Clore Leadership-AHRC Online Research Library Paper

Doing the right thing: An ethical analysis of Cultural Leadership

Author: Jigisha Patel

Supervisor/s: Heather Widdows,

Department of Philosophy, University of Birmingham

Year paper completed: 2007

Leadership Content Theme/s: Inclusive Leadership Practice

AHRC Subject Area/s: Policy Arts Management and Creative Industries

A note on contents:

Since 2005 Clore Leadership and AHRC have partnered to offer a diverse range of cultural leaders the opportunity to produce a piece of extended research relating to leadership and to their specific cultural discipline. These papers, published from 2023 onward on the Clore Leadership-AHRC online research library, reflect an important contribution to the field and we are extremely pleased to make them available to practitioners, scholars, and other interested parties. We recognise that this research library contains a range of terminologies and outlooks: these are reflective of the significant and ongoing changes within the cultural sector over the past 20 years. As such we urge readers to recognise that the authors' thinking and language may have shifted since completion of these papers, or may be in the process of shifting as consequence of their enquiries.

Unless otherwise stated, research papers included in the Clore Leadership-AHRC Online Research Library have not been formally peer reviewed or published in an academic journal.

Doing the right thing.
An Ethical Analysis of Cultural Leadership

Jigisha Patel

2006/7 Fellow of The Clore Leadership Programme

23 August 2008

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep and heartfelt thanks to Dr Heather Widdows, my supervisor for this piece of research, whose advice and support has been incredible.

Thank you to the following individuals, all of whom I greatly admire, who despite their hugely demanding works schedules, gave their time so willingly and enthusiastically:

Dr Hilary Carty, Director, Cultural Leadership Programme

Caroline Collier, Director, Tate National

Vikki Heywood, Executive Director, Royal Shakespeare Company

Michael Lynch, CBE, Chief Executive Officer, Southbank Centre

Ruth Mackenzie, Expert Advisor, Broadcasting and Cultural Policy, Department of Culture, Media and Sport

Dr Justin Morris, Head of Strategic Planning and Collections Services, The British Museum

Sandy Nairne, Director, National Portrait Gallery

Right Hon Lord Smith of Finsbury, Director, The Clore Leadership Programme

I am hugely grateful to Chris Smith, Sue Hoyle and Helen Acton of the Clore Leadership Programme for making the Fellowship such a transformative experience.

Thanks to my fellow Fellows on the Clore Leadership Programme, for challenging discussions, unfailing faith in me, and for their general inspiration and friendship.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband Jeet and son Mehul for being so supportive and understanding throughout my research and for putting up with my long absences during the final stages. Thinking of you both always keeps a smile on my face.

Doing the right thing?
The Role of Ethics in Cultural Leadership

Contents

Chapter One

Introduction

The purpose of this research project is to explore and analyse the role that ethics play in leadership of the cultural sector. Though the rigorous discussion and application of ethics plays a prominent role in certain parts of the sector, for example, the issues of restitution and human remains in the museum field or censorship and copyright in the wider arts field, there has been little focus on the role of ethics in cultural leadership. The sector and the individuals within it have remained largely untouched by the debates that have influenced and shaped the worlds of business or medicine for example. This is perhaps because the sector has evolved and grown organically, where external intervention has largely been related to finance and where it is widely acknowledged that there have been shortfalls in expertise with relation to governance, as highlighted by the Mission, Models, Money paper, *A position of trust, a duty of care: Governance in the not-for-profit cultural secto*r which reported failings in governance of the cultural sector and suggested ways forward including a new code of conduct for trustees. (Cowling, Burchfield and Purvis, 2005*).*

Cultural leaders, be they Artistic Directors or Executive Directors, are fundamental in determining the vision, articulation and programme of their organisations. They have such great influence that often the same cultural organisation is entirely different under the leadership of one from the next. This paper will explore whether the individual leader's value and ethical framework is key to this and how it shapes the organisation where they hold ultimate responsibility. It is therefore interesting to explore further what role ethics, consciously or unconsciously, play in their day-to-day and their long-term thinking and planning for their organisation.

It is especially valuable to explore the way in which ethics functions in the management of the cultural sector and its impact on the tensions, demands, approaches, assumptions and pressures of the leaders of the flagship national institutions (largely based in London) because of the influence they bear on the cultural sector across the country. There is an acknowledged London bias in terms of positions of power and influence, and a subsequent trickle-down effect in the way that organisations in the region operate.

Cultural leadership has come under the spotlight over the past five years by the Government, in its sector-related non-departmental public bodies and privately, with a

focus on issues such as excellence and diversity. A great deal of important work is being undertaken to address the skills-gap, gender imbalance and experience-building across the sector driven by the recommendations of reports such as *Developing leadership: the challenge for the cultural sector* headed up by Arts Council England (Arts Council England, 2006). This in itself shows a concern for ethics within the cultural sector. However, there is still very little focus on ethics in leadership in what is fundamentally a value-centred environment and where in the majority of cases, leaders and staff share vision and values, mutual trust and respect. In undertaking research to develop this project, little previous work or documentation on this area was uncovered. Indeed this project reveals the extent of this lack of focus on ethics. As one participant in this project who has worked prolifically in Australia and the UK said "In over 30 years of working in the cultural sector, this is the first time that anyone has ever asked me about ethics." (Interviewee four)

This research project therefore seeks to better understand how cultural leaders experience ethical dilemmas, and whether and how they see them. Through the exploration of issues such as decision-making, legitimacy, loyalty, custom, finance and politics, this research project will consider how the ethical framework of cultural leaders shape and affect the organisation's delivery and standing. This is particularly timely given the new openness in the sector, as measures of more rigorous assessment are put in place and it moves towards a focus of excellence across the board as championed by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport report *Supporting Excellence in the Arts: From Measurement to Excellence* (Sir Brian McMaster, January 2008).

In order to explore the issues, the key ethical theories of consequentialism and deontology will be introduced in chapter three. These theories will provide a framework by which examples of practice within the sector will be assessed. From the findings of the interviews, the key themes that have arisen and will be covered in chapter four are consultative leadership and the decision-making process; values, judgements and risk-taking; loyalty and customs; and politics, money and the constituency. The final chapter - the conclusion – will draw together the findings overall and look at the implications for the sector.

Taken together, this paper provides a snapshot of current ethical themes and approaches within cultural leadership and points the way to further investigation. It is hoped that this

research paper will provide the basis to stimulate debate, further dialogue and thought about the practical and philosophical role of ethics in cultural leadership today.

Chapter Two
Methodology

Twelve leading figures from the cultural sector were approached to be interviewed for the project. They were selected as each is responsible for a major national cultural institution and holds significant weight and authority in the wider cultural sector. All are highly-respected and regarded leaders, known for their vision, integrity and with strong work background. Though the sample size is small, importantly, each participant has had a distinctive career progression and held a number of key positions which is significant considering the modest size of the profession and the relatively few positions of national weighting available.

Of the twelve leaders approached, ten agreed to participate in the project (one supported the project but was unable to allocate time and one did not respond.) In the end, eight interviews were undertaken as two individuals had to cancel. Demographically, the participants were four men and four women, two were from 'minority' groups; all were based either wholly or in part in London.

The research was conducted through face-to-face interviews after each participant had been contacted in writing with detailed information about the project. Given the pressures of time and the responsibilities of the participants, it was felt that telephone and postal interviews would largely be unsuccessful and would not be appropriate for the subject area. The depth of the issues could only really be explored through face-to-face dialogue where a meaningful and honest conversation could take place.

The interviews took place in May and June 2008. Each interview lasted around one hour and took place in the respective Director's Office. In most cases, the interview had to be drawn to a close due to the diary commitments of the participant, but many wished to continue the discussion. As one interviewee commented, "I got your letter and thought, "oh my," this is no small topic." (Interviewee one)

Given the nature of the topic and its sensitivity, it was felt that only if confidentiality and anonymity were ensured would participants be able to speak freely and without fear of repercussions from what they disclosed. All of the participants were encouraged to speak honestly and it was stated clearly that the purpose of the research project was in no way to make judgements on an individual's leadership but rather was an exploration of

current attitudes and methods of practice.   It was vital to be able to get under the skin of the personalities and try to engage them in a stimulating conversation about their real experiences, the tensions they face and how their public and private ethical and value frameworks shape their work.

An interview questionnaire was created for each participant. The purpose of the questions was to help shape and move the interview forward but the intention was that the meeting would be a conversation rather than a formal interview. Again it was felt that this approach would be most effective given the sensitive and diverse nature of the topic and to elicit as much relevant information as possible. As the interviews progressed, the questionnaire was used less and less and a more open-ended method was used where each participant was encouraged to reflect on their own experiences, to share anecdotes, stories and concerns.   Each interview was recorded digitally and subsequently transcribed.

Alongside the practical research, a range of reading was undertaken to understand how the philosophical methods of ethics, chiefly deontological ethics and consequentialism, were linked and could be applied to the findings from the interviews in order to be able to analyse and comment on the current role of ethics in the leadership of the cultural sector.

Chapter Three

Trends in Ethical Thinking

This chapter introduces the key ethical theories that have been used to analyse and interpret the interviews with the cultural leaders. The ethical theory discussed focuses on the way that day-to-day moral dilemmas or ethical situations are approached and how decisions are made as opposed to how moral conclusions are reached. The theories discussed are consequentialism and deontology. These theories are used to guide and assess choices of what we ought to do, in contrast with the moral theories that guide and assess what kind of person we are and should be (in terms of character traits). The purpose of this research and analysis is therefore to explore different models of making moral decisions and determining moral action rather than focusing on individual character.

In contemporary ethical theory, the 'right' and the 'good' are the two central moral concepts. Consequentialist theory holds that the good takes precedence over the right whereas deontological theory takes the opposite position – the belief that the right is a more fundamental moral concept than the good. For example, a consequentialist may argue that lying is wrong because of the negative consequences produced by lying — though a consequentialist may allow that certain foreseeable consequences might make lying acceptable. A deontologist will argue that lying is *always* wrong, regardless of any potential "good" that might come from lying.

Consequentialist theories hold that the right thing to do always depends on the goodness of the consequences. Deontological theories hold that there are right and wrong decision-making considerations and that actions are intrinsically right or wrong independently of their good and bad effects or outcomes. For example, as Stephen Darwall explains "a deontological theory might say that torturing innocents would be wrong even if its consequences turned out to be beneficial in the long run." (Darwall, 1998, p. 81.)

Both of these theories are concerned with action and determining the best, right or good action in any given situation. As the interviewees demonstrated, determining the best action to follow however is not an easy task. This project uses ethical theory to help explore and clarify ethics in this context and this chapter discusses the two theories, their criticisms and complexities.

a. Introducing Consequentialism

The central idea of consequentialism is that what makes an action morally right is that its consequences are better than any of its alternatives, and that these consequences form the basis of any valid moral judgement about the action. Thus, from a consequentialist standpoint, an ethically right action is one that produces a good outcome, or consequence. The process and the action itself is therefore of less importance providing the outcome is good. As the ethical theorist James Rachels writes, "Actions are to be judged right or wrong solely by virtue of their consequences. Nothing else matters. Right actions are, simply, those that have the best consequences." (Rachels, 1999, p. 107.) Consequentialists rank the state of affairs from best to worst as judged from an impartial perspective. They then hold that acts are right if they promote the best overall state of affairs from this impartial perspective.

This concept is illustrated by philosopher Gilbert Harman in the following scenario. "You are the physician in charge of an emergency room. An accident occurs and six people are brought to your ER in critical condition. You have the resources and personnel to save five of the patients if you act immediately. The remaining patient can be saved, but only if the entire staff ignores the first five patients to work on him. If they do so, the first five patients will die. In this case, unless there is something truly exceptional about the one patient, most of us would opt to save the first five, and it seems that we would do so for the consequentialist reasons. We believe that a state of affairs in which five people are saved and one dies is better than a state of affairs in which one person is saved and five die and we want to create the best possible state of affairs." (Geirsson and Holmgren, 2001, p. 81.)

Consequentialist forms of reasoning were evident in the responses of some of the interviewees. For example, one leader spoke of maximising social benefit, progressing the organisation and making a difference:

> You're looking at the overall output of the organisation, the impact that it's having on the world and the people is something that you're continually trying to maximise, but you're trying to do that in a way that is beneficial socially (a bottom line for me), and if I can look back on my working life whether it be here or in any of the other things I've done that I can see net benefit to society in terms of what's happened, I could die happy.
> (Interviewee 4)

Consequentialist reasoning is clear in the following individual:

> I think you probably have to put yourself through doing things for a means to an end that you probably otherwise wouldn't do, but that doesn't mean that you betray with the integrity of the organisation or your personal integrity. If you lose that you've lost everything.
> (Interviewee 8)

"A means to an end" is a much-quoted consequentialist viewpoint, meaning that to judge if an action is right, we should look at what will happen as a result of doing it. Actions are deemed right, only if they produce the most good. As John Stuart Mill laid out in his famous 1861 text, *Utilitarianism*, "The utilitarian doctrine is that happiness is desirable, and the only thing desirable, as an end; all other things being desirable as means to that end."

There are different types of consequentialist ethical theory. Consequentialists disagree on whether the best overall outcome is one where the greatest total accumulated amount of happiness, pleasure, and satisfaction is achieved, or whether it would be where the greatest average amount of happiness for each individual is achieved. In utilitarian theory, as laid out by Mill, the intention is to maximise goodness or happiness, so that right actions are those that produce the greatest possible balance of happiness over unhappiness, with each individual's happiness counted as equally important. This theory known as "the Principle of Utility," as defined by Jeremy Bentham requires that "whenever we have a choice between alternative actions or social policies, we must choose the one that has the best overall consequences for everyone concerned." (Rachels, 1999, p.97)

Importantly, the rightness or wrongness of an action is determined by whether the consequences of that act are good as judged from an impartial perspective – the idea that each person's life and interests are as important as anyone else's. As Mill said, when we are weighing the interests of different people, we should be "as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator." (Rachels, 1999, p. 115.) Consequentialists of this sort will therefore argue that it is morally obligatory to do whatever will produce the best overall state of affairs. This type of approach was expressed clearly by this interviewee:

All my life the starting point for discussions in a new place which you are leading is about how much further you can push risk, innovation, experiment you know, what is the art form, how you can take the audience and the staff and your board and your stakeholders on a journey, and test and innovate, and aim for the best you can possibly find to come and work with you. That is it always, every single time.
(Interviewee 3)

Likewise:

Actually at the end of the day, I am probably prepared to do almost anything if it is for the good of the organisation. Whilst I would never say that publicly, I would go a very long way down the road on some issues to make sure that the organisation benefits for the longer term whereas others might stop at the first hurdle. We can't afford not to. That is something that you just have to live with.
(Interviewee 2)

In consequentialist theory, contemporary philosophers also distinguish act-consequentialism from rule-consequentialism. Act-consequentialism argues that the rightness of any action is dependent upon its consequences. Thus, the most ethically right action and therefore obligatory, is the one that leads to the best consequences, or consequences that are at least as good as any of its alternatives. By contrast, rule-consequentialism argues that an act is right only insofar as it conforms to a rule which leads to better consequences than conformity to another rule. It is always permissible, indeed obligatory, to act according to a rule, general adherence to which would promote the best consequences. The idea is to look not at the particular act under consideration, but at a general policy – or rule – of performing such acts.

As Marcia Baron explains "If cheating on an exam will promote the best consequences, it is what I should do, according to the act-consequentialist. But the rule-consequentialist asks, Would general conformity to a rule of cheating on exams promote the best consequences, or would general conformity to a rule of never cheating on exams promote the best consequences? Only if the answer is that general conformity to a rule of cheating would promote the best consequences is it permissible for the agent to cheat." (Baron, 1999, p. 8.)

Act-consequentialism does not allow for the individual to work out which of the available options at any one time will promote the best consequences as the risk of error and the loss of spontaneity outweigh the good of calculating the consequences. So act-consequentialists believe in sticking to "rules of thumb," for example, don't cheat people, always stop at red lights, do not kill. However, the act-consequentialist holds that if for some reason it is clear that sticking to the "rule of thumb" in a particular case will produce worse consequences than breaking it, the right thing to do is to be break it. By contrast, the rule-consequentialist favours sticking to it, as long as it is the case that a policy of sticking to the rule can be expected to produce better consequences than abiding by a different rule.

Even with these opposing branches, consequentialism does offer a number of advantages. Firstly, it provides a theoretical simplicity – a single principle from which any moral dilemma or issue can be resolved. Secondly, it is intuitively attractive - in practice, most people use consequentialist reasoning without necessarily even consciously thinking about it, as it is instinctive that humans would seek to ensure the best possible results overall. There is a tendency for us all to use consequentialist reasoning in times of crisis such as war or famine. When such scales are involved, it is hard to think beyond trying to ensure the best outcome for the greatest number. Thirdly, through its focus on the value and importance of each person as an individual, no one's interests are greater than anthers, and so consequentialist ethical thinking allows us to operate with equality, objectivity and impartiality.

However, there are many disadvantages to consequentialist theory. Firstly, critics of consequentialism argue that it is simply impractical to accurately work out what the outcomes will be as there is too much hidden information, too many complexities, too many things that could go wrong. It is impossible to accurately predict the outcomes every time and so the theory is just unworkable. Secondly, as an ethical theory, consequentialism can also create implications that conflict with our most firmly held and carefully considered moral judgements, and ignores well-recognised moral concepts such as guilt, justice, right. For example, consequentialist theory seems to imply that, under certain conditions, you could kill an innocent person in order to save several others; people could be punished for crimes they have not committed to prevent greater atrocities and that organs for transplantation should be taken from healthy people against their will to save others' lives, as in the example on page two.

Thirdly, it requires that whoever can best benefit from a resource should get that resource in all cases, whether or not they have a right to it and so ignores the significance of the actual situations and relationships people live in. For example, individuals would be prohibited from leaving an inheritance to their children as it would be deemed to produce greater benefit to a greater number by donating it to a charity. This strict neutrality between individuals means that no one is allowed to show preferences for individuals like friends or relatives, not just in professional/public life but also in private life. Finally, it fails to respect the needs and rights of individuals as it requires individuals to always do whatever is needed to produce the best overall state of affairs, even if that requires us to override a person's basic rights in the process. For example, individuals would be required by consequentialist reasoning to donate almost all of their time and resources to the benefit of others.

Intuitively we believe that our lives are our own to live as we choose, but this would be heavily compromised if we were always under obligation to do whatever would produce the best overall state of affairs. This makes consequentialism unbelievably demanding, to a degree that it almost can't be practiced in real life.

b. Introducing Deontology

In deontological theory, the moral value of an action is wholly independent from the consequences of the action. Deontological theory instead focuses on the rightness or wrongness of the action itself. Duty is the basis of moral value according to deontology, and duties and obligations must be determined objectively and absolutely, not subjectively. Each individual is responsible for complying with certain duties, whatever goals he or she chooses to pursue and as a result, certain acts, e.g. murder, are always wrong no matter what the consequences.

Deontological reasoning was evident in some of the interviews with the cultural leaders. For example, this interviewee had to make decisions which he knew would have undesirable consequences, but did so anyway:

> I think probably the unhappiest and the loneliest time of my working
> career was when you are in that position of having to continually be
> making really quite difficult choices and difficult balances in terms of
> where the organisation was but knowing that nearly every decision you

make was going to have consequences for other people - people that you respect in terms of their work or their impact on the world. That can be quite difficult.

(Interviewee 6)

This interviewee also demonstrated clear deontological reasoning:

If I look at the things I've done accumulatively over the last 35 years of work and if anyone else more objective than me looked back at it, I think I would say that my working life has actually done something to make the place better and to me I guess that tries to bring you back to the idea of ethics in this business. That if you're able to say you have behaved ethically and where the preponderance of your decisions was based on right not wrong. You may have still got them right or wrong but you were doing them from some set of principles, values that enable you to feel good about what is achieved and feel good about yourself. I guess that's the hugely attractive part.

(Interviewee 4)

Deontological theory is fundamentally different to consequentialism in that rather than being goal-focused and performing whatever actions will lead to these results, deontologists believe that certain actions are themselves right and wrong, regardless of the consequences. Deontologists believe that you cannot legitimately pursue the best results in any way you choose - the ends do not justify the means. Some actions are intrinsically wrong and should not be undertaken, even in the pursuit of the most exceptional consequences.

As with consequentialism, there are different types of deontological theories. For the eighteenth-century German philosopher Immanuel Kant, certain actions are always wrong, creating absolute moral rules which should not be overridden, with no exceptions. Kant believed that one should "Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become universal law." (Rachels, 1999, p. 124.) By "maxim," Kant meant the *underlying principle* of the act, policy or activity, by which other, more superficial aspects of action are guided. When contemplating a particular action, each individual should ask themselves "what rule they would be following to carry out that action, and would they be willing for everyone to follow that rule?" If the rule may be

followed by all, the act is permissible, but if you would not be willing for everyone to follow the rule, the act is morally impermissible. As Rachels describes, "Being a moral agent, then, means guiding one's conduct by "universal law" – moral rules that hold without exception, in all circumstances." (Rachels, 1999, p. 125.) An example of one such rule would be a rule which does not permit lying. For Kant, each individual must "Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means but always at the same time as an end." (Geirsson and Holmgren, 2001, p. 132.) In his view, the ends never justify the means. There is an intrinsic rightness of certain acts which depend not on their consequences but on their own nature.

The twentieth-century Scottish philosopher Sir William D. Ross provided an alternative view on deontological thinking where the importance of consequences are not dismissed entirely and where he emphasises the role of duties such as action-guiding principles. For example, the duty to keep a promise can be overridden by another duty, such as the duty to render aid, holding that a number of duties may come into conflict in any particular situation. The interviewee below seems to adopt a framework of this sort and suggests a number of principles that they hold firmly:

> If you have a belief in integrity it means that you have a view about
> clarity, transparency, interaction and relationships, and the way in which
> questions of power and control operate. And that means that where there
> are choices, as there always are, there may not always be right choices
> or wrong choices, in my view generally moral frameworks don't give you
> absolute clarity, but at least you will argue for integrity, that will lead you
> to argue for clarity and transparency, even if somebody would differ with
> you about whether you made the right choice.
> (Interviewee 5)

There are several advantages to deontological thinking. Firstly, deontological theories enable us to tap into the moral conviction that our lives are largely our own to lead, respecting the individual and their rights.   Secondly, while deontology articulates constraints on our actions, it allows us the freedom to pursue our own goals and projects, providing that we operate within these constraints. Thirdly, rather than asking us to sacrifice the basic interests of some individuals in order to generate the best possible state of affairs for all, deontology places no such requirement to maximise the pleasure of

the masses at the expense of the individual. Fourthly, deontology takes into account factors such as morals, rules and justice, for example, they would argue that it is simply wrong to punish someone who does not deserve the punishment, even if we could produce good consequences in the future by doing so. Finally, while consequentialist theories are strictly forward-looking moral theories, from the perspective of the time of the decision to see how to bring about the best possible results in the future, deontology recognises the continuing significance of past actions.

However, there are also a number of disadvantages with deontological ethical theory. Firstly and perhaps most importantly, critics of deontology such as the British philosopher John Stuart Mill, argue that deontologists fail to specify which principles should take priority when rights and duties conflict. Therefore deontology cannot offer complete moral guidance and no clear way to resolve conflicts between moral duties. For example, a deontological moral system should include both a moral duty not to lie and one to keep others from harm, but how should a person choose between those two moral duties? The interviews undertaken in this project demonstrated this tension in the case of the value of consultative leadership verses other conflicting values, shown in chapter four, section a.

A second criticism is that deontology does not fit with real life experience as it does not readily allow for grey areas where the morality of an action is questionable. They are, rather, systems which are based upon absolutes — absolute principles and absolute conclusions. However, in reality, moral questions more often involve grey areas than absolute black and white choices. Individuals typically have conflicting duties, interests, and issues that make things difficult.

Thirdly, critics argue that there are no 'universal moral truths.' On the other hand, the benefits and disadvantages of actions are much more easily calculated. Thus, rather than relying on unstructured, vague moral truths to guide action, we should look to more concrete ways of determining the ethics of a particular act.

c. Consequentialism, Deontology and Cultural Leadership

Deontological and consequentialist theories are useful in the analysis of the approaches to ethics in cultural leadership, in that they provide a framework for exploring motivations,

how decisions are made, issues prioritised, and more broadly, how individuals consider and manage the responsibilities of their roles.

We will see from the interviews that it can often be unclear who is a deontologist and who is a consequentialist. Individuals are deontologists about those issues that matter to them and they in some sense believe in, so nothing will make them compromise this value or principle no matter what it would get them. However, some consequentialist ends are also held very dearly – an individual may believe in a certain end so much that they will do anything to reach it. Understanding how people think about different values, aims and objectives and what particular approach they adopt, or think it's acceptable to adopt in which circumstances, can help to understand what is possible and even to communicate about possible options.

It is natural to see deontological and consequentialist orientations as mutually exclusive. An individual either pays attention to the nature of the act (its moral correctness) or to the anticipated outcomes. However, what makes an action right or wrong is not always definable without considering its consequences in some form or another. Individuals with deontological orientations rarely disregard consequences entirely. Even a deontologist may take into account outcomes if two equally moral acts have different consequences. As one interviewee said, "Tensions exist on an almost daily basis." (Interviewee 2)

Different ethical approaches may also be taken by the same individual with relation to a particular time, situation or set of decisions as expressed by this interviewee:

> In any leadership position whether it's in the cultural sector or beyond,
> you're going to end up making decisions that you are unhappy about, that
> you realise are going to impact detrimentally on any number of
> individuals, that are not a choice between good and bad but are a choice
> between bad and slightly less bad, where nothing is particularly clear cut
> and you have to try and differentiate between shades of grey. There will
> always be compromises along the way, there will always be ultimately a
> lack of satisfaction about the outcome, but none the less somehow you
> have to find your way through this thicket of competing values and issues
> and decisions.
> (Interviewee 7)

For other individuals, an ethical approach may be entirely non-negotiable and they will work and behave in a consistent way. As this interviewee explained, "You have to be clear about where you're going and then without trampling over everything, including your own ethical system, working out how best to do it." (Interviewee 8)

As we have seen from the quotes, the processes of leadership are complex and the same individual can use both consequentialist and deontological approaches. This interviewee described this complexity:

> If you're going to be a leader you have to be in a position to make some
> hard decisions. The more complex question [is] getting to know whether
> you're making the right decisions rather than the hard decisions, and
> that's somewhat more complicated.
> (Interviewee 4)

In the following chapter, deontological and consequentialist ethical theories will be applied to the key themes that arose from the interview process in order to practically demonstrate these theories and explore the prevalence or otherwise of these approaches and positions.

Chapter Four

Key themes in ethics and cultural leadership

During the interview process with the eight cultural figures, a series of themes emerged that demonstrated commonalities around considerations of ethics within their roles and the way in which they operate in the sector more widely. It is these themes that form the basis of the analysis of the role of ethics in cultural leadership for this project. Although approached and addressed in different ways, the themes show a convergence in the main areas of ethical concern and attention. However, the interviewees show a different interpretation and application of ethics within these themes, and at times, endorse very different even contradictory ethical approaches. The themes that arose in the interviews and will be drawn out and discussed in this chapter are:

    a. Consultative Leadership and the Decision-making Process

    b. Values, Judgements and Risk-taking

    c. Loyalty and Customs

    d. Politics, Money and the Constituency

This chapter will present and explore each of the key themes above in turn using quotes from the interviews in order to provide an exploration and analysis of the ethical forms of reasoning and approaches the interviewees adopt.

a. Consultative leadership and the decision-making process

For the purposes of this project, the two key ethical issues around leadership techniques that were explored were firstly, to what extent the interviewees seek to involve their senior management teams in the actual processes of leadership, and secondly, how they as individuals make decisions as cultural leaders.

Leadership of the cultural sector, as with any other industry, is complex and multi-faceted. But perhaps a defining feature of cultural leadership is the strong emphasis on a shared belief in the value of art and the artistic product, whatever form it may take, across

the whole organisation.   Individuals who work within the cultural sector largely do so because of this passion and commitment to the art form and its ability to make powerful and lasting impressions on people, rather than for any financial gain or prestige. Organisations, even the larger national institutions, are small in size compared to other industries, and the arts sector as a whole is small, well networked and relatively homogenous. A good reputation for 'getting things done,' strong artistic and leadership values and a solid track record are therefore important factors for anyone seeking to establish a role for themselves in leadership of the cultural sector.

Cultural leaders must be able to lead from the front and set a dynamic vision for others to follow, and importantly, in doing so tend to consult and take on board the input of others rather than dictate how things should be done. One interviewee explained that "I've always wanted to set some form of example to the people I work with in the way that you model behaviour, you model an ethical stance, you model values for an organisation." (Interviewee 4) The interviews reflected a common appreciation that consultation and being seen to actively involve senior staff was needed to maintain legitimacy and authority, encapsulated by one interviewee who said "I think a good Director will seek permission rather than necessarily have to pull rank." (Interviewee 8)

Another interviewee spoke explicitly of consultative leadership and their personal ethical framework:

> Certainly integrity, certainly freedoms of expression and view, I would put incredibly high within my ethical view point, i.e. a respect for someone else's point of view and a hope that they respect yours.
> (Interviewee 5)

Likewise another interviewee spoke about why a consultative leadership model was so important:

> Do I care what my peers think? Actually most of my life at the time of innovation my peers externally have been against me. Did that matter? No, not really. It enormously matters to me what my peers internally think. I mean that I have learned that my inner team are absolutely crucial. If your chums aren't confident, trusting, happy, stimulated, if it isn't sparkling and fun, and privately we can quarrel but we can come out

and be a unified team because we share the values, we share the vision, then it is miserable really.

(Interviewee 3)

From these quotes, it is evident that there is a highly incorporated and consultative style to cultural leadership that is much used and valued. It would suggest a deontological approach to participatory leadership where leaders have a moral commitment to involving their staff and a firmly held principle that it is valuable in itself to seek the opinion and input of their colleagues. This was explained by the following interviewee:

Clearly I'm heavily influenced by others because I think lots are people are smarter than me and I tend to probably want to have a group of smarter people around me - as smart as they can be. I've worked in situations where if you don't have that challenge then I think that you're not going to probably do a very good job.

(Interviewee 4)

A strong deontological ethical stance was also expressed by this interviewee:

Often there can be judgements on people or judgements on things that you might be doing, where you as someone who is managing the process or people, or the activity are in a much better position to judge. So if someone says to you "I think what you're doing in this area is not right," you have to be self-aware enough to be able to question whether they are right but then fundamentally, you then have to get yourself into a position where you can say "Well I think you're wrong and I'm right"

(Interviewee 4)

The phrase "Well I think you're wrong and I'm right" is a fundamental deontological statement. Here the leader is explaining that at times, there will be other values at play which have a greater importance or significance, and which will therefore override the still firmly held deontological belief in consultative leadership. Leaders may have a range of strong deontological beliefs that they deem are intrinsically valuable. But, consultative leadership may not necessarily be the *most* valuable in a whole set of intrinsic values, as they take into account other issues which they believe to take precedence in a particular situation.

However, even though this claim to consultative leadership is strong, one should consider to what extent the voices of others actually influenced the decisions that are made or whether it is simply a mechanism that the leaders use to increase their legitimacy and power. If it is the case that there is no actual participatory leadership, this would suggest that respect for others' voices is not intrinsically valuable in itself but only as a means to get the best value from their staff, making them feel incorporated and needed. This would suggest a consequentialist approach to leadership whereby the leaders were more focused on the resulting impact on their standing and position and simply used consultative and cooperative methods because they were effective in reaching their end goals.

Even a leader with a deontological attitude towards participatory leadership may in fact move to a more consequentialist approach if they believe that higher principles are at stake in a given situation. For example, one interviewee described this approach clearly, explaining that even given a consultative process, as the leader, they will have the final say:

> I guess there comes a point where I suppose I don't deny the fact that if I think something is right, or I think that it is imperative that we do something in a certain way, that as much as other people might disagree sometimes you have to actually make those decisions and say that's the way is going to be. But I think that's probably part of the attraction of leadership - that there are so many interesting things that get thrown at you, and that interesting range of decisions and interesting interaction around things.
> (Interviewee 4)

This quote is key as it demonstrates that while an individual leader may have a partly deontological view on participatory leadership in itself, at times, there are other processes, options, requirements or principles for which this deontological approach will be sacrificed. They may hold very strong deontological views about participatory leadership but given the pressure of being ultimately responsible for the institution or organisation, there will be occasions when another firmly held deontological belief may take precedence to ensure that a higher value or objective is achieved.

All of the interviewees clearly understood that as the leader, they held the ultimate responsibility, and as such it was an intrinsic part of their remit to make the final decision using their knowledge, best judgement and experience. As one interviewee described:

> I think the difficulty if you're looking at it from the perspective of someone running organisations, often the hardest decisions are the ones you have to make yourself.
> (Interviewee 4)

Another interviewee spoke of the reality that often, the leader has no other choice and is forced to make the final decision:

> Being able to sort through in conversations some of the issues before you finally make the decision can be very helpful. But there are also many moments when all help deserts you.
> (Interviewee 7)

During the interviews, this acknowledgement of the responsibility of their positions clearly played heavily on their minds. For instance one interviewee said "I think that is just part of the idea, if you're going to be a leader you have to be in a position to make some hard decisions." (Interviewee 4)

This is important when considering the role of ethics in cultural leadership as it demonstrates that while consultation and participation amongst senior managers, who are themselves very experienced and knowledgeable, plays a part in the leadership of the cultural sector, ultimately the power within the sector lies within the hands of a very few people. While there are Boards of Governors and advisory/peer committees in place, the practical reality is that it is the values and ethics of the leaders as individuals that shape and mould the cultural sector as a whole. However, despite this power cultural leaders cannot direct through dictatorship, nor would that be seen as desirable or suit the characters and personalities of any of the interviewees. As acknowledged in the preceding quotes, it is widely accepted that they need the support of their staff to be successful and they could never wholly separate themselves from the input and support of their senior teams, demonstrating a deontological ethical stance that is strongly valued. Accordingly, interviewees spoke of how they seek to influence opinion within their senior management teams in order to get the outcome they want. As one interviewee said, "you

will persuade, cajole, traduce or do any of the things you need to get there." (Interviewee 4) Another interviewee explained:

> Learning how you can influence people sometimes without them realising it. You might say "that's not so transparent, if you're influencing people and they don't realise, that's not very transparent at all". It may be, it may not be, but it's not something I would never hide other than making sure one does it cleverly.
> (Interviewee 5)

One interviewee described the conflict and tension that is felt operating in a manner which is both consultative and at the same time, uses the benefit of their own experience and knowledge, demonstrating that even the most established and hardened individual experiences the ethical tensions of leadership:

> As a leader, you have to stand up and do what you believe in without being domineering. It quite a delicate balance isn't it - the balance between having a vision and being sensitive to others in the way that it's carried out. You have to consider how you bring people with you and enrich that vision by drawing other perspectives into it.
> (Interviewee 8)

This quote clearly demonstrates the recognition of the ethical tensions that leaders experience and the balancing act that takes place when differing or conflicting values are in play.

With regards to consultative leadership in the cultural sector, the interviewees appear to take a strong deontological stance in the majority of cases. Consultation and participation by senior colleagues is intrinsically valuable to the leaders and cannot be compromised in pursuit of specific goals. However, there may be instances where consultative leadership has to be overridden and a leader feels that that they have to take full control, but only when higher values are at stake or where a more strongly held ethical belief is in play. The tension felt and the balancing act of a multiplicity of values and ethical beliefs was expressed by the interviewees.

Throughout the interviews when discussing the responsibilities of leadership, the cultural leaders also spoke of the tensions around decision-making and times in their careers

when they had been presented with difficult ethical dilemmas. For example one interviewee said:

> If you're making decisions about people's futures, those sorts of decisions, they're the ones that probably are the hardest, and that can be incredibly difficult. You are having to take into account a set of facts, a set of circumstances. I think they are probably amongst the hardest things that you have to do.
>
> (Interviewee 4)

This quote shows a deontological ethical approach to decision making as the interviewee holds fundamental beliefs about the way in which difficult situations should be handled including explicit care for the individual involved, which appear cannot be compromised. He/she acknowledges how difficult this can be.

Another interviewee explained the process by which he/she approached hard decisions:

> In difficult situations, you must try and do it in a reasonable, rational, considerate kind of way but you have to do it, and you don't like doing it, and it's hurtful for the individual, and particularly for the individual's family, but you have to make the decision on the basis of what you think is the best, for the general good.
>
> (Interviewee 7)

This interviewee demonstrates a consequentialist approach to addressing difficult decisions. Though he/she is concerned with the acts and process involved, he/she will ultimately do what is needed to secure the desired outcome. Later in the interview, he/she explained that in his/her particular career (in politics and cultural leadership), a consequentialist ethical approach has been the most productive and appropriate way of working but acknowledged that he/she found it personally very challenging. This suggests a divide in the way in which he operates publicly as compared to in his private life. As he/she explained:

> It is impossibly difficult. It gets easier the more you have to do it because you get more confident about being able to operate in this sort of way, at that sort of level, but it's still hard.

27

(Interviewee 7)

The issue of awareness and acknowledgement of making the 'wrong' decision, and subsequently how this was dealt with was also discussed with several interviewees. One interviewee said:

> You have to live with the decisions you make. You simply can't go back and deconstruct everything – it would drive you mad. You make decisions with the best information you have access to and an assessment of the situation which you hope grows with experience.
> (Interviewee 6)

This reflects a consequentialist view in that providing that the leader feels that that he/she has made the best judgement with the given information at the time, they are able to stick by the decisions that they have made and live with the outcomes, even if the leader subsequently believes the wrong decision has been made.

Conversely, another interviewee displayed a deontological perspective with regards to decision-making, explaining a series of processes that would be considered:

> Sometimes you do realise you've made the wrong decisions and in those circumstances sometimes you have to be big enough to say "Yep I made the wrong decision and I'm going to change it" or "I'm going to try and change it". Sometimes it's very difficult to change it in which case you may just have to make the best of the decision that you did make. Sometimes you realise it as an imperfect decision but because it's now been taken you would actually make it worse if you tried to change it. Sometimes there are ways you can find to make it less bad.
> (Interviewee 7)

He/she went on to explain that:

> Sometimes you make a decision and it's the response that that then generates that makes you realise that it was the wrong decision. There have been many occasions when I've said something that I've then

regretted almost the moment it's out of my mouth on a public platform or in an unguarded moment to a journalist or something of that kind.

(Interviewee 7)

This cultural leader is demonstrating a deontological outlook to the decision-making process in that he approaches decisions and statements from the viewpoint of them being right and wrong and not just whether they did or didn't work in bringing about what he wanted. This may not always necessarily lead to favourable outcomes, as the interviewee explains below, but he/she felt it was ethically the right approach to take:

Sometimes you will have private doubts about a decision you've taken, sometimes you will have private turmoil over the public reaction you're having to go through, but you can't let any of that show. You just have to keep on smiling.

(Interviewee 7)

Broadly speaking, the cultural leaders appeared to approach the decision-making process with *either* a consequentialist or a deontological view. There were however examples where an individual who appeared to be using a consequentialist ethical approach would also make a deontological approach in another instance. As with consultative leadership, this demonstrates that in decision-making, the same individual will often apply both a consequentialist or a deontological in response to a particular situation or set of circumstances.

It is perhaps interesting to close this section by briefly exploring the role of consultative leadership and decision-making on how the cultural leader wants to be seen in terms of how popular and liked they are. All the interviewees were asked, "Is it important what people think?" One interviewee demonstrated the simultaneous application of a deontological and consequentialist ethical stance:

You can't ignore the external factors and there'll always be a bit of me thinking how is this going to play out, what are people going to think, how are they going to react. There's a bit of 'how's this going to look to the outside world'. But that's a subsidiary thought to 'what is the right decision to make here.'

(Interviewee 7)

The focus on the "right decision" no matter what the consequences demonstrates a deontological view. There is also another deontological view expressed in the interviewee's concern for how his/her decisions will be perceived in the wider sector. Likewise another interviewee dismissed the suggestion of 'popularity', again demonstrating a deontological view in that it was unimportant how others' perceived his/her actions as long as he/she felt that he/she was doing the right thing:

> I think I got over, I think I spent a lot of time in my youth and early adulthood wanting probably to be popular and then there came a point where you thought 'I don't really care that much any more' and so I think there is a transition that you go through in a career where if you are always thinking about what other people think and trying to be popular then you know you're going to find it difficult.
> (Interviewee 4)

Thus in summary, with regards to consultative leadership and decision-making, there are differing ethical approaches taken by cultural leaders as demonstrated by the quotes used here. There appears to be a strong deontological ethical slant in terms of consultative leadership, whereby leaders believe that the input and support of their senior colleagues is intrinsically valuable and cannot be compromised. However, there may be situations in which consultative leadership is sacrificed where higher values may be at stake. In terms of decision-making, different leaders adopt different ethical approaches. While some leaders believe that there is a right and wrong way of dealing with challenging situations, while other individuals feel that the focus should be on concentrated achieving the required or desired outcome.

Having discussed consultative leadership and decision-making, it is important to look at the issues of the individuals' values, the use of judgement and approaches to risk-taking. These themes are discussed now.

b. Values, Judgements and Risk-taking

In any leadership role, an individual is required to draw on their value framework and make considered judgements about a range of issues. Values and judgments are a clear expression of what an individual believes to be good or bad in some respect. One of the

most important characteristics of judgments is that they express our values (but not all expressions of values are also judgments). Therefore, in the analysis of the role of ethics in cultural leadership, it is important to understand how values and judgements are approached.

The cultural sector is very value-driven in that people who work within it do so because of their strong belief in and commitment to the value of art in life. For example one interviewee described:

> I suppose the thing that attracts me to the roles that I've done is that there is a fundamental belief system that underpins why people work in the not-for-profit sector, which I think is probably in many ways somewhat different to the belief system that other people have in other sectors. It doesn't mean that you're necessarily any better, or good, bad, indifferent but it does tend to be prefaced on the idea that they're doing good things. I guess it tends to probably then focus you on the idea that the people working in them share some sense of value about the worth, what to do, how you do things the right way.
> (Interviewee 4)

This interviewee is presenting a clear deontological stance in that he/she believes that working in the sector is intrinsically valuable and speaks of the shared value of doing things "the right way." He/she explicitly makes it clear that he/she is not making a judgement on other sectors, but that he/she is certainly attracted to a shared belief system in processes and care for the way things are executed which is hugely appealing to his/her personal value base.

In contrast, another interviewee spoke from a clear consequentialist stance about his/her values and role as a leader:

> I think it's a question of not betraying your values but recognising that in order to achieve certain things that you're going to have to do things you ordinarily wouldn't. You can do the most extraordinary things really if you've judged them right. I would have thought you need to be politically astute but that's not a negative thing to be it seems to me.
> (Interviewee 8)

This interviewee explains clearly how his/her personal value framework is different to his/her professional value framework. Using firm consequentialist reasoning, in leadership from his/her perspective, there is an understanding that some acts need to be done in order to achieve the desired or necessary outcomes. The interviewee advocates that by using judgement correctly and by being intelligent about the relationships involved, this can be a very productive way of working.

With regard to the use of judgement, another interviewee said "I think a lot of the judgments that are made are not necessarily articulated as much as they are instinctive, built on knowledge." (Interviewee 8) The use of experience, knowledge and opportunity also came up with the following interviewee:

> Certainly one makes judgements all day long and of course the scale and sort and type of them are just vastly different. In most meetings frequently I'm listening to things, talking with people, influencing, and either making judgement, or affecting judgment, or influencing a judgement. In those judgments, one is aware that judgments are always a mixture between experience and knowledge and opportunity.
> (Interviewee 5)

The interviewee below discussed the use of judgement in assessing how well he/she deals with a difficult situation:

> Where you've had to make hard decisions, you have to ask yourself how many of those individuals can you still stand up in front of, be able to talk to, and I think I probably, that's the way you make a judgement about how well you've handled those sorts of situations. If you can still talk to the people after having gone through some of those experiences then I guess on balance you might be doing better than most.
> (Interviewee 4)

Here the interviewee is applying consequentialist reasoning about the use of judgement, in that he/she judges a difficult situation to have been handled well or not depending on the outcome - in this instance whether he/she is able to stand up and face the individual involved.

Values and judgement also play a key role in approaches to risk-taking, an important theme in the management of the cultural sector due to financial constraints and at times, by the very nature of art itself. All of the interviewees were asked to discuss how they approach risk. One interviewee commented:

> It might be a huge risk but if I am determined to take it because I really feel for the values or what have you, then what I will try to do is say, what do I need to do to make it less risky.
> (Interviewee 1)

This individual is expressing deontological reasoning where if he/she feels that it is the right thing to do, no matter what the consequences, it is non-negotiable and the risk is always worth taking. He/she will then try to ensure that the right processes are in place to manage that risk. The same interviewee went on to talk about these measures to ensure that the outcomes are well-controlled:

> I am very frightened of failure, of having some kind of public dissonance so no matter how high the risk, I will have assessed the nature of that risk. I will have assessed the consequences of going forward and the consequences of not going forward. What I have to do is mediate risk. Who do I need standing beside me when I say something or other. Which ten groups of people or ten people do I need to have talked it through with beforehand so that they might at least understand or have heard me and appreciate the fact that I came… do you know what I mean?
> (Interviewee 1)

His/her admission of a fear of failure and a concern for external perceptions also suggests his/her deontological principles are tempered with a consequentialist concern for outcomes. Given the risk, he/she pays due attention to the outcomes and consequences including how the situation will reflect on himself/herself. However, he/she went on to say:

> I will always try to think how can I make myself less vulnerable? Make it less of an issue if it is to do with someone else - feeling challenged or exposed or something or the other - how can I lessen the edge of it from

their perspective? So a lot of the time I am strategising about how is this going to be perceived, who do I need to talk to, am I the best person to say it or it is it going to be less dark if someone else says it, etc.
(Interviewee 1)

The interviewee has deontological values but a consequentialist presentation of these values with regards to perception and outcomes. In another light, one interviewee spoke specifically about the role of risk in artistic leadership and the production of new work:

It is only good if it is challenging, it is only good if it is scary. If actually you don't wake up in the morning and go 'oh my god,' then you are not doing it right. And that is incredibly exciting. I mean it is only good it if is a rollercoaster in terms of making art and even then, sometimes it won't be good. So the first thing is you have got to aim for is the best in the world. The second is if you are going to be serious about risk you have to be serious about failure. You have to be strong enough to help your staff, your board, your audience understand that we have really, really tried but actually this isn't any good. That is the nature of risk. If every time you risk it is a brilliant success, you are not risking. You are just not, statistically it can't be possible.
(Interviewee 3)

This interviewee has a strong deontological approach to risk-taking and the artistic process. For him/her, the process of making art is absolutely the central focus. While there is a strong attention to the quality of the outcomes and there is a view to always try and be the "best in the world," there is an essential recognition that artistically things will not always work that is given greater emphasis. He/she has a deontological view of the intrinsic value of art itself. The artistic outcome is of less importance than the artistic process. From his/her perspective, risk-taking in artistic terms makes a consequentialist view unworkable.

Thus to summarise, it would therefore appear from these interviews, that in terms of risk-taking, both managerially and artistically, cultural leaders have a greater focus on a deontological approach. Having made a decision to pursue a certain risk, the attention is then placed on the processes and actions needed to successfully manage that consequentialist risk. This demonstrates a deontological respect of the artistic

endeavour no matter what the consequences. With regards to the role of values in cultural leadership, there was a clear divergence amongst the interviewees. Some leaders apply deontological reasoning where they hold their values so firmly that these will not be compromised for any end. Other leaders apply consequentialist reasoning with a view that certain acts may have to undertaken in order to achieve particular desired ends. The analysis of the role of judgement in cultural leadership did not always fit the deontological/consequential framework laid out in this paper, and as discussed, the findings were more suited to an analysis of the role of the virtue ethics in cultural leadership.

c. Loyalty and Customs

The role of loyalty and customs was explicitly discussed at length by some of the cultural leaders. A number of the interviewees spoke about the responsibility that they felt towards the organisation which they worked for, whether that be a loyalty to a particular set of principles for which the organisation stands, the decisions that it makes, (that are sometimes firmly grounded in its history) or an observance for certain customs which the leader felt it was necessary to follow or perhaps even, not possible to deviate from. This section discusses the ethical tensions and approaches to the themes of loyalty and customs.

One interviewee spoke at length about the tensions of working within a very institutionalised organisation that has a set of specific historical traditions and sector expectations in the way that it operates, (it is important to say that this individual was speaking about a time in his/her career when he/she working for an organisation with shared leadership):

> There are a number of instances where I was really challenged by what
> are you actually doing - that line between really really saying what you
> think and sharing how frustrating it is and what the limitations are about
> what you can do, and actually staying in the grounds of being a
> representative for the organisation for whom you are working.
> (Interviewee 1)

The interviewee went on to say that:

> There are many times when I kind of struggled with that because very often you just want to say I know it is shit, a pile of shit and it hasn't changed and they won't let me change it and I tried. You want to say all of that but you know you are part of the institution. I struggled with how I could I find my voice faced with that challenge because of course you are not happy with a lot of things that are going on. I felt frustrated and hemmed in by some of the decisions and the decision-making processes. I violently protested about a number of decisions that were made that were beyond my control.
>
> So in the end, I kind of realised that the best I could do sometimes in the most challenging situation was that I wouldn't speak against it but I wouldn't speak for it. And that is kind of my ethical sort of line. So that silence is for me the most telling thing and sometimes I have gone as far as to say this is not necessarily a decision that I can actively condone however I am part of the machine that is making it and I must take some responsibility for that.
> (Interviewee 1)

With regards to loyalty, the cultural leader is demonstrating a deontological attitude as loyalty is seen as intrinsically valuable. His/her end point is a commitment and respect for the organisation that he/she is employed by - ultimately, he/she places a higher value on the belief that as a representative for the organisation, he/she must be seen externally to support the output of the organisation. Although he/she opposes some of the decisions that the organisation takes, he/she chooses not to voice his/her disagreement publicly, but equally, chooses not to speak in favour of them. Internally, the interviewee also has a very clear deontological approach:

> Inside the organisation, my god, that is a whole different ball game because I have been down those corridors and knocked on those doors and "how dare you" and "what do you think this is" and internally I am the person who is pointing out the dissonance between this is what you are doing and this is what you are saying.
> (Interviewee 1)

He/she shows a deep concern for the importance of doing the right thing and a commitment to using his/her power to influence change and decision-making. While this is evidently a tension for him/her, he/she makes his/her ethical stance very clear by explicitly drawing on his/her personal value base:

> I never quite warmed to those people who banged on about the organisation that they were working for. I worked for X so I have to have loyalty to them, at least whilst I am in it. And if you hate it that much then go. Vote with your feet. If you hate it that much and it is that bad and that terrible then go and join a campaigning organisation and fight from the outside.
> (Interviewee 1)

Here, the interviewee displays a deontological view that loyalty is intrinsically valuable which he/she believes other people are failing. Loyalty is clearly highly valued within the sector as a whole. This may be in part because so many of the relationships in the cultural sector are based on trust. The discussion of loyalty falls more within a framework of virtue ethics which focuses primarily on what sort of moral person one should try to be rather than rules or consequences. If a professional code of ethics were to be created for the cultural sector, it may have certain deontological principles of which loyalty may be one.

The ethical approaches by this leader present an interesting point about cultural leadership. It suggests that internally, some leaders have a strong belief that there is a right and a wrong way to work. This may be manifest in areas such as supporting new work, artists' development, inclusion, participation, or a policy such as maintaining equality and diversity. Meanwhile, externally, they feel a need or pressure to represent their organisation in a certain light, which may mean following or presenting views or policies which they personally do not agree with but which they feel are intrinsically important to the standing or position of the organisation where they work or lead. Examples of this may be participation in a particular event, acceptance of a grant, or 'politically' supporting an individual whom they personally dislike. All of these represent deontological ethical approaches, though in conflict, they determine that certain behaviours are right or wrong no matter what the consequences.

The interviewee below also speaking from a shared-leadership role, similarly spoke of the tension of having to follow values, beliefs or processes that he/she doesn't necessarily agree with:

> That is actually a daily tension because I don't agree with everything that X does or says and I have to myself recognise when I should and can say something to that effect or when I just need to go with the decision that is being made or the direction of travel that is being set out.
> (Interviewee 2)

In this quote, the interviewee clearly shows conflict as his/her personal deontological ethics are compromised. He/she is describing a process whereby he/she makes a judgement in any particular situation, which depends on the extent of the ability of his/her influence to make a difference or where he/she feels he/she would be better placed to follow a decision even if he/she doesn't agree with it. Though he/she demonstrates a deontological concern for the rightness or wrongness of actions as he/she sees it, he/she places a greater value on the consequentialist approach of following decisions out of loyalty and respect for a senior leader or colleague. H/she accepts the ethical struggle here and takes a consequentialist approach which is in conflict with his/her own deontological principles. Though the interviewee feels a tension here in terms of the relationship, he/she expresses why this approach is important:

> I still have a lot of my career ahead of me and tactically I don't want to do anything stupid to upset that. My future is probably somewhere in the external environment beyond this role and so the network is very important, and the network is not just about direct communication with those people, it is about how X communicates about me or how other people perceive me through him.
> (Interviewee 2)

Whilst loyalty to the senior leader and the organisation is an important and genuine factor here, the interviewee is also considering longer-term outcomes in terms of his/her career development and what he/she deems necessary with this in mind, displaying a conflicted consequentialist approach.

From these two interviewees speaking of their experiences in shared leadership roles, it appears that often a consequentialist approach must be adopted in order to 'survive' in an organisation, with a vocal and articulated respect for and loyalty to the organisation. Even if the individuals themselves have a deontological view on a particular issue, unless they have the ultimate power and say, it appears that this must be compromised at times in favour of a consequentialist approach. The reasoning being that it is more important to be seen to be supporting the organisation or the position of the more senior leader out of a loyalty or respect to the organisation and a need not to be seen as 'going against the grain' externally. It is also important to note that we are talking about highly prestigious and well-regarded national institutions where it must be extremely hard to challenge the status quo or be seen to be being 'difficult.' The application of consequentialist reasoning, at the expense of their own deontological inclinations is also a result of the two individuals considering their future careers.

As well as a consideration of loyalty to an organisation, the interviewees also spoke about the observance of a particular set of organisational customs, which is especially the case of the major national institutions. For example one interviewee said, "Of course a lot of what one does is guided by custom." (Interviewee 5) This is an interesting point with regards to ethical theory as it shows the potential influence, power and long-term impact of how things have been approached in the past, ways of doing things that are simply carried forward, and the complexities of breaking with custom. For instance, one interviewee said:

> X is a very old institution in many ways – not *that* much has changed over the years. That's not to say we are outdated or not progressive, or that we're not doing amazing work with our productions and education work and so on, but there's a lot of baggage that comes with running an organisation like X, and that's something you have to be very aware of. And it's not easy to lose that or make big changes very quickly.
> (Interviewee 6)

This interviewee has a strong recognition of how things have been done in the past that he/she respects and works within. This leader displays a deontological approach with regards to customs as he/she believes that these customs have value and are intrinsically right. In some cases though, it may simply be impossible to break with certain customs, for example, historical or political decrees about the institution's

existence, which may well be out-dated, and issues such as private patronage that the leader may no longer wish to be associated with, but which have to be followed and respected no matter how strong and determined the individual. For example one interviewee expressed, "Custom, being the way things are done institutionally, is very-very powerful." (Interviewee 5)

This interviewee also described the complexities associated with customs in another light:

> There's other hugely important circuits within the region, international and nationally of other kinds, and you want to be in that larger circle, so you'll be aware of their customs - those you can interact with, those you can't interact with very much.
> (Interviewee 5)

Whilst the interviewee confesses that he/she wants the institution to be part of important regional, national and international networks, he/she states there are some customs that he simply will not observe, regardless of the consequentialist outcome of being included in these wider networks. He/she displays a deontological stance placing a greater value on his/her beliefs about how the institution can and can't behave with an understanding that the consequence will be that it is excluded from some significant circuits. This may mean not touring to venues in certain countries because of their political regimes or not being part of a national or international association because of their stance on a particular issue.

As with loyalty, the discussion of customs by both of these interviewees suggest complex ethical situations which require the individual to have a clear belief system about what they will and will not accept or how they will or will not act. There appears to be a predominantly deontological attitude in that both interviewees made firm acknowledgements of the power of customs and their value. There was also a recognition that there will be occasions and situations when customs should not be followed as they may be wrong or unacceptable from the leader's perspective, again demonstrating deontological thinking. Particular customs may be overridden where the individual leader placed a higher importance on another issue that he/she believed to be intrinsically more valuable than following the custom. It was also evident though that decisions are often constrained by customs. Deontologists will override a particular custom but only when they perceive higher values to be at stake. Leaders with a

consequentialist outlook will abandon custom too but only where and when it not meeting their end aims.

Closely linked-in with custom are the themes of politics, money and the constituency, as often a consideration of these areas is guided by "how things are done" by the organisation over time, even though these three themes are hotbed issues for the cultural sector. They will be discussed in the following section.

d. Politics, Money and the Constituency

It would be almost impossible to have a discussion about ethics and cultural leadership without addressing the areas of politics, money and the constituency whom the institutions seek to serve. The cultural sector is intrinsically linked to politics through its heavy reliance on public subsidy which is granted through the Treasury. It is therefore extremely susceptible to political change. Cultural leaders have to be very politically astute and shrewd, and be armed to play the political game as representatives for their organisations but also for the wider cultural sector. The national institutions also play a very significant diplomatic role for government and can be called upon very strategically. All of the leaders interviewed for this project have a seat at the top cultural political table and are consulted and briefed directly by the most senior politicians.

Adequate finance does not come from government alone and cultural leaders must be enterprising and commercially discerning individuals who are able to seek out opportunities and forge relationships to secure enough money for the delivery of their programmes, capital and development whether that be through business sponsorship, private individuals or foundations.

Along with considerations of money and sustaining the organisation financially is the public. As national institutions serving the whole public, each must be aware of the widest possible plurality of interests and diversity in terms of their existing and potential audiences. As well as setting their own agendas around inclusion and audience development, as recipients of public money, there are also requirements and targets from government in this area. This section seeks to explore the ethical approaches taken with regards to the three areas of politics, money and the constituency.

All of the interviewees in this research project are in receipt of major government funding for their organisations. There has been much debate in the wider cultural sector about the interference of government in the arts and the imposition of targets around education and social inclusion which has been seen to detract from the intrinsic value of art itself. However, all of the interviewees expressed a clear recognition of the responsibilities that came with that level of investment and its requirements. For example one interviewee expressed, "Having tax payers monies obviously brings with it responsibilities." (Interviewee 5) He/she went on to say:

> Some people talk about the independence of these great institutions and I would argue hugely for our independence, that we don't have the kind of interference that we see in other countries. For me though that has never been a difficulty because I've always taken the view that of course government is going to ask for things. No government gives anything to anybody without an expectation of things in return.
> (Interviewee 5)

This interviewee expresses clear consequentialist reasoning about the conditions that come with public grants and knowingly accepts that in return for the money, the institution will required to deliver certain outcomes. The same interviewee went on to explain this position further, again establishing his/her consequentialist view on funding:

> I argue consistently with Government they don't give us enough money and they would do better to give us more because we would give very very good public value back. We choose to take the £7 million from government, in which case we shouldn't be naive about the fact that government will have influence that comes with it.
> (Interviewee 5)

Another interviewee gave an explicit example of how this influence may manifest itself:

> If a large Saudi company say to us we are going to give you ten million pounds for a new building and we expect to have an exhibition here about Saudi history and culture, we are probably going to do it because we can't afford not to. That is something that you just have to live with. The government would, because of its various relationships with Saudi

Arabia especially in the defence industry, probably expect us to do it as well. Not because they would apply pressure but us doing it would help them and that is a role that we would have to play - we have to recognise that we have a very significant diplomatic role to do which not all museum and cultural organisations do.

(Interviewee 2)

The interviewee described the ethical thinking that would come into play in such a situation, "How do their values sit within the institution? How is it going to play to your public? If you name your gallery after a Saudi prince, is that going to stop people going in that gallery? (Interviewee 2) However, he/she conceded that it was too important to stay in favour with the government (and also vital to raise money for the institution).

These interviewees therefore demonstrate consequentialist reasoning with regards to politics and the money they receive. They have an appreciation that the funding is going to be attached to specific requirements, spoken or unspoken, which may require them to do things that they may not necessarily feel comfortable doing, but which is outweighed by the outcome of receiving the money.

It is clear why a consequentialist approach would preside over a deontological approach. All of the institutions have little or no option but to accept government funding with the requirements attached. Not doing so would seriously impact the operational ability of the organisation and the artistic programme. It also works in their favour to have a close relationship with government for the benefit of their organisations. For instance one interview said, "You often find yourself as an unlikely bed fellow with a politician because you need their support for a particular issue. It's not something you especially enjoy but it's a necessary part of the role." (Interviewee 6) The majority of the cultural sector would argue that it was vital to have for representation by sector representatives at this level.

With regards to money, the focus of discussion in the interviews was largely on raising money from the private sector to support the arts. One interviewee described the tension this can cause:

The dilemma for me in having to chase money, say from the private sector or from individuals, having to be nice to really unpleasant people. "I'm being hypocrite, I shouldn't be doing this." And I think in a way that's

one of the difficult things about working in these organisations, the not-for-profit sector even bigger than the art sector, is that too often you have to be not true to yourself but thinking about the net gain for either the organisation or society, and the fact that now there are many public figures that I abhor that I've had to be charming to and escort around. They're the sorts of things where you often think 'I'm pushing it a bit here'.

(Interviewee 4)

This quote excellently encapsulates the thinking of many of the interviewees. The individual is using a deontological approach to courting money from the private sector by expressing concern and attention to the acts involved, being intrinsically good or bad, right or wrong. However, he/she ultimately applies a consequentialist approach to the process, which he/she is clearly uncomfortable with, for the benefit of the organisation and the people it serves, reasoning that the outcome of securing the money takes precedence over what needs to be done to get it.

This consequentialist approach was similarly applied by another interviewee in a particular situation where he/she had to secure financial support from the private sector to prevent a capital development project from going under:

I very quickly realised that my board of directors were living in the 1970s, and the very thought of accepting money from a private investment company was going to cause outrage and resignations by governors. In my head, it was already a done deal. If we didn't accept the money, we were going to have to lose staff, all our contractors and all but close down overnight.

(Interviewee 6)

In this situation, this individual used clear consequentialist reasoning. She was aware that the decision to accept the money was going to cause serious and controversial issues, but she deemed the ultimate goal of securing the money to complete the project as far more important and preferable than not accepting the money. The decision though had huge consequences for her as a leader, "I was publicly chastised for it in the press and amongst the whole sector. No one stood by me. It was very hard." (Interviewee 6) This demonstrates a real strength in this individual, who knew that taking a

44

consequentialist approach was going to reflect very badly on him/her. In accepting the money from the private sponsor, he/she was also ensuring that people were not going to loose their jobs overnight, commitments made in contracts would be made, and the money invested so far would not be wasted or lost.

The decision of whether to accept money from the private sector where they may be dubious connections, for example with links to defence or from countries with specific policies on women or homosexuality, was approached with little uncertainty, as explained by the following interviewee:

> We have these dilemmas all the time and our Ethics Committee quite rightly say, "We will not accept totally anonymous donations, we need to know who's giving the money, we need to know that the money hasn't been obtained illegally". Other than that, in my view all money it tainted anyway. If you really start therefore all you can do really is that, know where it's coming from and know within the terms of the law. You can make a stand on smoking or drugs or pharmaceuticals, arms trading, of course you can, but once you start doing that you're almost on a road to nothing - almost. I don't know but I'd say it's a fairly pragmatic view.
> (Interviewee 8)

Another interviewee said:

> You have to ask a series of questions which is, firstly how do I personally feel about their values and how do they sit with mine? And actually at the end of the day, I am probably prepared to do almost everything if it is for the good of the organisation and ... whilst I would never say that publicly... I would go a very long way down the road on some issues to make sure that the organisation benefits for the longer term whereas others might stop at the first hurdle and say I don't agree on their policy on women and therefore I am not prepared to engage with them.
> (Interviewee 2)

Both of these interviewees are applying strong consequentialist reasoning. While they recognise and acknowledge that some relationships are not especially desirable, they have a belief, and even perhaps a need, that the benefit of securing the money for their

institution far outweighs the costs of not having it. One interviewee also shared the same belief but provided some stipulations:

> Providing it was above board and given without strings attached. I'd have a problem if I think if it had been from British American Tobacco or from the Moonies or from some sort of shady oil magnate from Russia or something about whom there's been lots of scandal. One could think of circumstances in which money of that kind would not be acceptable but if it's a blue chip company and it's all above board and it's clear what's happening, then no problems.
> (Interviewee 7)

This interviewee expresses an ethical concern around certain sources of money where he/she would adopt a deontological approach in which the need for the money would not take precedence over his/her ethical beliefs about where it was right or wrong to accept the money from.

One interviewee made the point that:

> One tries to find ways around things but I realise that you've got to be very-very careful with sponsors not to end up in a compromise position ethically for the wrong reason, or without realising it.
> (Interviewee 5)

This quote demonstrates that whilst a consequentialist approach is often taken with regards to securing money from the private sector, it is not done so blindly or without due thought to the processes that will need to be involved. For example one interviewee spoke of a situation when banking sponsors of a photographic exhibition got very nervous about the contents of the show:

> They said "You're crazy, you can't have X in this exhibition, and have us sponsor it". So we said "Yes we can and we think we can and should, but we need to tell you why." Hugely to their credit they went into a process in which we could talk it through. And we did a lot of things like made sure there was a way in which they could write to their clients from me, I did a presentation with one of our curators a week before the exhibition

opened to their 1,500 staff here in London. We really worked on it and in the end it was fine."

(Interviewee 5)

Overall, the interviewees reflected that the decisions they are faced with concerning money are not always black or white. The financial volatility of the sector as a whole and the competition for funds amongst institutions and the private sector meant that often a conscious consequentialist approach had to be taken in the face of very limited options. This consequentialist approach may also be taken because the leaders believe in the end goal so much, for example allowing an education wing to be built or providing a national tour for an exhibition, that they will do anything to reach it.

This commitment to making work happen leads us on to a consideration of the ethical theory applied when discussing the role of the constituency that these organisations seek to serve. In recent years, there has been a great focus on diversity and equality in the cultural sector with regards to inclusion and participation, which shows an ethical concern in itself. All cultural institutions in receipt of public funding, of any scale, have detailed plans and strategies about how they will engage new and potential audiences. This is an especially complex issue for the national institutions as their remit is so large with regards to the diversity of the constituencies they serve, including international visitors, and the geographical spread they cover. For the purposes of this project, the issue of prioritisation of audiences was discussed during the interviews. As one interviewee said, "But for me that's the major issue - for whom are we working, for whom are we doing it, and for whom are we responsible." (Interviewee 5)

The interviewee below was explicitly clear about how he/she sought to bring some order to the diversity of his programme and the potential audiences that it could attract:

You're looking at what is the overall output of the organisation, the impact that it's having on the world and the people is something that you're continually trying to maximise, but you're trying to do that in way that is socially beneficial - a bottom line for me.

(Interviewee 4)

For this leader, the focus is on how he can have an impact on the addressing a potential audience from those groups that may be currently excluded or disengaged from the arts. He/she went on to say:

> It's taken me along time to actually think about whether my behaviour, whether I'd closed myself off too much to what was going on, and whether I probably could have had much more influence on peoples' lives and careers. And I was really being confronted by situations where you looked at people and you could see where unless people like yourself took certain courses of direct action, then there are many people who may be denied a fair go and would never get the opportunities that I've been given.
> (Interviewee 4)

This individual is using consequentialist ethical thinking when considering how he/she sets priorities for his/her audience development. He/she unmistakably holds a strong personal concern for equality of opportunity - a strong ethical concern - and asks himself/herself whether there is more he/she could do to help achieve his/her goals with regards to the audience. He/she has a strongly ethical approach to audiences and is focused on his/her end aims of building the relationships between art and opportunity.

A clear deontological view was expressed by another interviewee while discussing inclusion with regards to funding agreements:

> When X was director of X there was a moment when he made some point about "how is it that the government thinks X is going to reduce the rate of teenage pregnancies in west London?" And did so partly joking, partly joshing the government in this post Blair period, of seeming to want a more instrumental approach to arts funding. As it happens, the idea that you might not necessarily or superficially reduce teenage pregnancies but you might actually be seeking to have a wider audience, and you much actually be seeking to broaden not just to have a wider but a much more broader, deeper shift in the range of those who participate in arts whether that's culturally, ethnically, age, all different factors about who might want it, seems to be straight forward to me.
> (Interviewee 5)

This interviewee displays strong deontological affinity through his/her firmly held belief in the importance of broadening his/her audience base, increasing participation and also a deep-seated belief in the power of the arts to make a significant impact on individuals. This compelling deontological reasoning was also displayed by the interviewee below:

> Every time I have been very, very clear that there is a hierarchy of disadvantage - the most important are the most excluded at whatever level. So when we set up X, the criteria were the most deprived wards in the country. In X we introduced programmes for looked after children and refugees, and that in X was rather revolutionary actually because X didn't really think of themselves as being a place for people who had no homes and no carers and refugees.   So for me, that has always been a perfectly clear priority really, sometimes it is explicitly and sometimes not."
>
> (Interviewee 4)

From these interviewees, it is evident that there is a strong deontological approach with regards to the prioritisation of audiences. They believe intrinsically in the value of diversifying their audiences. The impact that the organisation can have on its community is taken very seriously, and the concern to involve as wide and broad an audience as is possible was clearly approached with a great care and attention by the interviewees.

In this chapter, the key themes that were drawn out from the eight interviewees have been explored using quotes from the interviews and analysed through the ethical frameworks of consequentialist and deontological thinking. The final chapter will summarise the main ideas of this research project and draw some conclusions from its undertaking concerning the current role of ethics and cultural leadership.

Chapter Five

Conclusions

This research project was designed to explore the relationship and role of ethics in the leadership of the cultural sector. The focus of the project was on the leadership of the UK's major national cultural institutions, which, by the complex combination of their artistic, political and financial status hold a great deal of influence on the wider cultural sector nationally. Eight key cultural figures were interviewed in person for this project, and their interviews formed the source material used to consider and analyse the ethical thinking that is currently applied in leadership of the sector.

The research project revealed the complexity of ethics within leadership of the cultural sector as articulated by the interviewee below:

> I think cultural organisations and particularly one like this, are very complex and very difficult to make work in an ideal way. I think what we do is balance a whole lot of things, balance the idea of the interests of the artists, the interests of the art forms, the interests of the staff, the interests of the audience. For the person who's running it with all of the people who work with me, it becomes an issue of making certain judgements along each day, each week, each year, that you think are actually going to progress it.
> (Interviewee 4)

There are some important conclusions that came from the undertaking of the research as a whole. Firstly, all of the interviewees responded extremely enthusiastically to the theme of ethics and leadership. Many of the interviewees said that it was first time that they had been asked to talk about ethics in the context of their leadership role. All had done some level of preparation either in the form of notes or thinking in advance of the interview. It was clear that it was an area that had caught their attention and interest.

All of the interviewees were willing to engage in deep and considered dialogue. Ensuring confidentiality allowed them to speak candidly and specifically, giving detailed examples of real-life situations and speaking honestly about times in their careers when they have felt especially challenged or troubled. In most cases, the one hour time frame of the interview was too short and given the opportunity to extend the time, the majority of the

leaders commented that they would have liked to continue the discussion. Five of the interviewees invited further discussion at a later date. There is therefore a strong indication that this is a highly under-researched and under-discussed area and that more conversations are needed and would be welcomed about ethics and leadership in the cultural sector.[1]

Secondly, the key themes of consultative leadership, decision-making, values, judgements, risk-taking, loyalty, customs, politics, money and the constituency as discussed in this project, arose from the concentration of discussion in the interviews. This therefore demonstrates the main areas of ethical concern as deemed by the individuals currently operating in the sector. During the design of this research project, given the current 'hot' topics in the sector, it had been anticipated that the project would explore how the leaders' value frameworks and ethical stances approached the four themes of cultural value, engagement, legitimacy and risk. Although there is cross-over here between what was anticipated and what actually came out of the interviews, the themes were framed differently by the interviewees showing a particular practical approach which may not necessarily be expected from the outside.

Thirdly, it was evident that each of the themes discussed could warrant an entire research project on its own. It was perhaps too ambitious for a project of this scale to consider the whole theme of ethics and cultural leadership. The discussions that took place represented only the tip of the iceberg and clearly presented the potential to explore each of the themes in greater depth.

Fourthly, the interviewees discussed the role of ethics in their leadership from the perspective of the way in which they operate in their roles. One interviewee said:

---

[1] Interestingly, a conference held in June 2008 by The London Centre for Arts and Cultural Enterprise and The Cultural Leadership Programme on the theme of ethics and the cultural sector, focused on issues such as art and religion, the economics of art, the use of public spaces, and faith and conflict in art, looking at questions such as how can the creative industries use their economic pulling-power to change society for the better? What kinds of values should the arts represent? How can culture mediate in conflict and is there a place for artists in war zones? Though the conference included keynote speeches and submissions by leading cultural figures, the role of ethics in the leadership of the sector was not discussed.

I do think I work within a view of an ethical framework, and I probably would use that word more than I'd use moral although I might talk about certain moral issues and moral dilemmas and I'd certainly talk about certain values.

(Interviewee 5)

There appeared to be a less than anticipated distinction or divide in the public and private approach to ethics amongst the leaders with the exception of loyalty where there appeared to be considerable movement. Their approaches and positions on ethical issues came from a personal viewpoint or position which they greatly valued and felt deeply about. This is a unique point about ethics and cultural leadership. In other professions such as the medical or legal sectors, it would be considered highly inappropriate for an individual to be applying their personal ethical viewpoint in a professional situation. Here there would be a clear public/private divide which doesn't appear to exist in the cultural sector. This may be due in part to the fact that there is no given code of ethics for leadership of the cultural sector or explicit standards and rules that have to be followed. However, discussions such as the issue of loyalty suggest that there may be implicit and/or emerging expectations, standards or rules. The implication is that it therefore falls on the individual to make use of their own judgement, values and experience in their work contexts. This makes the role of the individual as leader extremely significant as it is their personal value framework and ethical stance that hugely influences the organisational culture and its value framework.

Fifthly, it was interesting to observe that on many occasions, leaders did not seem to be aware of particular ethical decisions or situations at the actual time of experiencing them, but rather only on reflection or where the ethical dilemma was particularly stark. This may be due to the multiplicity of decisions and the scope of work that each individual has to manage day-to-day. It again demonstrates the importance of the individual in the running of the major national institutions and organisations, and the number of small ethical situations that they are confronted with everyday. If a professional code of ethics existed for the cultural sector, there would be committees to reflect on how things are being done and what decisions should be made. In the cultural sector, this is left largely to the individual. This code could give guidance on how far leadership should be consultative or how far people should be expected to stay loyal to their organisation.

The sixth point is that it is important to restate that this research project includes the viewpoints of only eight individuals and therefore does not attempt to offer any absolutes or conclusive statements concerning the way that ethics in approached in leadership of the cultural sector. However, it is equally significant to say that each of these eight individuals is highly regarded and influential. They have long career histories occupying a range of key roles in the sector, leading major institutions and organisations. They will also be working in the sector for many years to come so their potential long-term influence is great. Furthermore, much of what they said overlapped which suggests perhaps further study would reveal commonality in leadership methods and approaches in the sector.

The seventh point in conclusion is that in relation to the ethical theory and the key themes, in no area did one particular ethical position stand out over another. In each instance, there were differing ethical approaches being used. In areas such as risk-taking and the constituency, broadly speaking, a stronger deontological approach appears to be taken. In these areas, the values and the nature of the acts involved are extremely important. In areas such as politics and money, a consequentialist approach appears to take greater precedence. The focus is on the end outcomes and ensuring that whatever is needed is done to achieve them.

In other areas such as consultative leadership, decision-making, values and judgements, and loyalty and customs, a mix of deontological and consequentialist ethical approaches are taken. This depends on the individual and how they apply their particular values to a given situation, for example, whether they place a higher emphasis on their own values or putting a loyalty to the organisation where they work first.

This research project has also demonstrated that the same individual may apply consequentialist reasoning in one situation while applying deontological reasoning in another. This should not be considered as an inconsistent ethical approach by the individual. Indeed, most people will use different ethical thinking depending on a particular situation and/or set of circumstances. Where an individual displays a deontological approach, it is often an indication of the things that matter most to them. Nothing will make them compromise this value or principle no matter what or where it would get them. Equally however, consequentialist ends are often held very dearly too in that people believe in a certain end so much they will do anything to reach it.

There is an issue however when individuals take an inconsistent approach on the same points as in essence, it suggests that what they will say or how they will act depends on what day it is. There did not appear to be any such instances in the discussions of ethics in cultural leadership with the interviewees, which demonstrates that cultural leaders are consistent in their use of ethical reasoning, using the same forms in the same contexts. As one interviewee said "I couldn't quite live with myself if I didn't' behave consistently." (Interviewee 1) She went on to say:

> Yes you are challenged and I guess you have to find your lines of integrity and consistency and that affirmation of who I am, what I stand for, what my principles are and what I am not prepared to do and say. (Interviewee 1)

Cultural leaders clearly take the area of ethics and leadership very seriously. Ethical decisions and positions present themselves on a daily basis, and much thought and deliberation is given to the way that individuals respond and act in any given situation.

Taken together, this research project provides an analysis of the ethical theory currently being applied in leadership of the cultural sector. It has presented some of the difficult tensions that cultural leaders face and has highlighted the importance of the role of the individual's ethical and value framework in how ethical situations are approached organisationally. This project provides a basis for further discussion and exploration of this area.

Bibliography

Books

Baron, M, Pettit, P, Slote, M. 1999, *Three Methods of Ethics,* third edition. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

Blackburn, S. 2003. *Ethics: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Darwall, S.1998. *Philosophical Ethics*. Oxford: Westview Press.

Geirsson, H and Holmgren, M (eds) 2001. *Ethical Theory*, second edition. Ontario: Broadview Press.

Rachels, J 1999. *The Element of Moral Philosophy.* India: New Delhi: McGraw Hill International Editions.

Official Papers and Reports

Cowling, J, Burchfield J, and Purvis, C (2005) *A position of trust, a duty of care: Governance in the not-for-profit cultural sector.* London: Mission, Models, Money

McMaster, B (2008) *Supporting Excellence in the Arts: From Measurement to Excellence*. London: The Department of Culture, Media and Sport.

Various authors (2006) *Developing leadership: the challenge for the cultural sector.* London: Arts Council England, Creative & Cultural Skills and the Museums, Libraries and Archives Council.