections and disconnections are identified and examined. For example, insights from leadership theory might be directly helpful in thinking about organising a festival but may also stimulate a new way of understanding how to manage the kind of portfolio of projects that many musicians – and managers – juggle. Equally, understanding the challenges of staging the first performance of a new composition might throw some light on our understanding of markets and patterns of consumer behaviour. Hence, our aspiration is to encourage learning-oriented dialogue.

We see dialogue as a process of enquiry through which self-examination is stimulated by contact with 'the other'. Such dialogue is particularly effective where the learning is less directed at the other ('my ideas can help you') and more directed towards reflexivity ('having had an encounter with you, I now think differently about my own position') in the style advocated by Shotter (2010) and Gergen et al. (2001). Because the dialogue is about learning (Hibbert and Huxham, 2011) it means that one needs to be open about things that have gone wrong as well as telling the 'success stories' – the sanitised version of reality that is often well-rehearsed (Sims, 2003). Hence, trust between storytellers and listeners/readers is paramount. Producing tales from the field in written form

1

therefore requires a 'leap of trust', in which readers are trusted to treat the material and characters of the stories with care and respect.

Dialogue is a process of finding sufficient lines of connection or translation between parties so that engagement can be productive. It is not about creating complete agreement or overlap (Bohm, 1996). In some of the literature on the creative industries there is a belief that the logic of creativity and the logic of organising are so different that they are often in conflict with each other (Caves, 2000). For example, a composer or songwriter may create a piece that involves so many musicians it is bound to make a financial loss, or managers might seek to influence musicians to produce popularist work so that audiences and revenues can be increased at the expense of artistic freedom. This implies that either the values of organising and performing are at odds with each other or there is something about the way they are practised that leads to conflict. In this book we will question this way of thinking. While some managers and musicians may inhabit oppositional world-views, we do not accept that there is a necessity for the opposition (Beech, 2011). Rather, practices of organising and performing interpenetrate and influence each other such that interconnected or hybrid practices can lead to value for a variety of stakeholders. However, achieving this is not easy and so it is useful to work through a series of empirical examples in order to develop a theoretically informed, empirically grounded perspective.

What we present below is not intended to be a classic 'theory and cases' book, in part because the cases in such books can be presented as both fairly 'neat and complete' and chosen in order to support the theory. Here, we hope that the tales from the field are brief but open – capable of interpretation from different angles and further exploration. Similarly, the theoretically oriented contributions are not written in the mode of classic theory chapters – seeking to produce a comprehensive view of a theory – but rather provide a set of 'orienting ideas' with which the reader can approach the tales from the field. Hence, these contributions are intended to provide materials for generative dialogue (Beech et al., 2010): clear but open to interpretation; informative but open to question; and theoretically informed but practically oriented.

We hope that the time is right for this dialogue. Organisation theorists have become increasingly interested in the 'creative industries'. This may be because practices that have been common in organisations in the creative industries are of particular relevance more broadly as organisations in other sectors seek to work across organisational boundaries and to be creative, focused on performance, flexibly organised and engaged with customers/service users (Bilton and Cummings, 2014). The music industry is a prime example. It involves a variety of people in composing,

creating and performing. Live performance entails networks of experts enabling events in which venues, programming, marketing and sales, sound and light, among many other functions, are coordinated so that creative outcomes are achieved (Cloonan, 2011; Frith et al., 2009).

Audiences value experiences of events (such as going to concerts and festivals) for the music but also as part of lifestyle choices, and even as part of their identities. Workers (e.g. musicians, promoters, engineers) operate on several projects simultaneously (McLeod et al., 2009), often for different companies, and the musical field has many small entrepreneurial enterprises. Audience demand is affected by fashion: legitimacy is gained not only through expert opinion but also through informal reviews via social media (Gonzalez, 2010). The nature of production and consumption is not merely an economic exchange but is something incorporating aesthetics and a level of significance in people's lives and relationships. As change, innovation and flexible ways of working are central to the creative industries, there is potential for organisation theory to learn much from practices in music-making.

On the other side of the coin, making music and the way the music 'industry' is understood may be able to pick up ideas from organisation theory. The 'creative industries' are regarded as an important part of modern economies (Caves, 2000). However, the term 'industry' is often criticised as leading to false assumptions about the degree of structure in supply chains, clear product demarcation and established competition between companies. This may represent part of the story but, as Hesmondhalgh (2007) points out, the organisations involved span many areas of activity, from leisure and commercial companies dealing in a variety of media and cultural forms to micro companies and amateur activities. Hence, it is unlikely that a single way of thinking about the variety of actors will be efficacious (MacDonald et al., 2002). Pratt and Jeffcutt (2009) have drawn attention to the changing nature of competition and dynamism within creative and cultural sections of economies. They argue that these sectors are typified by the speed of change of products and by a blurring of the boundaries between competition and collaboration. Companies, venues and artists who might be competing at one moment (for example, producing alternative concerts on a particular night and thus competing for audience numbers) may also be collaborating (for example, in staging a multi-venue festival that aims to bring larger audience numbers into an area). Creative and cultural industries, and music-making in particular, are engaged in the very issues that are of primary concern in current organisation theory. These include how people can operate in uncertain and changing environments; how traditional industrial structures of competition are becoming challenged by working

across organisational boundaries; how the natures of markets and market-ing are being transformed by shifts in consumer behaviour; and how economic activity can be understood as a social phenomenon – something with broader and disputed meanings, identities and relationships.

We will now take a brief overview of the organisation of music, illus-trated with examples from the music scene in Scotland, before discussing some relevant developments in recent organisation theory. We will then conclude this introduction with some reflections about how music-making and organisation theory may be complementary in various aspects that facilitate learning-oriented dialogue.

Organising music

When we think of how music is 'organised' we probably tend to think firstly of the observable structures that seem to govern the way music happens. These include the organisations, venues, promoters and fun-ders that each play a role in organising the nature of the individual musical event by shaping each element; the aesthetic and commercial considerations that underpin the event; the musicians who participate and the nature of that participation; the music they play, both in outline (say, genre) and detail; the audience that chooses to attend; and the nature of the relationship between performers and audience encoded in the space in which the performance takes place and the manner in which performers and audience interact. We can sense, in general terms at least, that each of these elements is related to the others – that the process of organising is characterised by a network of interrelated considerations.

In addition, however, recent research has highlighted some of the hidden structures that may affect – and, in a slightly different sense, organise – music-making. To take just one example, Simon Frith and his colleagues (2011) have suggested that compulsory national service played an important role in the rapid growth of the guitar as the instru-ment of choice among young men in 1950s Britain. It was a light and portable instrument that could easily be taken on the long train journeys that were often a feature of national service, during which groups of young men were thrown together with leisure time to fill, learning from each other without formal tuition or authority figures. Similarly, Christopher Small's (1988) ethnographic analyses of well-known musical structures like the orchestra, and the application of (for example) Bourdieu's (1977) 'tools for thinking' to musical practices in a range of different contexts, also remind us of the many influencing factors that may play a more veiled role in organising musical practice.

In surveying the contemporary scene, we might try to consider both the more overt structures that shape musical practice and those that are not so obvious or easy to pin down. Most of the structuring elements mentioned above – the organisations, venues, promoters and funders – have seen some significant evolution in recent years, even if they remain more or less recognisable from previous times. So what has changed?

Audiences remain, but their nature changes

The study of patronage has always been an important way of understanding music's relationship to society, and historians of Western music traditionally trace the history of its patronage in the last 500 years as a gradual passing of responsibility from the church, via the aristocracy, to the middle classes, and finally to government and individuals. Surveying very briefly the current scene, the role of 'patronage' in its widest sense remains an important factor. Although the word carries with it connotations of 'high art', the notion of 'who pays the piper' – and why they choose to do so – is a key element that structures musical events.

Recent large-sample surveys of participation in culture and the arts (Widdop and Cutts, 2011) show that those who participate most tend to be least concerned with traditionally conceived notions of art form and genre. Rather than restrict themselves to favourite forms, the most avid consumers of art and culture increasingly tend to engage with as wide a spectrum of experiences as possible, cutting across old categories such as 'high' and popular art.

Thus, the notion that different genres of music have distinct audiences has rather less support now than it perhaps had in the past, and we can perceive significant implications in the way musical events and practices may be structured in the future as a result of this. The audiences of today and tomorrow may tend to be more stylistically promiscuous and enthusiastic to sample different musical experiences, and less concerned with the conventions and formalities of traditionally conceived musical events.

At first sight this seems to undercut the arguments of social theorists who posit consumption of the arts as the embodiment and reinforcing of a particular (and perhaps class-based) 'habitus' (Bourdieu, 1984). But it is possible that the notion of the 'promiscuous cultural consumer' is itself an identity with a strong cachet, reflecting an outlook that revels in its own confidence with diversity and accumulates its own capital. This may have the effect of eroding the conventions and practices of traditionally conceived musical events (the conventions of the orchestral concert or the jazz club, which can seem strange to the uninitiated), but it may also mean that

audiences will become increasingly focused on the unique qualities of individual events, rather than on the way they enact well-worn traditions.

We might see a reflection of this trend in so-called classical music when we observe the gradual shift away from event forms rooted in a sense of continuity and genre specialism – such as the orchestral or chamber concert series, the notion of a subscription series or concert season – and note the increasing importance of discrete events and 'specials', often linked to a particular time (an anniversary, for example) or place.

Venues remain, but the way we use them changes

Venues are far from neutral in the way they shape the unfolding of musical events: the old Gewandhaus in Leipzig – in which Mendelssohn regularly conducted – had seating arranged in rows lengthways down the hall rather than crossing it, as we would now expect. Thus, concert-goers sat facing each other, with the music emerging from a performance space that was not a visual focus. Compare this with the modern concert hall or theatre, in which the orientation of each seat is planned in such a way as to maximise the sense of linear transmission from the performers on stage to the occupant of the seat: the rest of the audience – the social dimension of the experience – is clearly played down in such a formation.

The second half of the twentieth century saw a great number of large new venues constructed, often to replace Victorian halls that were considered unfit for purpose. These super-venues are still being built, but we can perceive the way they operate as signifiers of different kinds of musical experience, and in the evolving relationship between generic spaces and those that celebrate a unique identity. The Glasgow Royal Concert Hall (GRCH) illustrates an evolution of use that mirrors many other similar venues. In its opening month, October 1990, performances were given by the Scottish National Orchestra, the Band of the Royal Marines, the Berlin Philharmonic Orchestra, the Scottish Chamber Orchestra, the Bolshoi Orchestra, the Orchestra of the Age of Enlightenment, and the London Philharmonic Orchestra. The few non-classical events included a performance by the Count Basie Orchestra, a jazz evening in the smaller Strathclyde Suite, a single stand-up performance and some concerts by Runrig. This initial programming was part of the identity-forming process of the Hall, with the 'high-art' orientation of the programmes mirrored by the visual art on show (an exhibition of the 'Glasgow Boys') and even in the way the catering was promoted ('Why not entertain your guests in the ambience of the 1930s in our superbly appointed restaurant . . . or dally awhile in the sophisticated decadence of the cocktail bar?').

In October 2013, the GRCH programme still included performances
by the (now) Royal Scottish National Orchestra, but these were the only
orchestral events. They took their place among performances by Petula
Clark, Alison Moyet, Daniel O'Donnell, The Hollies and Barbara
Dickson, together with special shows such as 'Dancing Queen' and
'Bootleg Sixties', plus two performances of *The Wizard of Oz*. The com-
parison could be analysed from a wide range of perspectives, but focusing
on the way the venue inflects the nature of the event, we might note that a
large, highly formalised and mostly seated space is reshaping musical
events that might previously have taken place in less formal spaces –
perhaps those designed principally for dancing rather than seated appre-
ciation. The physical formality of 'art' music, encoded in the building's
design, now shapes the experience of a much wider range of genres. This
changing use of space may also reflect cultural priorities and political
requirements for arts venues to pay for themselves rather than relying on
local government, charities and other funding bodies to help cover costs.

'Place' matters more

One of the main events in the GRCH calendar is now the Celtic
Connections festival, held each January – a very diverse gathering of
musical events, densely programmed with such intensity that the qualita-
tive experience of the festival itself becomes more significant than the
individual musical events that comprise it. The host city, Glasgow, is
important in the 'feel' of Celtic Connections.

Other, more modest festivals – such as Aberdeenshire's Sound Festival
or Llupallu (which, linguistically and metaphorically, turns Ullapull
inside out) – are even more rooted in their locations. At Llupallu, it is
the experience of hearing (say) Franz Ferdinand against the backdrop of
Loch Broom that gives the event its particular quality: the place itself, with
all its individual qualities, becomes an organising element in a way that is
more thoroughgoing than a mere change of venue. Llupallu – as its name
makes clear – would not be Llupallu if it were hosted somewhere else.

Of course, such festivals are not in themselves new, but their relative
importance has certainly increased. In art music, this shift is reflected at
various levels, with the growing importance of locationally specific festi-
vals (e.g. St Magnus, Lammermuir, East Neuk) and of location in the
working practices of artists (e.g. the rise of retreats such as Cove Park or
Crear as places that offer the time and intellectual space for new work to
develop). It is also reflected in the increasing standing of unique or
idiosyncratic venues such as Glasgow's Fruitmarket, which is a repurpos-
ing (with minimal alteration) of the city's long-mothballed fruit market,

adjacent to the City Halls and still complete with stall signs and other reminders of its former life.

That the Fruitmarket has become a significant venue for new and experimental music while the GRCH hosts less of the supposedly 'high art' performances than it did in 1990 is clearly not on account of their different capacities alone. Even with its raw acoustic, the Fruitmarket is attractive to innovating artists because it is a genuinely unique space. Somehow the paraphernalia of its old life as a marketplace is less loaded with cultural significance than the supposedly neutral space of the modern concert hall, designed to the highest acoustic specification and with a minimum of visual distraction for the listening audience. Place – and perhaps a sense of uniqueness – matters.

Genres are still significant, but they are related in new ways

Alongside the new use of venues and the rising significance of place, the use of genre as an organising concept has shifted. The new significance, for audiences, of 'genre hopping' was mentioned above, but in fact the way we use and understand the concept of genre has evolved too. In some contexts, the notion of genre continues more or less unperturbed by recent developments: the orchestral world, for example, still inhabits a fairly unified genre context of 'art' music, with occasional forays into related orchestral fields such as film music.

In other contexts, however, we see new developments. Genres, far from being 'found' categories that emerge neutrally from music itself, are being continuously created and reshaped. The creation of 'world music' in a record company sales meeting (Frootsmag, 1987) is only one famous example of a trend that we can see continuing both locally and globally. It would not be too much to say that the Celtic Connections festival – along with the Festival Interceltique in Lorient, Brittany – has been instrumental in creating a new genre of Celtic music: a genre that, within certain broad geographic and musical contexts, nonetheless embraces a fabulous variety of sounds, styles, media, performance interactions and cultural references. Along with this new genre concept comes a new way of conceptualising this music as in some way unified – as with the 'style' concept used by music historians, genre is, at root, a tool for organising and distinguishing different musics. When we create genres, we are creating new ways of organising our understanding of music, and new ways of understanding can stimulate new ideas of performance and composition so that the flow of inspiration can operate in both directions between the stage and the marketing office.

At the same time, we can see other trends that specifically eschew, or at the very least play off, the notion of genre and any concept of order. Cryptic Nights – a series of performance events 'ravishing the senses' – is an example of this. It offers events and experiences as diverse as 'Why Scotland, Why East Kilbride' (a wonderfully wacky evening of music and chemistry experiments woven around an East Kilbride Development Corporation promotional film and a fictitious gender-shifting scientist and musician) and 'The Cabinet of Curiosities' (an evening showcasing sonic curios – junk, machines and antiques, refashioned into musical instruments). While it is difficult to imagine where these events would have found an easy home in the traditional structures of art music, it is also worth noting that in creating a home for themselves through organisations like Cryptic, the artists doing this work have also created new structures – perhaps not genres, but frames or settings in which their one-off experiments can be shared and understood.

Therefore, organising music-making is a field of diverse actors, practices, influences and performances. Engaging with this field requires a degree of dynamism and flexibility in theorising, and in the next section we will outline two approaches we think are particularly appropriate to this task.

Developments in organisation theory

The ways we think about, study and act in organisations are related to our view of the world and the way we think society works: i.e. our paradigm. Some paradigms view the social world as a given reality that exists independently from the people living within it – one in which structures, systems and roles can be observed and form the basis for being an effective member of society. This is known as a 'realist' view of the world. It includes, for example, the views that managers have a position in a formal organisation structure that determines their goals, responsibilities and authority; and that people behave according to particular laws and principles. Researchers can observe these phenomena, categorise behaviour and determine a manager's source of power and whether s/he is performing the role as s/he should. By referring to these structures, categories and systems, we can identify the causal mechanisms and the factors and variables that influence effective management performance. This paradigm, known as structural-functionalism, assumes that efficiency and effectiveness occur by conforming to these external requirements and mechanisms and by behaving in a 'rational' way. Changes to an organisation or work process occur by modifying structures, systems, goals, etc.

Alternative paradigms have a different understanding of the nature of our social world. For example, researchers working from a 'subjectivist'

view of the world believe that the social world is not separate from us, but that people shape and maintain social and organisational realities in their everyday interactions and conversations. This is known as the social constructionist paradigm. Analysis within this paradigm focuses on the meanings that people give to their world – how they simultaneously interpret and shape what's going on around them. Cause and effect are not that clear; neither is there one rationality, because social life is complex and open to many different interpretations by the people living it. Researchers therefore need to ask those involved in a situation what it means to them, and to look for both similar and different meanings. For example, managers interpret and enact their goals and 'roles' in different ways: some may have a great deal of influence and good relationships with employees and colleagues, while others in the same role may not. We discover this by talking to different members of the organisation and seeking to understand the way they conceive and enact their work and relationships with others.

Social constructionist researchers and managers therefore see organisations not as independent structures and systems to be measured and manipulated, but as communities of people with both shared and different ways of making sense of what's going on. While some social constructionists study the interactions and conversations between people and how these might influence strategy or teamwork, for example, others take a broader perspective to look at how language, interpretations of symbols and written documents might construct the culture of an organisation, and how that culture plays back into employees' interactions. Whichever approach is taken, it is assumed that relationships and interpretations are dynamic and change over time and place. For example, as an employee, customer or hospital patient, we can probably all identify with the old saying that 'the only thing that is constant is change', as we get different advice from different people. And what may be perceived as 'good customer service' in one organisation is interpreted differently in another. In this paradigm, therefore, language, meanings and actions are not universal and generalisable as in the structural-functionalist paradigm, but are localised to the context. It is thus important for researchers to interpret the local meaning-making and activities of people.

The paradigms outlined above are just two of many. While the former structural-functionalist paradigm still predominates, especially in North America, over the last thirty years organisation and management theory has become more pluralistic. The so called 'paradigm wars' of the 1980s and 1990s, which sprang from Burrell and Morgan's (1979) book *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*, raised debate about whether there should be just one paradigm for organisation studies. The