

Noticing, curation, cultivation: Academic development leadership in the arts university

Catherine Smith, University of the Arts London

Abstract

The curation of four ‘teaching exhibitions’ of pedagogic research outputs in a specialist arts university is presented as a case study of distributed leadership practice, with the leadership in question being positioned as a feminized mode of leading educational or academic development from a middle-out position. Scholarship of teaching and learning focused upon the development of academic micro-cultures within universities (Roxå and Mårtensson 2015) is collided with thinking around arts-informed approaches to leadership (Latham 2014). Through reflexively evaluating her nascent curatorial practice, the author reconsiders what academic development leadership in the specific organizational culture of the arts university can look like when arts modalities are brought into play.

Keywords

teaching exhibitions; curation; art school; leadership; academic development; academic practice

Introduction

Taking as its epistemological point of departure the idea of leadership as a socially constructed phenomenon (Fairhurst and Grant 2010), this article sets out to critically analyse a case study of my leadership practice within the arts university in which I work. In doing so, I briefly outline my professional context, and describe the project work – a series of exhibitions of educational research – before reflecting on my own leadership role in the case (Savage 2007).

I then re-present the case as an example of distributed leadership (Gronn 2000). In making this analysis, I collide scholarship of teaching and learning focused upon the development of academic micro-cultures within universities (Roxå and Mårtensson 2015) with thinking around arts-informed approaches to leadership (Latham 2014).

I consider what academic development leadership in the specific organizational culture of the art school can look like. The looking is important. As is culture. I conceptualize culture following the theorist Raymond Williams, as a way of life *and* arts and learning (1958), along with broad notions of organizational culture (e.g. Schein 2016), and specific consideration of art school culture (Adler 1979, Llewellyn 2015, Tickner 2008).

Professional context: art school educational development

I work in a UK-based, specialist arts university, as director of a postgraduate programme in Academic Practice. As course leader of a Masters course (also overseeing its sister Postgraduate Certificate) I manage a team of over 20 lecturers, leading on curriculum development and delivery for our 150+ participants, who are mostly colleagues undertaking part-time study as continuing professional development. My leadership context is leading the facilitation of learning about academic practice in a community of practice (Lave and Wenger 1991) of creative practitioners. Our learners are educators, and therefore themselves leaders, in so far as any educational organization might be considered a site of distributed leadership (Gronn 2000). The case study I present for consideration lies outside, but intersects with my core programme leadership role.

The case: curating teaching exhibitions

In 2016, as part of an academic enhancement project I was leading, I co-curated the first exhibition of teaching within my university, *Practices of Enquiry*. The wider project was showcasing and developing enquiry-based learning, proposing it as a common pedagogic model within art school. As project manager, I set up a cross-university working group of staff and student stakeholders to co-design and deliver a number of project interventions. The team was keen to showcase teaching excellence in a way that would engage the community via its own visual vernacular. The idea for an exhibition of teaching was borne out of an ideas generation session early in the project and quickly morphed into a central output. The show saw student researchers document examples of innovative enquiry-based teaching practice, and re-present them as art installations. Through the private view and associated events programme we engaged over 500 people within a week.

Since then, I have initiated and co-curated 3 further exhibitions of teaching. Each has had a different theme and purpose, appearing in galleries across multiple campuses. The second,

Lost and Found (2018), was a collaboration with a university archive department. It represented themes emerging from a funded institutional memory research project, exploring how art school teaching practices developed over a specific period of time. The third exhibition, *Education in Progress* (2019), brought together and surfaced learning from our university's teaching scholar's programme, an educational development initiative that funds teaching staff to conduct applied pedagogic research into their own teaching contexts. The most recent show, *Academics, in Practice* (2020), was a degree show for graduating students from my MA Academic Practice course to articulate aspects of their dissertation enquiries.

This pattern of exhibitions evolved organically; they were unconnected as projects. Despite this there are two significant ties that bind them. The first is thematic: they have all been attempts to visualize educational research conducted within the university. The second is personal: I conceived the ideas and worked with others to bring them into being. Beyond this point, the precise exhibition content is superfluous. The remainder of this article will be used as a tool of enquiry, to interrupt this nascent curatorial academic development practice, using aspects of leadership theory as a lens through which to critically reflect upon the work as leadership, and therefore develop its capability as change agent.



Images, clockwise from top left:

Figure 1: Smith, C. *'Practices of Enquiry'* exhibition, 2016. [Photograph] London.

Figure 2: Burns, E. *'Lost and Found'* exhibition, 2018. [Photograph] London.

Figure 3: Smith, C. *'Education in Progress'* exhibition, 2019. [Photograph] London.

Figure 4: Marsden, R. *'Academics, in Practice'* exhibition, 2020. [Photograph] London.

Leadership: through a social constructionist lens

Leadership discourse stretches as far back in time as Plato and his idea of the philosopher-king (Kellerman 2018: 17). Historically associated with nationhood, state-craft and military power, the 20th century saw leadership conceptualised through a series of evolving foci, from associations of power, domination, influence, focus upon the leader, focus upon the group, behaviour, the organization, influence, traits and transformational potential (Rost 1991, in Northouse 2013: 2-5). In the 1980s, leadership detached itself from its mother discipline of management studies, and became widely regarded as a field in its own right. In common with many other academic fields, it defies reductive definition, offering a plurality of often contradictory models and theories. Avolio *et al's* review of current and future leadership theories and directions (2009) identified a range of contemporary thematics, including authentic leadership, leadership cognition, complexity leadership, distributed leadership, followership, e-leadership and more. Despite the vast array of leadership definitions precluding conclusive definition, scholars generally agree that the idea of human influence lies at the core of the concept of leadership (Mullins and Christy 2010: 373).

Offsetting this linear narrative, the post-structuralist school of social constructionist thought (Berger and Luckman 1966) suggests that leadership (along with other theories in use) is formulated in linguistic dialogue and interaction between human actors, and does not exist as objective truth. Fairhurst and Grant propose, 'language does not mirror reality, rather it constitutes it' (2010: 174); leadership might be considered merely as a linguistic attempt to build a world into which forms of leadership can then be propelled and operationalized. This line of argument asserts that humans create or construct an idea using discourse, and that the idea then in turn makes and shapes reality in a particular way, usually in a manner convenient to governing forces of power (Foucault 1972). These ideas align with my epistemological belief, that knowledge is not given, fixed or uncontestable, rather it is always situated (Haraway 1988) and open to interpretation. The interpretivist paradigm within which I construct, deconstruct and reconstruct a plurality of knowledges is brought to bear in how I practise as a professional, a thinker and as a leader. In order to begin to analyse my curatorial

practice as an act of leadership, it is necessary to contemplate, to ‘become aware’ (Gunnlaugson 2011: 3) of my perceptions of myself as leader, uncertain as I am about inhabiting this discursive terrain.

Valuing noticing

Leadership development literature advocates intrapersonal reflection on identity and values for enhancing leader development (Day *et al* 2014: 65). I position my leadership practice as centred on a core value of *noticing*, a driver for ‘living in, and hence learning from, experience’ (Mason 2002: 29). This is relevant for multiple reasons. Firstly, although Mason conceptualises noticing primarily as a tool for enquiring into one’s own practice, he also argues for it in the context of leading professional development, arguing that ‘any intentional professional development has the aim of enhancing noticing’ (2002: 144). My academic development role draws upon collegiate practices of noticing; much of my teaching centres on supporting colleagues to transform their anecdotal observations about context and practice into researchable enquiries. My PgCert and MA Academic Practice programme context brings together participants from different disciplinary fields and various job roles (technicians, academics, librarians, outreach workers and student support staff). Learning from the rich diversity of each other’s practices, knowledges and research interests fosters curiosity, challenge and critique.

Perhaps this is made easier because the art school context is a hotbed of noticing. Institutional discourse privileges visual epistemologies; ways of knowing, becoming and coming to know (Barnett 2009: 429) that are practiced through modes of communication mediated by the construction and critique of visual ‘texts’. The environment is infused by aesthetic considerations. Furthermore, in the arts the notion of practice is important, itself signifying many diverse practices. It can be conceived of as a mode of thinking through making (Ingold 2014); a research methodology (Barrett and Bolt 2007); a cognate subject discipline (e.g. Fine Art); or as a verb, the iterative nature of creative learning. As I reflect on my leadership practice, I am considering it through all of these lenses: as a set of professional practices encompassing creative modes of working; a way of making new knowledge about the ways in which I work; leadership as a function of my work; and as something that needs to be continually worked at (Perusso *et al* 2019).

Noticing constitutes a feminized version of leadership, a counter to dominant, male-centric, hegemonic leadership rhetoric (e.g. Kellerman 2018). I propose noticing as a tender leadership practice, that takes care. This underlying value of care resonates with the construct of emotionally intelligent leadership (Goleman *et al* 2002). Goleman *et al* conceived emotional intelligence as an attitude or capacity for attuning oneself to the needs of others, rather than a singular particular leadership style. I observe echoes of this in my various professional practices, all of which attend to others, taking the temperature of situations through deliberate, embodied habits of listening, questioning and nurturing. This plays out in my student-centred teaching practice, but also in the way that I work with, and lead, people and projects. In the context of my embryonic exhibition practice the idea of care has particular resonance as curation is etymologically linked to the Latin *curare*, ‘to take care of’, connected to *curatus*: ‘one responsible for the care of souls’ (<https://www.etymonline.com/word/curate> 2020). Hesitant as I am to call myself a curator – a profession that I am not trained in, and am only playing around the edges of – I am interested to re-consider the exhibitions as an act of institutional care. I will return to this.

Noticing cares about detail. The trouble with paying attention to detail is that it is messy and exhausting. I scrutinize in minutiae the work produced by others. As a project leader, this allows me to know what is going on and make informed decisions. However, attention to too much detail is unsustainable long term and risks feeling overbearing to those on the receiving end. Much has been written on the subject of the difference between managing and leading (e.g. Kent 2005 in Mullins and Christy 2010: 374), with a general critique of management being overly focused upon process and product, compared to the transformational, visionary nature of leadership. In transition from being a manager to becoming a leader I need to prevent myself from seeing too much, whilst retaining creative oversight. A forensic leadership practice will always miss things, because the strain required to rapidly change focus from the micro to the meso to the macro and back again creates blind spots.

Under-valuing vision

As I begin to consider the exhibitions as a body of practice, I wonder if a surfeit of noticing might have occluded the creation of an overarching strategic vision, unintentionally constricting the transformative potential of the work. The exhibitions evolved organically, and despite the first one having its roots in a funded institutional enhancement initiative, I

never holistically conceived of them as strategic change. In hindsight, this may have been a missed opportunity. Organizational change literature breaks down processes of change in order to evaluate contributing factors. A common early stage in linear change processes is establishing a vision for the desired change (e.g. Kotter 1995, in Cameron and Green 2015: 110). Without a vision, or strategic direction, enhancement work risks purposelessness, and therefore irrelevance. Whilst I am not diminishing the work as unsuccessful, I acknowledge that these exhibitions were a form of accidental, organic leadership, rather than designed, strategic leadership, with an associated set of specific goals and prescribed outcomes that could be measured and evaluated.

In their discussion of middle out leadership for innovation Belasen and Luber suggest that ‘both organic and mechanistic innovation processes are needed for innovation implementation’ (2017: 235), with an emphasis on role of the organic at the initiation of an innovation. They argue that middle managers are closer to the action-oriented heart of the organization than senior leaders, and are therefore more in touch with its pulse, providing ambidexterity, agility and velocity to identify and facilitate aligned change that meets the core needs of an organization (ibid: 234). They suggest that such organic work needs to be joined up with more strategic leadership in order to fulfil its potential. It is to be hoped that with the benefit of this reflective exercise, the exhibition work might become more strategic as it develops in the future.

Quality enhancement project leadership

Notwithstanding my lack of over-arching, rationalizing vision for the exhibitions, it is useful to re-imagine the practice as a middle out academic development innovation that surfaces, celebrates and anticipates institutional change. In order to do this, it is necessary to briefly contextualize quality enhancement within universities.

Malcolm Tight describes the vast scale and rapid pace of sector change in UK higher education (HE) since the mid 90s as ‘institutional churn’ (2013: 11). The pace of political agenda change has been rapid and relentless. The provision of funding streams to foster the scholarship of teaching and learning in order to support this transition has been a fixture of the UK HE educational development landscape since the expansion of participation in the late 1980s (Baume, Martin and Yorke 2002). However, Ewens and Young warn of ‘a history within the higher education sector of short-term... learning projects that rarely make

connections with core education programmes and tend to atrophy when funding ceases' (in Howkins and Bray 2008: 87). They argue that a key limitation of a project-based approach to enhancement is spreading impact beyond the boundary of project itself.

The exhibition work was conceived as project work. Although lacking vision, the overarching purpose was always to surface the careful, scholarly approach taken by colleagues who are investigating teaching and learning issues within the university, presenting them back into the university. Beyond that there was not an explicit motive to change colleagues' practice. Rather the intention was to inspire, to draw attention, to draw other people's notice to the pedagogic issues, findings and the breadth and depth of the enquiry that is happening - often invisibly - under the institutional radar. To celebrate and share the value of pedagogic research, and provide a platform that might encourage others, and indeed those who had done the work themselves, to go on to do more. Perhaps this ambition was too mild. A more transformational leader might have placed more focus on the end game, 'transforming the performance or fortunes of a business' (Mullins and Christy 2010: 391), for example, upon more eliciting more directly interventionist methods to achieve improved institutional metrics around student satisfaction. However, Bryman's literature review of empirical research into what constitutes effective leadership in Higher Education (2007) which identified 13 aspects of effective university leader behaviour, listed only 4 that were related to infra-structural, process-related behaviours. The other 9 were what leadership theorists would describe as 'traits' (Stogdill 1948/1974, in Northouse 2016: 19-21), for example, being considerate, acting as a role model, creating a positive atmosphere (Bryman 2007: 697). It is interesting to reflect on how this leadership tension between procedural (what I do) and modal (how I do it) both effects outcomes and affects others. My emphasis with the exhibition work has generally been focussed towards affect, and although I am coming to realise I need to shift the balance towards effect, I am also becoming more conscious of the soft power of my caring behaviours. I am now starting to conceptualise the curation as a practice of institutional care. Therefore it might also be considered an act of leadership.

Curation: inherently interprofessional

As a solution to the bounded scope of project work, Ewens and Young advocate that institutions employ an individual who works interprofessionally across project teams to draw together learning to feed up into policy (2008: 89). In her work on the emergence of third

space professionals in UK higher education, Whitchurch recognized that certain ‘Individuals [...] worked backwards and forwards across internal and external boundaries, translating and interpreting between different constituencies, and creating new institutional spaces, knowledges and relationships’ (2008: 9). I recognise my leader-self in this description, particularly in relation to how I worked with other stakeholders to achieve the exhibition outcomes. This project work entailed convening and motivating a large team of people from several departments, all of whom had different expertise. Ewens and Young suggest that champions of such interprofessional work see power as distributed and socially constructed and do not see power relations as a barrier to work achievements, viewing power as ‘existing only in the immediate social relationship’ (in Howkins and Bray 2008: 88). Such leaders understand the traditional hierarchies of an organization and use this knowledge to make things happen, leading by example, using their ‘well-developed networks’ (ibid) to bring about change. They claim that the role of such individuals cannot be under-estimated, however one of the challenges of interprofessional work is to move beyond champions and distribute the model more widely, moving from project outcomes to departmental and institutional outcomes (Langton, in Bluteau and Jackson 2009: 56). This is a direction that my leadership practice needs to explore.

Curation: distributed leadership?

In 2000, educationalist Peter Gronn conceived distributed leadership as an ‘architecture’ (2000: 317) that bridges the polarized focus between the agency of individual leaders and the structure of the organizational system they operate within. Distributed leadership is a collective leadership model that ‘involves the sharing of influence by team members’ (Northouse 2016: 365). Education Professor Philip Woods problematizes this seemingly democratic mode, and reminds us that, ‘all are engaged in some way in determining who is included in or excluded from exercising leadership and authority’ (Woods 2016: 160), whilst Gronn calls for a nuanced, whole systems approach to understanding how to influence organisational change. Highlighting ‘the centrality of joint agency’ (ibid: 318), he critiqued the ‘causal omniscience of leadership’ (ibid: 319), suggesting focus should instead be placed upon multi-directional action. His model proposes the use of Activity Theory (Engeström 1999) to analyze relations in leadership scenarios, in order to take account of ‘the interactional relationship between all of the components’ (Gronn 2000: 328). This makes sense in the case of the exhibition work, which is always co-constructed; created from other

people's research. On a practical level, I identify and persuade contributors (researchers) to participate, work with others to create installation pieces (often students, sometimes the researchers themselves), which are then designed into an overarching coherent presentation by others (often student designers), installed by yet others (technical staff), promoted by others (events officers), and eventually viewed by a mix of staff at the private views and beyond. The organizational system is adaptive, working across campuses, moving between text and practice-based research spaces, changing content themes responsively. I draw upon different funding streams to finance the work, lobby management in order to secure spaces and local support, and promote it through a variety of networked opportunities, digital, meetings, in class.

Lichtenstein *et al* discuss factors for leading in complex adaptive systems, such as a university, and propose that adaptive leadership 'emerges through dynamic interactions... [and is] a collective venture' (2006: 2). Highlighting the role played by leadership events (ibid: 5-7), they advocate undertaking research to analyze interactions which result in change. Similarly to Gronn, their focus lies upon uncovering intersubjective actions between parties. They argue that such events and interactions should be systematically captured via empirical research that elicits longitudinal data, in order to identify moments and agents of influence, constructed in relation to contexts and actors. This focus on the relational might be a useful way into investigating any potential influence of the exhibitions, as yet unexplored, and therefore undetermined. Primary research interviewing different stakeholders such as exhibitors, audiences, colleagues, managers and students could lead to understanding of any influence engendered by the work, on whatever scale. This is a useful consideration for extending the work, echoing Avolio *et al's* call for future directions of leadership theory and research to focus upon 'determining the causal mechanisms that link leadership to outcomes' (2009: 442).

Some universities have explicitly invested in distributed leadership models with regard to the enhancement of teaching and learning. Jones *et al* (2012) conducted an empirical study into a cross-university Australian project that focused on bringing together formal and informal leaders to create positive cultures for learning and teaching. Their research findings indicated that, 'a new, more participative and collaborative approach to leadership is needed that acknowledges the individual autonomy that underpins creative and innovative thinking' (2012: 68). I propose that the exhibition work operates as a form of distributed praxis, communally engaging and practicing ideas. Visualising institutional educational research via

exhibitions is an act of affirmation in a number of ways. Firstly, affirmation of the research itself, by deeming the theory, methods, ideas and findings contained within it worthy enough to be articulated to new audiences. By association, this leads to valorization of the researcher, through the public recognition of their achievements. Then significantly, by providing a platform for educational research to be displayed, the exhibitions themselves practise the idea that pedagogic research is a necessary component of the institutional life of the art school. A component that should be shared widely and celebrated. I argue that the pedagogic enquiries that are featured are a form of distributed leadership, academic leadership (as research) that is disseminated throughout separate communities of practice within the university. This research is traditionally largely hidden from view, and needs surfacing in order to move from its immediate academic practice context (for example, a particular course setting), into other communities of practice, where it might go on to exert further influence and impact. Curating exhibitions, putting the distributed leadership that is the research on show, is a further act of literal distribution, showcasing and sharing good teaching and learning practices beyond their immediate contexts.

Art school organizational culture and micro-cultures

In their research into practices that contribute to strong microcultures of teaching and learning in universities, Roxå and Mårtensson (2015) explore the link between organizational structures and cultural characteristics. They identify that many academics are loathe to get involved in quality assurance (or enhancement) initiatives due to a widespread perception that they are out of step with academic values (2015: 534). This chimes with my institutional observations that many educational development initiatives are viewed as remedial, top-down, punitive and managerially-focused. In my university such projects are often led by educational developers who have not taught in the art school courses themselves, are not creative practitioners themselves and lack experience of the studio environment. Schein and Schein suggest that ‘culture change programs can only work if they are consistent with the group’s cultural DNA’ (2016: 7).

Within the art school context, cultural tension between managerialism and artistic freedom has a history. Lisa Tickner’s in-depth historical analysis of the Hornsey College of Art student sit-in of 1968 (2008) illustrates how a student dispute about finances unravelled into a

far-reaching debate about the purpose and politics of art education. The Hornsey sit-in is often quoted as a seminal event in the history of art schools, as it brought the conflicted culture of the art school into the national limelight.

Further afield, in the 1970s sociologist Judith Adler conducted a seminal ethnographic study at CalArts, an internationally renowned art school based in California. Despite the intervening 41 years, the key workplace tensions captured in her account, *Artists in Offices*, still resonate in the 21st century art school:

But even with an adaptive academization of the arts, the college and university milieu jars with the mores of the bohemian subculture in which many artists still participate: a subculture which grows out of highly atomized, “loose” occupational structures and exalts qualities of anarchistic individualism (eccentricity, the apostasy and advertisement of personality through flamboyant, spontaneous and outrageous behavior) and confronts the culture and imperatives of a bureaucratic work organization with its stress on certified and universalistic credentials, routinized procedure, formally designated domains of authority and expertise, the subordination of person to office, and the use of formal and hierarchically significant titles.
(Adler 1979: 17)

This may explain why art school academics can sometimes be reluctant to join centralized enhancement initiatives. Conversely, it has been my experience that colleagues *are* keen to participate with the exhibition work. This may be because it does not take the shape of a traditional enhancement initiative, but that of a highly symbolic art school practice. In 2013 the FLAG Collective at Chelsea College of Arts sought to explore Fine Art pedagogy through a modally sympathetic series of events where students from a range of study levels came together with tutors to discuss teaching and working methods whilst engaging in mutual cake baking exercises described as ‘cake methodology’ (FLAG Collective 2014). This approach to developing educational practice, although clearly different to my own, has in common an attempt to invoke some disciplinary discourses and practices of the art school. Fairhurst and Grant emphasise the role of ‘Communicative practices – talk, discourse, and other symbolic media – occasioned by the context are integral to the processes by which the social construction of leadership is brought about’ (2010: 175). In specific relation to academic development, Roxå and Mårtensson’s international research into university

teacher's 'significant networks' (2009) highlighted the importance of 'backstage', or informal teacher talk for developing strong pedagogic cultures, but considered there to be limitations in the scope of such close-range networks, typically within a course team or department. The potential for sharing practices more widely is acknowledged to be desirable.

Exhibitions have dissemination capability and align well with the 'formal ritual and celebrations' (Schein and Schein 2016: 4) of the art and design school. Roxå and Mårtensson suggest that 'A possible integration of quality assurance and quality practice would be a form of reflective practice enabling the organization both to act and to reflect on its own behavior.' (ibid: 537). The use of exhibition format to translate the research into arts practice outcomes was designed to engage the institutional audience in a fresher, less logocentric way than pedagogic research traditionally does (i.e. through journals, conferences books). The teaching exhibition functions as a site of mutual institutional reflection. As Ron Barnett argues in his book on the business of Higher Education, '...it is not just a matter, therefore, of whether to act in this way or that, but also of, within which framework shall I act?' (1997: 141).

Conclusion: arts-informed approaches to leadership in the art school

Arguing for the arts as a lens through which to reflect on leadership practice Nancy Adler critiques traditional leadership discourse as 'dehydrated' (2010: 90), advocating use of artwork as a tool for generating reflective insights into leadership. She focuses upon art as a way of surfacing thinking. Through the construction of this article's analysis, I have come to understand my curatorial practice as a creative leadership act of distributing and cultivating academic development leadership throughout my institution.

A growing sub-field of leadership theorists are investigating the use of arts-based methods for leadership development (e.g. Sutherland 2012; Latham 2014; Adler 2006). I believe my academic practice curation work makes a contribution here. Curation is a multi-layered process that is more than just using the arts to reflect. Exhibition participants are encouraged to generate their own artwork or visual responses to articulate their research-led academic leadership. These acts of sense-making communicate powerfully. They communicate the often un-noticed practices of pedagogic research. They communicate that multiple micro-cultures of teaching and learning exist across the institution and wish to be in communication

with each other. They reveal a sense of an institution caring about its teaching and learning. The curation of the exhibitions celebrate the individuals and the practices concerned in a mode well-suited to art school culture. With more strategic vision, research into the impact of the work, and alignment with core educational development initiatives and institutional goals the work could go on to stimulate more scholarship of learning and teaching in others, in themselves acts of academic leadership.

References

Adler, J. (1979) *Artists in Offices: An Ethnography of an Academic Art Scene*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Adler, N. (2006) 'The arts and leadership: now that we can do anything, what will we do?', *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 5, pp. 486-499.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2006.23473209>

Adler, N. (2010) 'Going beyond the dehydrated language of management: leadership insight', *Journal of Business Strategy*, 31, pp. 90-99. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02756661011055230>

Avolio, B.J., Walumbwa, F.O. and Weber, T.J. (2009) 'Leadership: current theories, research and future directions', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, pp. 421-449.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621>

Barnett, R. (2009) 'Knowing and becoming in the higher education curriculum.' *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(4), pp. 429-440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070902771978>

Barrett, E. and Bolt, B. (eds) (2007) *Practice as research: approaches to Creative Arts enquiry*. London: I.B.Tauris.

Baume, C., Martin, P. and Yorke, M. (2002) *Managing Educational Development Projects: Effective Management for Maximum Impact*. London: Kogan Page.

Belasen, A. and Luber, E.B. (2017) 'Innovation Implementation: Leading from the Middle Out', in Pfeffermann, N. and Gould, J. (eds.) *Strategy and Communication for Innovation*. New York: Springer, pp. 229-243.

Berger, P. and Luckman, T.L. (1966) *The social construction of knowledge: a treatise on the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.

Bishop-Clark, C. and Dietz-Uhler, B. (2012) *Engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning: a guide to the process and how to develop a project from start to finish*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.

Bolden, R. (2011) 'Distributed leadership in organisations: a review of theory and research', *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13, pp. 251-269.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x>.

Bryman, A. (2008) 'Effective leadership in higher education: a literature review', *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6), pp. 693-710. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114>

Cameron, E. and Green, M. (2015) *Making Sense of Change Management: A Complete Guide to the Models, Tools and Techniques of Organizational Change*. London: Kogan Page.

Collective, FLAG (2014) 'FLAG Collective: Praxis between the educational turn and the art school', *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education*, 13(1), pp. 57-71.
https://doi.org/10.1386/adch.13.1.57_1

Day, D.V., Fleenor, J.W., Atwater, L.E., Sturm, R.E. and McKee, R.A. (2014) 'Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25, pp. 63-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004>

DeRue, D.S. and Ashford, S.J. (2010) 'Who will lead and who will follow? A social process of leadership identity construction in organizations', *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), pp. 627-647.

Fairhurst, G.T. and Grant, D. (2010) 'The Social Construction of Leadership: A Sailing Guide', *Management Communication Quarterly*, 24(2), pp. 171-210.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318909359697>

Floyd, A. and Fung, D. (2015) 'Focusing the kaleidoscope: exploring distributed leadership in an English university', *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(8), pp. 1488-1503.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1110692>

Foucault, M., Sheridan, A. and Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Gronn, P. (2000) 'Distributed properties: a new architecture for leadership', *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 28, pp. 317-338.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0263211X000283006>

Gunnlaugson, O. (2011). 'Advancing a second-person contemplative approach for collective wisdom and leadership development.' *Journal of Transformative Education*, 9(1), pp. 3-20.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344610397034>

Haraway, D. (1988) 'Situated knowledges: the science question in Feminism and the privilege of partial perspectives', *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), pp. 575-599.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>

Howkins, E. and Bray, J. (2008) *Preparing for Interprofessional Teaching*. Oxford and New York: Radcliffe Publishing.

Ingold, T. (2014) *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*. London: Routledge.

Jones, S. *et al.* (2012) 'Distributed leadership: a collaborative framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education.' *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 34(1), pp. 67–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.642334>

Kellerman, B. (2018) *Professionalizing leadership*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Latham, S. (2014). 'Leadership research: an Arts-informed perspective.' *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(2), pp. 123-132. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492613491434>

Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lichenstein, B.B., Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., Seers, A., Orton, J.D. and Schreiber, C. (2006) 'Complexity leadership theory: An interactive perspective on leading in complex adaptive systems', *E:CO*, 8(4), pp. 2-12.

Llewellyn, N. (2015) *The London Art Schools: Reforming the Art World 1960 to Now*. London: Tate Publishing.

MacFarlane, K. (2017) 'A thousand CEOs: Relational thought, processual space and Deleuzian ontology in human geography and strategic management', *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(3), pp. 299-320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516644514>

Mårtensson, K., Roxå, T. and Stensaker, B. (2014) 'From quality assurance to quality practices: an investigation of strong microcultures in teaching and learning', *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(4), pp. 534-545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2012.709493>

Mason, J. (2002) *Researching your own practice: the discipline of noticing*. Oxon: Routledge.

Miscenko, D., Guenter, H. and Day, D.V. (2017) 'Am I a leader? Examining leader identity development over time', *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28, pp. 605-620. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.01.004>

Mullins, L.J. and Christy, G. (2010) *Management and Organisational Behaviour* (9th edn.) Harlow: Pearson Education. Chapter 10: 'The Nature of Leadership', pp.372-416.

Northouse, P.G. (2016) *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. 7th edn. London: SAGE.

Online Etymology Dictionary (2020) <https://www.etymonline.com> (Accessed: 13 April 2020).

Perusso, A., Blanckesteijn, M. and Leal, R. (2019) 'The contribution of reflective learning to experiential learning in business education.' *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1705963>

Raffnsøe, S. and Staunæs, D. (2014) 'Learning to stay ahead of time: moving leadership experiences experimentally', *Management & Organizational History*, 9(2), pp. 184-201.

Roxå, T. (2018) 'Making use of educational research in higher education: academic teachers engaged in translational research', *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 6(2), pp. 67-79. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearningqu.6.2.6>

Roxå, T. and Mårtensson, K. (2015) 'Microcultures and informal learning: a heuristic guiding analysis of conditions for informal learning in local higher education workplaces', *International Journal for Academic Development*, 20(2), pp. 193-205.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015.1029929>

Roxå, T. and Mårtensson, K. (2009) 'Significant conversations and significant networks – exploring the backstage of the teaching arena', *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(5), pp. 547-559.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802597200>

Savage, J. (2007) 'Reflecting through Peshkin's I's' *International Journal of Music Education*, 25(3), pp. 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761407083574>

Sutherland, I. (2013). 'Arts-based methods in leadership development: affording aesthetic workspaces, reflexivity and memories with momentum.' *Management Learning*, 44(1), pp. 25-43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507612465063>

Tickner, L. (2008) *Hornsey 1968: The Art School Revolution*. London: Frances Lincoln.

Tight, M. (2013) 'Institutional churn: institutional change in United Kingdom higher education', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 35(1), pp. 11-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.727700>

Trowler, P. (2013) 'Can approaches to research in Art and Design be beneficially adapted for research into higher education?', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 32(1), pp. 56-69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2012.750276>

Whitchurch, C. (2008) 'Shifting Identities and Blurring Boundaries: The Emergence of Third Space Professionals in UK Higher Education', *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62(4), pp. 377-396. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00387.x>

Woods, P. A. (2016) 'Authority, power and distributed leadership', *Management in Education*, 30(4), pp. 155-160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020616665779>

