

## 3.1.1 University cultural management

by [Antonio Ariño Villarroya](#)

Cultural management is academically understood as the art or technique of planning and organising, managing and leading, and supervising and administering cultural activities in a certain organisational framework. As a result, it can be said that the university cultural management is the art of planning and organising, leading and managing, and supervising and administering those activities used by the university to carry out its third mission. Such activities include programming the supply and its financing, controlling management structures or specific services, managing relevant infrastructures, and promoting cultural participation, both internal and external. A more detailed meaning of management, culture, and university culture is given below.

---

### 1. The management function

Management is relatively a modern concept. It was first recorded in the *Nuevo Diccionario de la Lengua Castellana* [New Spanish Dictionary] by Vicente Salvá in 1846. The concept is defined as the diligence, the steps taken with the aim of achieving something, and its plural form is the most used. The expression “[foreign affair managements](#)” is also used. From this initial use, its historical evolution is interesting because it has been both specified and extended. So, in the new version suggested by the Spanish Royal Academy (2014), the verb “to manage” has a second use: to be responsible for administering, organising, and operating a company, [an economic activity, or an institution](#).

The meaning has been specified since it is applied to tasks requiring professional specialisation, which is usually acquired through a higher training providing a technical competence. Also, such tasks are carried out within a formal organisation. The meaning has been in turn extended by distinguishing management types (strategic, by processes, of results, etc.) and the areas to which it is applied (administrative, organisational, financial and business, NGO or cultural). Finally, it is worth highlighting that it has been professionally configured by creating [associations](#).

This meaning of “management” is becoming more important because it is associated with the emergence of society of organisations where the specialised knowledge, as Peter Drucker stated, is more and more applied to the achievement of results. In this sense, management consists in applying organisationally and systematically knowledge to knowledge in economy and technology as well as in science and society.

After clarifying the meaning of “management”, it is important to delimit its scope and distinguish it from the political dimension of action in organisations. The management role supports the leading role, but it does not replace it. In some way, it is a mediator between who produces goods and services according to a certain policy and who appropriates and uses them. We continue with this aspect in the next section.

## 2. Cultural management

Drucker (1993) pointed out that management should also be applied to areas such as society, politics, and knowledge itself. We also include culture. The aim is to achieve “productivity” or performance through specialised knowledge. Nevertheless, such areas —culture in particular— have their own characteristics that should be described before focusing on cultural management.

### About the concept of culture

The “cultural” nature entails many different objects, institutions, goods, services, and activities. Such numerous usages of the concept lead to many visions which are impossible to summarise in a unique concept. For this reason, if we try to explain the meaning of cultural management, it is essential to specify the culture we are referring to.

Culture is the construction of identities in the process of socialisation, as well as the food selected by each group, the values pursued by an individual, the rules organising the life of the group, people’s beliefs and ideas, and not only the goods they produce and consume, but also the way of producing and appropriate them. Generally, someone concludes the definition by exclaiming irritably and incisively: “so, everything is culture!”. That is totally true because the way that human beings organise their lives and give sense to them is not prearranged nor included in their genetic code. As a result, it would be more reasonable to talk about culture in plural (“cultures”).

In today’s complex societies, activities are coordinated in specialised fields of action (economy, politics, arts, etc.) in which autonomous rules and specific roles operate. In this sense, we are talking about a cultural sector, as occurs with the metallurgical or fishing sectors (different action areas). Also, we distinguish between the public and private sectors (different property areas). All these sectors have a cultural dimension as they are based on rules (public, private, or cooperative property) and organise specific lifestyles (with socially different and distinguishable languages and patterns of behaviour). So, how is the cultural sector understood?

### Cultural sector

Again, there is confusion. The cultural sector may also be referred as a creative or content sector, cultural and/or creative industries, etc., [with tremendous laxity](#), and such language has to do with an economic approach to culture which not always do justice to its singularity, since cultural goods are not simply merchandise. From a sociological perspective, we should technically identify the cultural sector with that social action area in which the production/consumption of symbolic meanings and goods prevail against another dimension (economic, political, or reproductive), but there is not any sociological study delimiting the space of this sector. As mentioned above, studies on economic impact or proposals of statistical harmonisation are the main attempts to operate the cultural sector.

From this statistical perspective, the most important projects are for now the UNESCO Framework for [Cultural Statistics](#) ([www.ifacca.org](http://www.ifacca.org)) (CSC-2009) and the European Framework. There are also other national frameworks developed after many political practices and research studies in France, [Québec](#), [Canada](#), and Australia ([www.abs.gov.au](http://www.abs.gov.au)), as well as in England and northern countries.

All these frameworks developed in recent years share an identical orientation. It consists in creating a matrix to distinguish *domains* (i.e., activity spheres or areas clearly identifiable) limiting both the cultural field (its breadth) and value chains (i.e., functions of supply and demand processes). The differences among such frameworks are the number of domains and the scope of the functional chain.

<b>Funciones Dominios</b>	<b>Creación</b>	<b>Producción Edición</b>	<b>Difusión Comercialización</b>	<b>Preservación</b>	<b>Educación Administración</b>
<b>Patrimonio cultural</b>					
<b>Archivos y conservación</b>					
<b>Bibliotecas</b>					
<b>Libros y prensa</b>					
<b>Artes visuales</b>					
<b>Artes escénicas</b>					
<b>Audiovisual, multimedia y digital</b>					
<b>Arquitectura</b>					
<b>Publicidad</b>					
<b>Artesanado artístico</b>					
<b>Diseño y servicios</b>					
<b>Formación</b>					
<b>Festividades</b>					

The most important difference in the former is between the most extensive frameworks (e.g., the Australian framework) in which sport, leisure, and those activities related are included in cultural domains, and the others (the majority) which exclude them. All such frameworks do not include the activities associated with information technologies as they are already recorded by specific statistics. A second difference is whether there is a hierarchical structure among domains: UNESCO distinguishes the fundamental domains from the transversal and peripheral domains. Canada also makes a distinction between domains and subdomains.

Regarding the value chain's functions, most frameworks focus on the economy of the production or supply, considering creation as a hegemonic function, and ignore participation processes related to demand. Canada's framework explicitly includes the processes of "using" goods and services, and therefore cultural participation because it puts participants in the core of the value chain. Surveys on habits and cultural practices specifically deal with them as well as involve an operational pragmatics of culture by specifying the activities (or scopes of practice) included.

The surveys on habits and cultural practices conducted in the last decade in Spain (2002/2003, 2006/2007, and 2010/2011) only include reading activities, visiting cultural facilities (libraries, archives, museums, exhibitions, and galleries), attending live shows (music, theatre, opera, and ballet), listening and watching activities (radio, cinema, and television), and using new technologies. Also, a question on the equipment available in households, another on the euphemistically so-called "active practices", and a last one on attending training courses are included. The interest, the habit, and the practice are investigated in most cases, as well as the characterisation of the last purchase and practice.

The 2008 French survey, periodically conducted from 1973, also includes aspects such as leisure activities out and inside the house, collecting, holidays, and [sociability](#). In such surveys on cultural practices, a double matrix can be hold by presenting, on the one hand, practice fields or domains and, on the other hand, the modes of the practice, which can be mainly divided into three: creating as a professional or amateur, practising as a visitor or spectator, and participating in a civic way (associations/volunteerism).

## Professionalisation and evolution of cultural management

As the management of organisations is a feature of societies belonging to the advanced modernity, cultural management has also progressively emerged both as a specialised function and a specific profession. It has been slowly arisen and institutionalised —and still is— because cultural organisations have also been implemented slower than industrial, financial, and commercial organisations.

In fact, the professionalisation of cultural management has been tightly constrained by cultural policies at different levels of the public administration: at a state level from 1978; later, at a regional level by creating autonomous regions; and at a municipal level by developing such political entities of proximity.

As the paradigms of cultural policy in Spain have not been clearly and accurately implemented and institutionalised, cultural management has been affected by this [insufficient](#) development. However, it has also been influenced by the characteristics of both private firms focused on culture and of non-profit organisations in which there is a great asymmetry made up of some big organisations and foundations as well as of many very little voluntary firms and associations which operate as practice communities. Such asymmetry and diversity of organisations (in scope and objectives, size, history, functions, property ownership, etc.) imply that the management function has a different profile in each case: either one person could be responsible for various types of activities or the work is divided.

In general, it can be stated that the cultural manager has a multidisciplinary training. The diversity of competences that should be acquired is usually proved, with a certain degree of approximation, by the contents of the many official and non-official master's degrees provided by universities in Europe and USA as well as by the good practice guides published by [professional](#) organisations.

In the last two decades, higher training is increasingly offered, thus implying an specialisation on areas of the cultural sector (such as heritage ([www.aegpc.org](http://www.aegpc.org)) or music, or with an international or local orientation) and an increasing organisation of people working in this profession who are able to retroact and determine from experience the profile of cultural management.

## 3. University cultural management

University organisations have incorporated various functions over their extensive history, including the cultural function. This chapter focuses on how the cultural function emerged and its features.

### Incorporating the cultural function: the illuminated intelligence

The cultural function of the university first appeared in the university outreach. Its underlying idea (the mission of disseminating the university knowledge outside) is old. However, the university outreach itself was conceived in the last third of the 19th century, within the framework of the increasing cultural difference between university elites and working classes.

This initiative —learning outside classrooms— was inevitably linked both to the phenomenon known as social issue and the vast wealth produced at the end of the 19th century. In this period and in a university for elites, very few lecturers were aware of the need to avoid sociocultural differences. The university outreach was therefore created in Cambridge in 1871, and then in Oxford and other universities.

It officially appeared in Spain in 1898, in the University of Oviedo. A collection of texts called *Cuestiones obreras* [Worker issues] by Rafael Altamira, a lecturer who actively took part in the university outreach in Oviedo, provides a justification of such approach:

"The starry sky is undoubtedly a wonderful thing which admires and captivates almost everyone, but it is more filled up with beauties, it gives more enjoyment and distractions to the cultured spirit than to the ignorant. Our eyes see more as more light is in the horizon, and the illuminated intelligence sees more, sees materially more things than that closed to culture. It is true that peasants are not those who see and more enjoy the surrounding landscape as they live in the middle of the country, but men of the cities who have the eyes of the soul opened and full of images to estimate lines and colours, mass and roughness" (Altamira:18) [quotation translated].

Rafael Altamira thought that every human being has the right to such cognitive illumination and “after-school institutions” were responsible for favouring it. The programme of the cultural outreach consisted in both promoting the democratisation of knowledge by including it in the social movements of the period, particularly in the worker movement, and defending a comprehensive idea of knowledge as every person —also those belonging to university training— is more important than the profession itself (the chemist should be trained as a human being).

After Oviedo, this idea was developed and extended to other Spanish universities, being valid until the mid of 1920s. Two factors influenced its evolution: on the one hand, the Franco period and the strict control of the university, and on the other hand, the increasing importance of mass media which, as Ortega stated, carried out such function better than the university of that period. With the return of the democracy and the Universities Reform Act (Spanish initials: LRU), the name was reused, and many universities created Vice-Rectorates for Outreach, Cultural Outreach, or Cultural Activities.

## The statute of the cultural function

People working in the area of culture of their universities often have the feeling of being undervalued in the sense that cultural programmes and activities are “dispensable ornaments” if they are compared to teaching and research.

This vision is widely extended and linked to the legislator's spirit. The LRU and the Organic Law of Modification of the Organic Law of Universities (Spanish initials: LOMLOU) clearly include in their articles this third function and mission of the university, specifically in the Preliminary Title, article one. Point 2 of such article states that functions of the university are available for society:

LRU - 1983	LOMLOU - 2007
a) La creación, desarrollo, transmisión y crítica de la ciencia, de la técnica y de la cultura.	a) La creación, desarrollo, transmisión y crítica de la ciencia, de la técnica y de la cultura.
b) La preparación para el ejercicio de actividades profesionales que exijan la aplicación de conocimientos y métodos científicos o para la creación artística.	b) La preparación para el ejercicio de actividades profesionales que exijan la aplicación de conocimientos y métodos científicos y para la creación artística.
c) El apoyo científico y técnico al desarrollo cultural, social y económico, tanto nacional como de las Comunidades Autónomas.	c) La difusión, la valorización y la transferencia del conocimiento al servicio de la cultura, de la calidad de la vida, y del desarrollo económico.
d) La extensión de la cultura universitaria.	d) La difusión del conocimiento y la cultura a través de la extensión universitaria y la formación a lo largo de toda la vida.

In addition, culture transmission is described in article 33 of the LOMLOU as an “essential mission” of the university.

Such qualitative improvement of the university institutionalisation of culture has also been reflected in successive attempts, unsuccessful until now, to create both a state and sectorial network within the Conference of Rectors of Spanish Universities (Spanish initials: CRUE) aimed at coordinating and boosting the efforts of universities in this field.

Moreover, in the last decades of the institutionalisation of the university outreach and its organisational structure, many important aspects have arisen because of various reasons:

1. Creation of summer universities or schools.
2. Creation of universities or classrooms for the elderly.
3. Internal dynamic of cultural participation.
4. Importance of foreign students, particularly Erasmus students.
5. Preservation of movable and immovable heritage.
6. Usage of NTIC.
7. Importance of physical and sports activity.
8. Dissemination of science and transfer of knowledge.

Other essential two aspects are also included: the civic leadership and the socio-cultural innovation. The former was mentioned by Ortega: the university is required to perform a duty of orientation and social representation. It is an entity with certain values (culture of peace, sustainability, fairness, equality, etc.), but it should also play a civic leadership role. The latter is a great contribution to its environment because dilemmas of the future of society are discussed in conferences, sessions, meetings, debates, etc., as well as new ways of

discussing social problems are generated.

## The content of the cultural function

Because of both historical reasons and rules, the university therefore has a third function which can be briefly identified as cultural and should be considered as an essential mission. However, which cultural contents should be promoted by the academic institution?

The university culture is only a selection within the cultural list at a specific moment. Despite what is suggested by a non-historical, religious, and elitist vision, culture is not a good itself, *a commune bonum*, but a piece of information of human nature and social reality: human beings are constituted as such by symbolic systems. But some —many of such symbolic systems— give sense to human and social life, which are arguable and even odious both from an ethic with universality aspirations and the illuminated conscience (domination, manipulation, mistreatment, subordination, legitimation of inequality, etc.). The mythical visions of the world are cultural forms and expressions, but their dissemination and promotion cannot constitute the contents of the university culture. The university headquarters science and reason, and there are four characteristics that should determine the culture created, promoted, and disseminated by it:

- **Scientific:** a culture of reason over prejudice, of evidence and argument, and ultimately, of method.
- **Critical:** a culture based on the best tradition of suspicion, questioning hegemonic visions which legitimate power relations.
- **Creative and innovative:** the relevant novelty is promoted to improve the dignity and quality of human life.
- **Academic:** a culture operating at the level of synthesis, interrelation, and coordination of knowledges in an era in which problems are global and cross-border.

## The organisational statute of the cultural function

This cultural function has been organised and managed very different from teaching and research functions, at least up to now. Teaching is implemented in official institutions (faculties, postgraduate centres, institutes, and doctoral schools) and is organised through central services with the role of planning and coordinating (student services, Degree services, postgraduate services, etc.), which are dependent on a political member (the respective vice-Rectorates).

The mission of researching is carried out by each researcher with a high degree of freedom, although it is implemented in research departments and institutes and has a central service for planning and coordinating, which is dependent on a vice-Rectorate.

In both cases, state laws, autonomous rules (on creating teaching centres and institutes), and the statutory regulation of each university regulate the organisation and implementation of activities.

The cultural mission is very different because there is not any legal, state or autonomous rule on management structures. Article 93 of LOMLOU just states that universities arbitrate the “means required” and that they generally have university outreach services (an anachronistic name in a democratic university), but in no case these services control other cultural activities or other issues related to culture (publishing services, sports, etc.).

Some multidimensional services provided by universities are included as they deal with the three functions at the same time. Paradigmatic cases are Libraries and Documentation Services or Learning Resources Centres (LRCs), Publishing Services, and Student Information Services, but others are also ambivalent because, apart from having a main, secondary, or complementary function, other cultural functions are developed (e.g., the promotion of sustainability, equality, and cooperation values, among others).

Each university has therefore regulated the implementation and organisation of such mission differently, although all or most of them have common features:

- The implementation of the cultural function is disseminated and can be developed, without a binding mandate, by teaching centres, departments, institutes, colleges, and singular centres. Such dissemination is not a fault, but a proof of the university wealth and creativity.
- In all or most of the universities, there is a higher body (e.g., a Vice-Rectorate) which performs a political function and joins many dimensions of the cultural mission, particularly the representative and civic leadership dimension.
- There is not, however, a unique member of global coordination, supervision, and management. Various services or structures operate with a high degree of autonomy and take on some subdimensions of the cultural function (e.g., the physical and sports activity, the dissemination of science, publishing services, summer universities, universities for the elderly, etc.), without being clear that such activities and services are related —no to say integrated— to the cultural dimension. Due to their organisational autonomy, they are linked to one or another vice-Rectorate depending on discretions rather than on the functional coherence of the cultural mission.
- Universities have not previously considered how to perform and transform this third mission according to the implications of communication and information technologies to transfer culture, and particularly the consequences of the applications arising from Web 2.0 and Semantic Web.
- On the other hand, all of them have specialised staff, both technicians and teaching and research staff (in Spanish, PDI), with an accredited career in university cultural management. They generally have good resources for permanently updating their training, which is linked to both internal training services of each university and specialised master's degrees in which they usually take part.

## 4. Two challenges for university cultural management

Although the public administrations withdraw from the cultural sphere and the production conditions of firms are very hard in this crisis period, the cultural function of the university provides society with a very relevant service due to its scope, volume, professionalisation, and human and physical resources. The network of universities, with their cultural services not only in big and intermediate cities but also in smaller towns, is the main supplier of cultural goods and services.

University cultural management has today two important challenges: the first one is the capacity of creating a network or a sectorial capacity within LRC to generate resources at a new level. Attempts have taken place, at least since 1991, when vice-Rectors from most public universities met in the University of La Laguna and discussed on the need to have professional technicians in each university as well as to create an organisational state structure. In 1993, the first sessions on university management took place in Barcelona, and there were another two in 1998: one in Valencia and another in Oviedo (Iberoamerican Conference to commemorate the centenary of the University Outreach). Finally, in 2002, there was a meeting in Alicante when the International Conference on Rafael Altamira.

The second challenge is related to the circumstances of today's Spanish society and world in which the

Observatorio Cultural del Proyecto Atalaya

economical-financial crisis is a symptom of both a deeper systemic crisis and a paradigm change. Ortega mentioned in his classical text on the mission of the university that it is necessary to live at the height of the times, and particularly at the height of the time ideas. Such proposal is now more urgent than ever because we are at the risk of losing the capacity of identifying the most important problems among the gaps of various types of areas of knowledge, departments, degrees, and specialisations, as well as of understanding such problems correctly. Within their cultural function, universities will be able to deal with more complex and decisive issues, to control them rigorously and clearly, to face them audaciously and intrepidly, and to provide a society based on the human dignity with sociocultural innovations.

.....

## Documents

1. [gestioncultural.org](http://gestioncultural.org)
2. [gestorcultural.org](http://gestorcultural.org)
3. [agetec.org/ageteca/profesion.htm](http://agetec.org/ageteca/profesion.htm)
4. [www.federacion-agc.es](http://www.federacion-agc.es)
5. [www.wikanda.es/wiki](http://www.wikanda.es/wiki)
6. [www.master-in-international-arts-management.com/program](http://www.master-in-international-arts-management.com/program)
7. [culturalhrc.ca](http://culturalhrc.ca)
9. [www.culturalpolicies.net](http://www.culturalpolicies.net)
10. [www.artscapediy.org](http://www.artscapediy.org)
11. [en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)

## References

**ALTAMIRA, Rafael.** *Cuestiones Obreras*. [València]: Universitat, D.L. 2012. 288 pages. ISBN 978-84-370-9052-8.

**ARIÑO VILLARROYA, Antonio; GONZÁLEZ RUEDA, Antonio Javier.** "La dimensión cultural de la Universidad en el Estado español" [online]. In: *Periférica: revista para el análisis de la cultura y el territorio*, no. 13, 2012, pp. 115-141. ISSN 1577-1172. Available: [revistas.uca.es](http://revistas.uca.es)

**Associació de Professionals de la Gestió Cultural de Catalunya.** *Guía de buenas prácticas en la gestión cultural* [online]. Barcelona: APGCC, 2011. 22 pages. Available: [www.gestorcultural.org](http://www.gestorcultural.org)

**Associació de Professionals de la Gestió Cultural de Catalunya.** La gestión cultural: una nueva profesión en

Observatorio Cultural del Proyecto Atalaya

debate. Barcelona: APGCC, c1996. 22 pages.

**BERNÁRDEZ LÓPEZ, Jorge.** "La profesión de la gestión cultural: definiciones y retos" [online]. In: *Boletín GC. Portal Iberoamericano de Gestión Cultural*, [2003], 10 pages. Available: [www.gestioncultural.org](http://www.gestioncultural.org)

**Gestión cultural: estudios de caso.** Alba Colombo; David Roselló Cerezuela (eds.). Barcelona: Ariel, 2008. 301 pages. ISBN 978-84-344-2226-1.

**DEROIN, Valérie.** "Conceptualisation statistique du champ de la culture" [online]. In: *Culture méthodes*, 2011-3, 12 pages. Available: [www.oress-bretagne.fr](http://www.oress-bretagne.fr)

**DEROIN, Valérie.** "Approche statistique européenne de la culture: synthèse des travaux européens ESSnet-Culture, 2009-2011" [online]. In: *Culture études*, 2011-8, 28 pages. Available: [www.culturecommunication.gouv.fr](http://www.culturecommunication.gouv.fr)

**DRUCKER, Peter F.** *La sociedad poscapitalista*. M<sup>a</sup> Isabel Merino Sánchez (trad.). Barcelona: Apóstrofe, 1993. 224 pages. ISBN 84-455-0053-8.

**HUERTO MARIMÓN, María Elena; ALMUIÑAS RIVERO, José; CARAMÉS LAGE, José Luis.** *La extensión universitaria: un reto a la gestión cultural de las universidades del siglo XXI*. Oviedo: Trabe, 2001. 113 pages. ISBN 84-8053-173-8.

**La responsabilidad social como misión en las universidades españolas y su contribución al desarrollo sostenible: diagnóstico y buenas prácticas** [online]. Margarita Barañano Cid (dir.). 467 pages. Available: [MEC](http://MEC)

**The Economy of Culture in Europe: study prepared for the European Commission (Directorate---General for Education and Culture). October 2006** [online]. European Commission Culture. 355 pages. Available: [www.keanet.eu](http://www.keanet.eu)

**GALLOWAY, Susan; STEWART, Dunlop.** "A critique of definitions of the cultural and creative industries in public policy". In: *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2007. ISSN 1028-6632.

**MARCÉ VILA, Xavier; MARTINELL SEMPERE, Alfons.** *Perfil y formación de Gestores Culturales*. [Madrid]: Dirección General de Cooperación Cultural, [1995]. 302 pages. ISBN 84-8181-093-2.

**MARTINELL SEMPERE, Alfons.** "La gestión cultural: singularidad profesional y perspectivas de futuro: (recopilación de textos)" [online]. In: *Seminario Internacional: La formación en gestión y políticas culturales para la diversidad cultural y el desarrollo* (Girona, 2004). Girona: Documenta Universitaria, 2007. ISBN 978-84-935231-0-7. Available: [www.gestionculturana.org](http://www.gestionculturana.org)

**O'CONNOR, Justin.** *The cultural and creative industries: a literature review* [online]. 2nd ed. Newcastle: Creativity, Culture and Education, 2010. 102 pages. ISBN 978-1-907264-05-4. Available: [www.creativitycultureeducation.org](http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org)