博物館學季刊 22（4）

Museology Quarterly, 22(4): 53-75

Purpose, Stakeholders and Values: Museum Leadership in the 21st Century

David Ebitz*

Abstract

These are exciting times through which to lead a museum. Public museums are being put into the hands of regional and local governments or privatized, and most museums are being called upon to increase their earned income and private support. Museum managers are becoming leaders. Looking outward, they can learn from business models to position their institutions strategically as destinations for cultural tourism, as sites of urban revitalization, as places for learning in the information age, as engines of economic development with the potential to facilitate growth of the experience economy and contribute to a creative economy in which inventiveness and meaning making rather than information define a new conceptual age. Museums are also embedded in the network of shared interests and values that make up what has been called the social capital of a civil society.

Museum leaders clarify the purpose and public value of their institutions. They plan strategically, guided by a vision for what their institutions can become. They build capability necessary to carry out the purpose of their museums by securing the support of external stakeholders with an interest in their institutions; by hiring and retaining effective staff, supporting their professional development, and modeling such core values as respect, teamwork and accountability, appropriate to the culture in which they work; and by being effective advocates. Museum leaders, other staff and supporters engage in a cycle of planning, action, evaluation, and reflection that enables them to learn and adapt in a changing environment. Leaders do not work alone. They put people first.

Keywords: museum leadership, purpose, core value

*Associate Professor of Art and Art Education; Coordinator, Museums and Cultural Institutions Option in Art Education, School of Visual Arts, Pennsylvania State University; E-mail: dme12@psu.edu

From Management to Leadership

In 1990, I participated in the Museum Management Institute, a summer program sponsored by the J. Paul Getty Trust. This month-long institute was designed to prepare directors of small museums and department and division heads of large museums to assume greater administrative responsibilities at their own or other institutions. In 2003, the name of the program was changed to the Museum Leadership Institute. This name change reflects a broad shift during the 1990s in the United States in the role of the museum director from manager, organizing the efficient use of collections, staff, finances, and other resources, to the role of museum director as leader, looking forward and facilitating effective institutional responses in a changing world. Museums have come to be seen as businesses over the past 20 years. The most effective businesses have been led by leaders, not managed by administrators. Museum leadership is the focus of this article.

These are exciting times through which to lead a museum. Governance structures are changing internationally, as an increasing number of public museums are being given over to the control of regional and local governments or privatized, and called upon to increase their private funding from admissions, sales, and individual and corporate gifts. As museum leaders look outward, they see their institutions in the context of a global economy and an international exchange of culture, ideas and people. Their institutions embody the cultural capital and aspirations of local communities, peoples, and nations. Museums are places for learning in the information age, with the potential to facilitate growth of the experience economy (Pine & Gilmore, 1999) and to contribute to a shift toward a creative economy (Florida, 2002, 2008) in which inventiveness and meaning making rather than information define a new conceptual age (Pink, 2005). Museum leaders are called upon to respond to changing demographics in their audiences, to competition from other cultural institutions and opportunities for learning, and to the impact of technology in enhancing or replacing the experiences their institutions have to offer.

In responding, museum leaders have sought to understand their stakeholders, to clarify the mission and vision of their institutions, to develop strategic plans that adapt to and anticipate external changes, and to advocate the value of their institutions in terms of the collections they preserve, the knowledge they share, and the new ideas they produce among visitors and other audiences in whose lives museums make a difference. Leaders build the capacity necessary to carry out the purpose of their institutions by securing adequate funding, by hiring and retaining effective staff and guiding and encouraging them in accomplishing their goals, by supporting their professional development, and by modeling such core values as respect, teamwork and accountability, appropriate to the culture in which they work. Leaders do not work alone. They put people first.

My point of view in writing about leadership is influenced by my own experiences in the United States. First, as head of a large education department at the J. Paul Getty Museum

and now as a professor of art education, I learned to value people, the audience or customers of a museum, on the one hand, and the staff, a museum's most important resource, on the other. Second, as director of the John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, the State Art Museum of Florida, I learned the difficulty of replacing public financing with earned income and private fundraising, and the importance of the perceptions that external stakeholders had of the museum and that guided internal stakeholders, including trustees, staff and volunteers, in their work for the museum.

These comments are also based on the work of authors who have helped me make sense of my experiences working in museums. There is a growing literature to provide guidance to museum directors, among which I would like to point out the influential work of Stephen Weil (2002a, b) who examined the position and management of museums from a primarily institutional point of view and whose writings have helped to adapt the business practices of the for-profit and non-profit sectors and shape the direction of museum practices in the United States. He was honored posthumously with a special issue of the journal, *Curator* (2007, 50[2]), on these topics. For a different, human perspective on the personal role of directors leading their institutions with emotional intelligence and passion through change, see the publication by Sherene Suchy of her international research on museum leadership (2004).

Changing Governance Structures: Public Ownership to Private Support

The majority of museums in the United States are private non-profit institutions governed by a board of trustees. They rely primarily on a combination of earned income and private and some government support to fund their operations. The smaller number of museums governed by Federal, state and local government entities have been increasingly directed to find private funding. For much of the 20th century, art museums in particular could rely on the philanthropy of private individuals both to build their collections and to create endowments to underwrite operating expenses. While individual support continues, more recently, museums in the United States have looked to corporations in the private sector for support and joint ventures, leading the American Association of Museums in 2001 to publish its *Guidelines for Museums on Developing and Managing Business Support* (AAM, 2001).

In contrast to the United States, museums in most countries including Taiwan were until recently supported, if not governed, by national and regional governmental authorities. But in the last 20 years, in Europe (Boylan, 2006), for example, national museums have been put into the hands of regional and local governments or privatized, and directed to become more financially self-sufficient through commercial activities and private support, the latter encouraged by tax benefits for corporate and individual donors. In Great Britain, the Victoria and Albert Museum stirred controversy in 1988 when it began to brand itself as

“an ace café with quite a nice museum attached,” in a controversial ad campaign to generate income designed by Saatchi & Saatchi. Similar developments have occurred in Japan (Itoi, 2005) and Taiwan (Chang, 2007; Tzeng, 2005). In South Korea, with the founding of the Leeum, the Samsung Museum of Art, the Korean electronics giant has taken on the usual roles of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development and combined corporate interests with national interests in creating a museum complex to exhibit and interpret both the traditional and the modern and contemporary arts of Korea and thereby cultivate national cultural identity and pride.

The shift in museum governance and support toward privatization or various forms of local control is international, and it will probably continue. As we have seen, changes in governance for public institutions can be sudden and unexpected with political shifts, as new administrations enter office and legislative agendas change. By contrast, governance changes in private institutions are less common and more gradual, driven primarily by economic considerations specific to each museum. In response to changes in governance and financial expectations, museum leaders must know and understand the stakeholders with a possible interest in their institutions, from politicians to businessmen, philanthropists to audiences. Developing relationships with these stakeholders before changes in governance are contemplated and possibly enacted will enable museum leaders to have a voice in and help guide this process. To do so, museum leaders must understand and be able to articulate the value of their institutions to these diverse constituencies, and seek partnerships and joint ventures.

Strategic Positioning: Museums as Businesses and Other Models

Compelled by political and financial necessity and encouraged by new relationships with the corporate sector, museum leaders in the United States, as well as in other countries where various forms of privatization have been adopted, have looked to business models for guidance. Internally they have used these models to increase and make efficient use of their human and financial resources and externally they have used them to strategically position their institutions. Within museums, these models have led to such practices adopted from the business world as situational analysis and strategic planning, managing by objectives, total quality management, teamwork, sharing core values, and post-heroic, transformational leadership. Looking outward, these models have included market segmentation, marketing exhibitions and related products, and developing a brand, such as the name recognition the Guggenheim has capitalized upon in expanding internationally (Twitchell, 2004). The Louvre is doing the same (Gumbel, 2008), and technology has been used for marketing as well as education in the development of the Digital Museum at Taiwan’s National Palace Museum (Chang, 2007). These business models have become institutional priorities both in the United States and abroad, though there has been some resistance and regret among museum staff and supporters over the passing of an era in which collections and the

knowledge they embodied seemed paramount in importance.

Business models change as the world changes. Museum leaders can and should look at the ways of thinking, living, and doing business that have entered into discussion in the last ten years, with implications for museums no less great than for the international business community. Museum leaders can take advantage of opportunities to capitalize on the brand name of their institutions, based on a museum's association with culture, quality, class, and the elite, or with a special story or valued knowledge (Chang, 2007; Gumbel, 2008; Twitchell, 2004). Museums have a role as sites of cultural tourism in supporting the local economy, and may be a cornerstone in urban redevelopment. Museum leaders can take advantage of museums as places for free-choice learning in the experience economy (Pine & Gilmore, 1999), as sources of information and places for discovery learning in the knowledge age (Falk & Sheppard, 2006), and as places to attract and foster creativity for the emerging creative economy (Florida, 2002, 2008) or to help develop new aptitudes in design, empathy, and making meaning, for example, to provide the necessary edge for success in global business in the conceptual age (Pink, 2005). Each of these business models for economic development and growth may find value in the kinds of experiences, insights and informal learning visitors may gain from visiting museums and participating in the kinds of experiences and learning they have to offer.

But we should also keep in mind what museums can and cannot do. Anderson warns that a " business-like approach " in American art museums has become a " profit-minded approach, " and that we have not been sufficiently critical in too readily accepting the argument that " art museums' relevance to the public good — as judged by corporate underwriters, foundations, and private patrons — has as much to do with being engines of economic development as with art preservation and education " (Anderson, 2007: 10). In fact, with few exceptions, museums cannot support themselves on earned income, no matter how entrepreneurial they become. Emphasizing their contribution to economic growth puts them at a competitive disadvantage with theme parks, for example, and overlooks their mission and what they can do well.

Museums have educational and social purposes more important than their economic one. As Janes (2007) argues, museums are part of a " civil society " made up such social institutions such as religious, cultural and educational organizations that lie between the private sphere of family and the public spheres of state or market. Museums, like libraries and universities, contribute to " the networks, norms, trust and shared values--the ' social capital'--that is transferred into the social sphere and not only helps to hold society together, but is also instrumental in facilitating an understanding of the interconnectedness of society and the interests within it " (Janes, 2007: 223). Janes concludes, returning to the language of the marketplace, that a museum's most powerful brand lies not in its name or products and their economic utility, but in its mission and core values as these reflect and communicate the shared interests, purposes and values of a civil society (pp. 231-232).

New developments in technology have an effect on the educational, social and economic potential of museums, and suggest new business models as well. Weinberger has proposed a way of looking at a world changing though technology that at first glance sounds less like an opportunity than a challenge to museums where, as in most educational institutions, " we need experts to go through information, ideas, and knowledge and put them neatly away " (Weinberger, 2007: 22). Museums generally impose order, sequencing experiences so that visitors can learn from what curators have to show them in the orderly arrangement of objects and participatory experiences in exhibitions and other installations.

The alternative Weinberger proposes is a miscellaneous digital mess in which " different points of view are negotiated, given context, and embodied with passion and interest. " In management terms, " it's not whom you report to and who reports to you .... It's how messily you are connected and how thick with meaning are the links " (Weinberger, 2007: 230). The idea that visitors are making their own meaning and constructing knowledge from their actual and virtual experiences in museums has become the common assumption in most writing on museum education in the United States (Falk, Dierking & Adams, 2006). Wikipedia, for example, has become an effective compendium of socially constructed knowledge without the intervention of authority. A visit to YouTube makes clear that the meanings visitors construct for themselves and value do not have any necessary connection with the experiences, interpretation and meaning that museum staff—the experts—would like them to have. Searching through YouTube for videos of the National Palace Museum in Taipei, for example, we find homemade videos of feeding the koi at the top of the list, before videos produced or sponsored by the museum. Museum leaders have to enter into this mess, and find ways along with visitors, audiences, and other stakeholders to acknowledge and co-construct multiple, personally significant meanings for their institutions. They can no longer control meaning, nor should they want to.

These various conceptually overlapping paradigms, or understandings of the global world in which we live, can provide museum leaders with insight and tools for positioning their institutions as sites of value in the global economy and for advocating the central role of museum experiences in facilitating learning about oneself and others, and about the times and worlds in which we live. Their institutions can make a difference if they provide the leadership to develop and act upon an understanding of the value of museums for the public and stakeholders.

Purpose and Public Value

What are the characteristics of the well led and governed museum? Comprehensive guides do exist to answer this question. The American Association of Museums confers approval on museums in the United States through accreditation. AAM published a

comprehensive statement of key criteria or standards to use in the accreditation process in 1996, revised in 2005. This statement divides the " characteristics of an accreditable museum " into seven broad categories: public trust and accountability, mission and planning, leadership and organizational structure, collections stewardship, education and interpretation, financial stability, and facilities and risk management (American Association of Museums, 2005). Divided among these categories, the list of " characteristics describing a professionally run, high-functioning museum " (AAM, 2005: 6) is useful both as a guide in the process of accreditation, but even more, as it is intended, as a tool for museum directors, staff, and trustees or other governing authority to use in reflecting on the strength and weaknesses of their institution.

Weil proposed a shorter list that shifts attention from where to look to what to look for in well run museums, suggesting that " good " museums can be recognized by four criteria.

> Such organizations are *purposive* (they have a clear sense of what purposes external to themselves they are seeking to accomplish), *capable* (command the means required to accomplish those purposes), *effective* (are demonstrably able to accomplish the purposes they seek to accomplish), and *efficient* (are able to accomplish those purposes in a maximally economic way) [italics original]. (Weil, 2002b: 7)

I would like to focus on the first three criteria, as does Weil, and on the leader's role in meeting them. The fourth criterion is more a matter of good management than of leadership.

The " purposive " museum has a clearly defined mission and purpose, one that states what value the institution can bring to the lives of the people it serves. The traditional mission of collecting museums in the United States was to collect, preserve, exhibit, research, and interpret. This mission usually implied a greater attention to the objects collected than to the public served. But as a result of changes in the demographic, social, economic, and political contexts in which museums operate, attention has increasingly shifted in the past 20 years to the public dimension of museums (Weil, 2002a). This shift is reflected, for example, in *Excellence and Equity* (American Association of Museums, 1992), a report on the public role of museums that has been used by directors and boards of trustees to re-evaluate the purpose of their institutions and to rewrite their mission statements. The shift is also reflected in the 2001 revision of *Professional Practices in Art Museums* of the Association of Art Museum Directors, where " public education " was included for the first time as a main function of art museums (Association of Art Museum Directors, 2001: 8). The discussion of the public role of museums has become international with the decentralization of governance structures, insistence on accountability for public funds spent on their support, and the demand that they earn and find other ways to increase their private support. These developments may be described as a shift of attention from the cultural capital (collections) of museums to their social capital (relationships), but, as Suchy argues,

this does not imply that museums need to turn away from their collections, but rather that they should be " revaluing the social relationships that are built around the collection " (2004: 101).

In a purposive museum, the mission, vision for the future, strategic plan, policies, and daily practices are all aligned with the stated purposes of the institution. This purpose is understood by the staff working at the museum, it is communicated to external stakeholders, it influences the values of the institution, and, ideally, it is felt by all who visit the museum. The mission of the Children's Museum of Pittsburgh is to provide " innovative museum experiences that inspire joy, creativity and curiosity. " These feelings and engagement are indeed inspired as soon as we figure out how to make the chicken dance when we visit the museum's website[1].

The purpose and value of a purposive museum may include, for example, providing discovery-based learning to reinforce and broaden formal education for children in schools; supporting life-long learning through personal and social engagement in the arts; serving as stewards of culture, local and national history, and scientific discovery; advancing economic development through urban redevelopment and attracting cultural tourists; and providing centers for community gathering and dialog. The purposes are specific to each museum and to the communities it serves.

Capability, Strategic Planning, Stakeholders, and Core Values

A leader ensures that the museum has a strategic plan that situates it within changing external contexts, addresses the interests of the institution's stakeholders, and provides the means or capability, both internal and external, to carry out the plan. Strategic planning takes various forms. One common approach is to begin with forming a vision of what the museum can be and do for its various constituencies, a vision that challenges and inspires museum staff and supporters looking to the future.

Visioning goes hand in hand with a situational analysis to understand the museum in relation to other institutions and to the demographic, economic, physical, social, and political contexts in which it operates. A useful tool in this process is a so-called SWOT analysis, reviewing the museum's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. This planning must be guided both by the mission or purpose of the museum and by a vision of what the museum can become, on the one hand, and, on the other, by a clear headed understanding of what is possible, the capability of the museum. This capability includes such tangibles as the museum's collections and exhibits, its facilities, its base of financial

[1] http://www.pittsburghkids.org/

support, both public and private, and such intangibles as its brand, its name and recognition within the museum community.

Assessing capability depends upon understanding the museum's external stakeholders, the key people, constituencies, and other institutions that have an interest in and influence on the success of your museum. Identifying stakeholders may enable a leader to anticipate the kind of influence, positive or negative, these individuals or groups may have in supporting or hindering the museum, and enable the leader to develop strategies to get the most effective support possible for your plans. You may simply keep stakeholders in mind. But in order to be more proactive, especially at the beginning of a strategic planning process, it is useful to conduct a systematic stakeholder analysis.

To do such an analysis, first list the people, groups, and institutions that will affect or be affected by your museum and its programs and other activities, and by any plans you envision. Then identify the specific interests these stakeholders have in the museum and your plans. Consider such issues as the museum's benefit to the stakeholder, the changes that plans for the museum might require the stakeholder to make, and activities that might cause damage or conflict for the stakeholder. Second, ask how important the stakeholder's interests are to the success of the proposed project. Third, assess the impact of key stakeholders. Consider the role each must play for the museum to be successful, and the likelihood that the stakeholder will play this role, or, on the other hand, the likelihood and impact of a stakeholder's negative response. Fourth, prioritize your stakeholders, and first address stakeholders with a combination of high interest and greatest potential impact on the museum or plan. The final step is to consider the kinds of things that a leader could do to get stakeholder support and reduce opposition. Consider how you might approach each of the highest priority stakeholders. What motivates them? What kind of information do they want from you? How important is it to involve the stakeholder in the planning process? Are there other groups or individuals who might influence the stakeholder to support your initiative? Will these stakeholders influence other potential stakeholders who have not yet emerged?

Capability depends even more upon the museum's internal stakeholders, including committed and engaged trustees or governmental authorities; professional staff inspired by reciprocated respect and a shared vision of what the museum hopes to achieve and for whom; and motivated volunteers and donors. As a new museum director in the early 1990s, I worked with senior staff and a management consultant to develop goals for the museum. The first of these was: " Put the visitor first. " I have since learned that a better goal would have been " Put the employee first. " Attracting and retaining a strong and motivated staff depends upon providing opportunities for professional development and personal growth, and together establishing commonly agreed upon core values. At the Ringling Museum, we agreed by consensus that these values should be: communication, respect, leadership, teamwork, and accountability. Each of these core values implies certain agreed upon behaviors. We decided that " leadership ", for example, necessitated the following

behaviors:

Recognize that we are all leaders.
Lead by example.
Teach, motivate, and empower others.
Encourage initiative and embrace new thinking.
Provide an environment for professional development.

Core values are what we value most highly, reflecting the immediate context of our institutions and embodying the diverse values of the cultures and societies within which we live. In some contexts, team-based management is reinforced by cultural values and is appropriate, in others total quality management using a variety of quantitative benchmarks fits better, and in others a hierarchical structure based on an authoritarian charismatic leader should continue. But in each case, the success of the museum will depend upon finding and understanding a common set of core values and on valuing and empowering staff, as well as on understanding and building relationships with external stakeholders. As I have learned, a leader cannot do and think of everything, and cannot see the present context and future directions as clearly as groups of people thinking together, whether in team meetings or in informal and sometimes accidental encounters in the lunchroom. Much of the best work done by staff cannot be understood by looking at an organizational chart. It occurs in the messy social interactions that occur off the chart (Friedman, 2007). If, as I think, people are the museum's most valuable asset, a good leader must build this human capability, and retain, develop, empower, and use staff wisely, and understand the importance of core values in doing so.

Effectiveness and Evaluation

A good museum is an effective museum. Whether or not a museum is effective depends upon more than a balanced budget and ability to account for how its budget is spent, or on such measurable outputs as the growth of the collections or number of exhibitions, the number of visitors who come to the museum or participate in the museum's programs and other activities, or the number of museum members and volunteers. Like many museum directors, I have used such numbers as indicators of the health of my institution and as evidence to advocate for further public and private support. But these numbers, though easy to collect and report, do not give a clear indication of the personal significance for a visitor of the time spent in a gallery exploring an exhibition or the nature of a museum member's involvement and identification with a museum.

A better measure of the success of a good museum are what have been called the outcomes of the institution, what benefits, both tangible and intangible, the museum is able to provide its visitors, other audiences, stakeholders, and community. " Outcomes " has become an increasingly popular term in non-profit management since the 1990s in the

United States, for example, as foundations and local, state and federal agencies have held museums accountable for the support they receive, often requiring reports that evaluate the impact or outcomes of their funded activities. These outcomes can be measured through evaluation in a number of ways (Anderson, 2004), depending upon the nature of the institution and its mission and role in the community.

Outcomes should relate to the purpose and mission of the museum (Fox, 2004) and to the audiences and stakeholders it serves. In a purposive museum, evaluation and assessment are used to clarify what is meant by these stated purposes and how they may be met, and to demonstrate whether these purposes are indeed fulfilled and that the museum has been accountable for the support it has received. In a purposive museum, purpose or intention informs the planning and implementation of exhibitions, programs and other activities. Evaluation of outcomes is the means to assess effectiveness. This occurs at the programmatic level where, for example, the focus is on whether an exhibition has met its goals. It also occurs at the institutional level where the most important question may be whether the institution continues to fulfill its mission and acts in keeping with core values, rather than whether visitor attendance is up. Evaluation enables the leader, staff and supporters of a museum to focus on three important questions: " Where are we going? How will we get there? How well are we doing? " (Korn, 2007: 260). Asking these questions, a leader can model and encourage a cycle of planning, action, evaluation, and reflection that enables what Korn calls the " intentional museum " to continuously learn and change in a changing environment.

Advocacy

A museum leader has a good story to tell if his or her institution has a clearly defined purpose, capability, and evidence based on evaluation of the museum's effectiveness in meeting this purpose, ideally in a cost-effective, efficient manner. But successful advocacy also depends upon defining the specific audiences. Different target audiences necessitate different messages and means of communication. As a museum director, I relied on the active engagement of schoolchildren in the galleries to make our case for the educational value of the museum to potential donors, and on major contributors to political campaigns to speak with legislators in the state capitol. Needless to say, ask your stakeholders to help define the messages you would like to communicate, so that you can also rely on them to help carry and sustain these messages. Support your message with specific research demonstrating outcomes, preferably quantifiable measures of impact where available, and with powerful stories to make your vision real and your requests compelling. Be specific as well in what actions you are seeking and provide multiple ways for the museum's supporters to engage and assist in advocacy.

Some efforts in advocacy lead to the desired results, others do not. It is important to

obtain feedback to assess which efforts directed to which audiences are productive, and which are not. Like any use of time and money, advocacy for its own sake is a waste of resources. Once engaged in an advocacy campaign, be ready to sustain it, difficult to do after the initial launch and excitement of a major advocacy campaign has passed. Advocacy must be sustained, and become a continuous responsibility in the life of a leader. On the other hand, if the message is well fitted to the purpose and capability of the museum and if it is meaningful to its audiences, then advocacy can energize a museum leader, providing an opportunity to tell a relevant and important story.

As advocates, museum leaders direct their attention outward. But do not forget to engage your own staff in the process of developing your messages and give them opportunities to participate in conveying them. A museum educator on the staff of the Ringling Museum surprised me with her suggestion that I call upon teachers from around the State of Florida who had participated in workshops at the Ringling to contact their local legislators and explain how the museum provided educational services for their local districts. It became one of the most effective tools in advocating for increased state government support for the museum.

Facing decentralization in the governance of museums and calls for accountability and internal opportunities to reflect on core values, empower staff and motivate supporters, museum leaders are most effective in their advocacy and leadership if they practice the kind of transparency that "reveals not only the mechanics of museum operations, but also the philosophy of management" (Anderson, 2007: 14). A leader is not alone.

References

American Association of Museums, 1992. Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

—— 2001. Guidelines for Museums on Developing and Managing Business Support. Retrieved June 25, 2008, from http://www.aam-us.org/museumresources/ethics/bus_support.cfm.

—— 2005. A Higher Standard: Museum Accreditation Program Standards, 2. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Anderson, M. L., 2004. Metrics of Success in Art Museums. *In:* Getty Leadership Institute, The Compleat Leader. Retrieved July 16, 2008, from http://www.getty.edu/leadership/compleat_leader/evalperf.html.

—— 2007. Prescriptions for art museums in the decade ahead. Curator, 50(1): 9-17.

Association of Art Museum Directors, 2001. Professional Practices in Art Museums. New York: Association of Art Museum Directors.

Boylan, P. J., 2006. Current trends in governance and management of museums in Europe. *In:* Genoways, H. H. (Ed.), Museum Philosophy for the Twenty-first Century, pp. 201-

219. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
Chang, Yu-Chien, 2007. Museum global marketing: A case study of the National Palace Museum (Taiwan). *In:* Bugge Amundsen, A. & Nyblom, A. (Eds.), National Museums in a Global World. NaMu III, Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, University of Oslo, November 19-21, 2007. Linköping
Electronic Conference Proceedings, 31. Retrieved August 14, 2008, from http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp/031/003/.
Falk, J. H., Dierking, L. D. & Adams, M., 2006. Living in a learning society: Museums and free-choice learning. *In:* Macdonald, S. (Ed.), A Companion to Museum Studies, pp. 323-339. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
Falk, J. H. & Sheppard, B. K., 2006. Thriving in the Knowledge Age: New Business Models for Museums and Other Cultural Institutions. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
Florida, R., 2002. The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure and Everyday Life. New York: Basic Books.
—— 2008. Who's Your City?: How the Creative Economy Is Making Where to Live the Most Important Decision of Your Life. New York: Basic Books.
Fox, H., 2006. Beyond the bottom line: Evaluating art museums with the balanced scorecard. *In:* Getty Leadership Institute, The Compleat Leader. Retrieved July 16, 2008, from http://www.getty.edu/leadership/compleat_leader/evalperf.html.
Friedman, T. L., 2007. The World Is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-first Century (3rd ed.). New York: Picador.
Gumbel, P., 2008. Louvre Inc.. Time, 172(6): 50-52.
Itoi, K., 2005. Japanese shows get top visitor numbers: The 2001 semi-privatisation of centrally funded institutions has led to a string of blockbuster at one end, and museum closures at the other. The Art Newspaper, March, 2005: 1.
Janes, R. R., 2007. Museums, Corporatism and the civil society. Curator, 50(2): 219-237.
Korn, R., 2007. The case for holistic intentionality. Curator, 50(2): 255-264.
Pine, B. J., II & Gilmore, J. H., 1999. The Experience Economy: Work Is Theatre and Every Business Is a Stage. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
Pink, D. H., 2005. A Whole New Mind: Moving from the Information Age to the Conceptual Age. New York: Riverhead Books.
Suchy, S., 2004. Leading with Passion: Change Management in the 21st-century Museum. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
Twitchell, J. B., 2004. Branded Nation: The Marketing of Megachurch, College, Inc., and Museumworld. New York: Simon & Schuster.
Tzeng, Shin-Chieh, 2005. A comparative study of museum governance of national museums in the UK and Taiwan. *In:* Colbert, F. (Ed.), Proceedings of 8th International Conference on Arts and Cultural Management. Montreal: HEC Montreal. Retrieved July 2, 2008, from http://www.connectcp.org/profiles/profile.php?profileid=601.
Weil, S. E., 2002a. From being about something to being for somebody: The ongoing transformation of the American museum. *In:* Weil, S. E., Making Museums Matter.

Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
—— 2002b. Organization-wide quality: A theory of museums and immodest proposal. *In:* Weil, S. E., Making Museums Matter. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
Weinberger, D., 2007. Everything Is Miscellaneous: The Power of the New Digital Disorder. New York: Times Books.

Manuscript received September 5, 2008; accepted October 13, 2008

博物館學季刊，22(4)：53-75

二十一世紀博物館的領導力：宗旨、利益關係人與價值

撰文／艾大衛[1]
翻譯／高慧芬

摘要[2]

就博物館界而言，當前是研究博物館領導這個議題令人振奮的時刻。為了提昇博物館收入與民間支持，許多公立博物館紛紛轉由區域性或地方性政府部門管理，甚至委託私人單位經營。於是，過去只須負責管理的博物館人，由於博物館角色與功能的遞嬗，如今必須擔負起博物館領導者的角色。對博物館領導者而言，跨出博物館之外可向企業模式借鏡，學習如何定位與營運策略之調整，例如究竟是成為文化觀光目的地、城鎮振興景點、資訊時代的學習場域？還是要成為創意與觀念掛帥年代驅動創意經濟的場所？不過，從公民社會角度觀之，博物館仍處於共同利益與價值所構築的社會資本網絡之中。

簡言之，21世紀的博物館領導者至少應具備下列能力：瞭解博物館設立宗旨與公共價值、有策略性地提出計畫使願景得以實現、爭取外在利益關係人的支持與認同使博物館得以朝既定目標前進、任用有效能的館員並鼓勵員工提昇專業知能以及形塑組織文化與核心價值（如尊重、團隊合作和責任感等）。此外，領導者亦須適時為博物館發聲以贏得各界支持。

博物館領導者、館員與支持者彼此相互依存，同處於一個以計畫、執行、評鑑與檢討的循環體系當中，相互學習並不斷自我修正以適應外在環境的瞬息萬變。切記，領導者要將「人」放在問題思考的第一優先，且絕不孤軍奮戰。

關鍵詞：博物館領導力、宗旨、核心價值

---

[1] E-mail: dme12@psu.edu
[2] 中文摘要翻譯：吳岱融，美國賓州州立大學藝術教育與女性研究雙修博士候選人。

從管理到領導

1990年我曾經參加一個由蓋提基金會所贊助的暑期「博物館管理講習會」。這個為期一個月的講習會，目的在於儲備小型博物館館長或大型博物館的部門領導人才，使其在館內能擔負更大的行政責任。2003年該研習方案被更名為「博物館領導人才訓練班」。這個名稱的改變反映出美國博物館館長的角色在1990年代有很大的轉變，也就是從一個善於整合並能有效利用蒐藏、人力、財務及其他資源的管理者，變成一個必須具有前瞻性眼光、使組織在變化中的世界能夠靈活因應的領導者。因此，博物館在過去20年已經被視同企業。最有效率的企業是由領導者帶領，而不是由管理者經營。本文即是探討博物館領導者的地位。

這個令人興奮的年代已經引導博物館走到前所未有的境界，全世界的博物館管理結構正在轉變當中。為數不少的公立博物館紛紛將管理權交到地方政府手中，甚至民營化，企求從門票、販售商品、個人或企業捐助來增加私人經營的財源。對外，博物館的領導者看到博物館處在世界經濟的網絡之中，並在文化、觀念與人員等方面進行國際交流。博物館被視為文化資本的象徵，背負著地方社區、人民以及國家的期望。在資訊時代，博物館是供大眾學習的場所，也是有潛力可以促進經驗經濟（experience economy）成長（Pine & Gilmore, 1999），並且對創意經濟（creative economy）有所貢獻的地方（Florida, 2002, 2008）。在未來，定義時代的觀念是創新與意義而非資訊（Pink, 2005）。博物館的領導者，必須面對觀眾人口結構改變的問題，必須面對來自其他文化機構及學習機會日增的競爭壓力，以及來自科技對於博物館現有經驗的強化或取而代之的衝擊。

要因應上述種種問題，博物館的領導者必須設法瞭解它的利益關係人，必須彰顯博物館的任務以及組織的願景，也必須因應外在環境變化而提出策略性計畫，並且從各方面來宣傳博物館存在的價值，包括：蒐藏保存、知識傳播、以新觀念引導觀眾等。換言之，博物館的領導者須蓄積能量以達成組織的目標。除了確保資金的充足與穩定，持續僱用並留住有效能的人才，並給予指導與鼓勵之外，博物館的領導者更要支持館員在專業上的發展，並且要塑造組織文化的核心價值，例如：尊重、團隊合作與責任等。博物館的領導者不必單打獨鬥，而須廣納人才以合力達成目標。

本文論及與博物館領導有關的觀點，乃得自筆者個人在美國的親身體驗。不論是過去在蓋提美術館擔任教育部門主管，或目前在藝術教育系擔任教職，都讓我瞭解到「人」的重要性。包括博物館的觀眾，以及博物館最重要的資源——館員。其次，在佛羅里達州芮林美術館（John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art）擔任館長的經驗當中，我也學到兩件事：第一，單靠營運收入及私人捐款而沒有公部門預算支持的博物館營運，是極為困難的事；第二，外部的利益關係人對博物館的觀感，深深影響到博物館內部的利益關係人（如董事、館員和義工等）的工作。

我的觀點其實也受到一些作者的影響，他們的文章使我對自己的博物館工作經驗有更清楚的認識。有許多人不斷地寫文章，為博物館館長提供有關管理方面的指導，我認為其中最具影響力的是 Stephen Weil（2002a, 2002b），他從一個最根本的組織觀點來檢視博物館的定位及管理，並改寫營利與非營利部門的企業實務，使其適用於美國博物館的運作。在他身故之後 Curator 期刊還特別以相關主題為他出了專輯（Curator, 2007, 50 [2]）。但若要看不同面向的文章，例如從

人性的觀點來探討館長的角色扮演，包括館長面對變革時的領導風格、情緒智商以及熱忱度，則可參考Sherene Suchy所寫的有關博物館領導的國際性研究論文。

變化中的管理結構：從公有到民營

美國大多數的博物館是由董事會託管的私立非營利組織。它們營運的財源主要來自收入所得以及私人或政府的資助。極少數由聯邦政府、州政府或地方政府管理的博物館，已經越來越多向私人尋求財源。20世紀大半時期，藝術博物館尤其能以私人慈善事業的態勢經營，包括蒐藏的建立，以及贊助機制的形成，以確保營運支出之經費來源。雖然個人贊助仍然持續，但尋求私部門企業支持及合資經營，已是當前美國博物館的趨勢，因此美國博物館協會（AAM）於2001年出版了《博物館如何開發與管理來自企業的資助》（Guidelines for Museums on Developing and Managing Business Support）一書。

相較於美國，有許多國家（包括臺灣）的博物館，至今仍由國家或地方政府，或直接管轄或在背後支持。但是，在過去20年，歐洲的國家博物館已經移給行政區或地方政府掌理，甚至民營化，使其得以透過商業活動或私人捐助而更能自給自足；而稅賦的優惠則是為了鼓勵企業或私人對博物館的捐助（Boylan, 2006）。英國的維多利亞與亞伯特博物館（Victoria and Albert Museum）於1988年為了增加收入，由Saatchi & Saatchi廣告企劃，將其品牌定義為「王牌咖啡館附設之優質博物館」，因而喧騰一時，引發不少爭議。同樣的情況也發生在日本（Itoi, 2005）和臺灣（Chang, 2007; Tzeng, 2005）。南韓的三星藝術博物館（Samsung Museum of Art）是由電子業的鉅子 Leeum 家族所創建，他們負起了一般認為文化觀光部、教育部及人力資源部應該扮演的角色，讓企業利益與國家利益合而為一，進而創造出一個博物館特區，以展示和詮釋傳統、現代及當代的韓國藝術，以此形塑國家文化的認同與驕傲。

博物館治理模式之轉變、朝向民營化發展或移轉成由地方控管的各種形式，都是一種國際趨勢，而且未來仍可能持續發展。誠如所見，公立博物館隨著政黨的輪替，因為新官上任和法令的改變，其治理模式可能突然改變且毫無預警。相反的，治理模式的快速轉變在私人組織並不常見，有的話也是漸進式的，其驅動力主要來自博物館本身的經濟考量。面對治理變革以及財政上的需求，博物館領導者必須瞭解各個利益關係人（例如政治人物、企業家、慈善家以及觀眾等）對博物館的興趣為何。在治理形式變革之前，管理者就應該和這些利益關係人建立關係，如此才可能在此歷程中有自己的聲音，甚至能發揮引導作用。為此，博物館領導者須先瞭解其組織的價值何在，並且能夠對不同的對象說明，進而尋求夥伴關係以及發展合資企業。

策略性定位：以企業和其他營運模式經營博物館

美國的博物館及其他國家採用民營化的博物館，其領導者既迫於政治及財務上的現實，又受到企業新夥伴的鼓舞，莫不期待以企業模式來領導博物館的運作。對內而言，企業經營模式可增進及有效運用人力及財務資源，對外則可作為組織的策略性定位。企業管理模式之導入，使博物館對其內部的實務管理有新的做法，諸如：形勢分析及策略

規劃、目標管理、全面品質管理、團隊合作、核心價值分享以及後英雄式及領導轉換等。對外而言，這些模式則可用於市場區隔、商展及營銷和品牌的開發，例如古根漢以其名號拓展國際市場（Twitchell, 2004）。接著，羅浮宮也步其後塵 (Gumbel, 2008)。臺灣的故宮博物院，兼具科技行銷與教育發展的數位博物館也如法泡製（Chang, 2007）。這些企業模式因此成為美國博物館的重點工作，其他國家也是如此。其間，難免遇到一些來自博物館館員及支持者的抗拒而有些許遺憾。因為在過去的年代，蒐藏與知識的重要性是至高無上的。

企業模式會隨著世界局勢而改變。博物館的領導者可以也必須去檢視過去十年間被討論過的議題，包括思考模式、生活方式和企業實務等，因其對於博物館的影響不亞於對國際企業體。博物館的領導者要把握機會將組織的品牌名稱加以運用，例如博物館與文化、品質、高級和名流有關聯的元素，或可連結於特殊故事或有價值的知識（Twitchell, 2004; Chang, 2007; Gumbel, 2008）。博物館既是支持地方經濟發展的文化觀光場所，也可以是都市重劃中的地標。博物館的領導者要善用博物館，因為它是經驗經濟（Pine & Gilmore, 1999）所宣稱的自由選擇學習的地方，也是在充斥資訊的知識時代中可供探索學習的地方（Falk & Sheppard, 2006），更是新興的創意經濟（Florida, 2002, 2008）所必需的誘發及培養創意的場域。另外，它也可能有助於讓新的才能被開發，例如設計才能、同理心及創造意義等，在觀念時代中，這些能力的應用在全球經濟體系都占有一席之地（Pink, 2005）。在經濟發展的歷程中，每一種企業模式都可有它在經驗、見解和非正式學習方面的價值。而觀眾可以從參觀博物館中，體驗種種的經驗，從博物館所提供的場域中學到一些東西。

但是，我們也應該注意到有哪些是博物館能做的，有哪些是不能做的。安德森（Anderson, 2007: 10）曾經警告，美國藝術博物館的「企業化取向」已經變成「利潤掛帥」。目前尚無足夠論證讓企業認捐者、基金會和私人贊助者去接受藝術博物館是公益事業這個關鍵性的問題。對他們而言，藝術博物館除了是藝術的保存與教育者，更是經濟發展的發動機。除少數的例外，博物館無論企業化的程度如何，事實上無法靠營利收入來自給自足。強調博物館對經濟成長的貢獻而讓它們在處於劣勢的情況下與主題公園競爭，儼然無視博物館的任務以及它們在社會貢獻方面的強項。

博物館有比經濟目的更為重要的教育與社會目標。詹尼斯（Janes, 2007）主張博物館是「公民社會」的一部分，公民社會由社團組織組成，包括宗教、文化以及教育團體，存在於私領域（如家庭）、公領域（如國家或市場）之間。博物館和圖書館及大學一樣，讓網絡、規範、信任和共同價值觀等所謂的「社會資本」在社會領域中凝聚社會力量，並且藉以瞭解綿密的社會網絡與分享利益 (Janes, 2007: 223)。總而言之，詹尼斯認為，回到行銷的用語，博物館是一個最有威力的品牌，不僅在於它的名稱、商品及經濟效益，也在於博物館的任務和其核心價值所傳遞出共同的利益、目標及公民社會的價值。

新科技的發展影響了博物館在教育、社會及經濟方面的潛能，而新的企業模式也同時應運而生。溫伯格（Weinberger, 2007: 22）提議從科技來看世界的改變。乍看之下，科技對博物館及許多教育機構而言，是一種挑戰而不是機會，因為「我們需要專家來處理資訊、想法及知識，然後將它們好好地儲存起來」。一般說來，博物館強調有秩序、系列性的經驗，讓觀眾從蒐藏研究人員所展示的井然有序的物件中學習，

或從展示及博物館的各種設施中去體驗。

溫伯格還有一個另類的提議，那就是在各式各樣混雜的數位化狀態中，「透過熱情與興趣，讓不同的觀點，經過協調、整理，然後具體化呈現」。從管理的角度，「這不是誰向誰報告的問題……而是你如何處在錯綜複雜的網絡以及你所連結的訊息究竟具有多少意義」（Weinberger, 2007: 230）。觀眾在其虛虛實實的博物館經驗中，創造自己的意義，建構自己的知識。這在美國有關博物館教育的論文中，已形成一種共通的假設（Falk, Dierking & Adams, 2006）。例如《維基百科》就是一本不受權威介入而由社會建構的強而有力的知識手冊。由YouTube影片分享網站可以清楚看出，影片的意義是由瀏覽的網友自行建構，不必然和館員／專家所要灌輸的經驗、解釋或意思相關聯。又如，從YouTube搜尋臺北故宮博物院，發現在這些自製上傳的影片裡，餵食鯉魚的影片竟然列入其中，而且排名在由故宮自製或贊助拍攝的影片之前。博物館的領導者必須深入這些混亂的狀態，然後結合觀眾及其他利益關係人一起找方法，以確認及建構博物館既多元又個人化的意義。在意義的建構上，博物館不能也不再主導。

這些各式各樣理念相近的普世範例或認知，可以做為博物館的領導者在定位博物館時的參考及工具。博物館是要在全球經濟體系中占有一席之地，或是要以博物館經驗促進對自己與對他人的瞭解，以及認識我們生存的時代與世界，都是博物館的定位問題。假如博物館的領導者能夠讓大眾及利益關係人對博物館的價值有所瞭解，博物館是可以有一番作為的。

宗旨與公共價值

有哪些特徵足以顯示一個博物館具有良好的領導與管理？有一些專業指南可以回答這個問題。AAM透過鑑定制度來認定美國的博物館，而且已經在1996年出版一份完備的評鑑項目及標準檢核表，並在2005年再版修訂。這份表單將博物館的認證項目分成七大領域：公共信託與責任、使命與規劃能力、領導與組織結構、蒐藏管理、教育與解說、財務穩定度，以及設施和危機管理等（AAM, 2005）。根據這些領域區分，有一份「專業化經營、高功能博物館」的特性描述表（AAM, 2005: 6）不僅可做為認證過程的指南，而且是博物館館長、館員、董事或其他管理當局用來自我檢視博物館優缺點的利器。

威爾（ Weil, 2002b: 7）曾經提出一份更簡短的表單，可用來檢視博物館的運作。它把注意力從「要檢視哪些地方」（Where to look to）轉向「該檢視什麼」（What to look for），才可以分辨博物館營運的好壞。他認為「好」博物館的四項指標是：

一、有企圖心：確實知道外界對它的期待及自己要達成設館的宗旨。
二、有能力：能以適當方法達成宗旨。
三、有效能：能展現實力以達成宗旨。
四、有效率：能以最經濟的方式達成宗旨。

像威爾一樣，在此我只從領導者的角度針對前三項指標加以探討，主要是因為第四項指標比較偏重管理的層面而非領導的問題。

「有企圖心」的博物館具有明確界定的使命與目標，其中闡明博物館的價值，也就是它的存在對民眾的生活有何助益。在美國以蒐藏為主的博物館，其傳統任務為蒐藏、保存、展示、研究與詮釋。這樣的使命意味著館方對物件蒐藏的重視甚於對社會大眾的服務。然

而，隨著人口結構、社會、經濟及政治形勢的改變，過去20年，博物館的運作重心逐漸轉移至大眾面向（Weil, 2002a）。從《卓越與機會均等》（Excellence and Equity）（AAM, 1992）一書的出現可以看出這個轉變。該書旨在論述博物館的公共角色，可供各館館長及董事會重新評估或修訂博物館的目標與使命。這項轉變也反映在2001年藝術博物館館長協會（Association of Art Museum Directors）所修訂的《藝術博物館的專業實務》（Professional Practices in Art Museums）一書，其中「大眾教育」首度被納入藝術博物館主要功能之列(Association of Art Museum Directors, 2001: 8)。博物館的公共角色一時成為國際性議題，其他還有：去中心化的管理結構、公共資金用於特定項目，要求自籌更多私有財源等議題。這種發展可說是從博物館的文化資本（藏品）轉向社會資本（關係）。但是，誠如 Suchy（2004: 101）所言，這並非意味著博物館就要拋開它的蒐藏，而是應該重估如何在蒐藏的基礎上建立社會關係。

具有企圖心的博物館，大自其使命、遠景、策略性計畫、政策，小至日常運作，都須符合博物館設立的宗旨。這個宗旨要讓全館館員都瞭解，也要傳達給外部的利益關係人知道。宗旨與博物館的價值有密切關聯，因此，最好也能讓觀眾感受到博物館的宗旨為何。匹茲堡兒童博物館（Children's Museum of Pittsburgh）的使命在於提供「新的博物館經驗，能帶動歡樂、創意與好奇」。當我們光臨該館的網站[3]，試圖要讓小雞跳舞時，這種情緒確實被激發了起來。

具有企圖心的博物館其目標和價值觀可以如：為制式教育中的學童提供加深加廣的探索學習，透過個人或社會對藝術的參與來進行終身學習，為文化、地方史、國史及科學發現而服務，藉由都市再造與文化觀光來促進經濟發展，亦可做為社區集會和意見交流的中心。這些目標因館而異，也因服務的社區而異。

潛能、策略性計畫、利益關係人及核心價值

一位領導者要確保博物館有策略性計畫，可放諸於變動的外部環境中，可滿足組織關係人的利益，並提供方法或結合內外部的能量來實現這個計畫。策略性計畫可有不同的形式。一個共通的方法是先提出願景，看看博物館可以為不同的群眾做些什麼，而願景則可以挑戰並激勵館員和支持者向前看。

願景和形勢分析是分不開的，必先瞭解博物館和其他組織的關係，甚至和人口結構、經濟、環境、社會以及政治背景間的關係。SWOT分析是分析這個過程的有效工具，它檢視了博物館的優勢、缺點、機會和威脅等面向。這個計畫要有正確的導向，必須一方是博物館的使命或目標及願景，一方則是明白指出什麼是可能的，亦即博物館的潛能在哪裡。博物館的潛能包括有形和無形資產，有形的如博物館的蒐藏、展示、設施以及來自公家和私人的財力支持。無形資產則如品牌、名號以及博物館在社群中的認同度。

要評估潛能有多少，就要去瞭解博物館外部利益關係人、關鍵人物、社群以及其他對於博物館感興趣或有影響力的組織。能夠識別利益關係人，可讓領

[3] http://www.pittsburghkids.org/

導者預作準備以應付各種正面的或負面的影響，而這些具影響力的個人或團體可能支持也可能阻礙博物館的發展，領導者因此能夠發展一些策略，讓博物館的計畫獲得最有效的支持。領導者可以只記住這些利益關係人，但是為了讓計畫更積極正面的進行，對利益關係人做系統性分析是有幫助的。

進行分析時，首先列出影響博物館或會被影響的個人、團體及組織名單，以及影響博物館願景的計畫及其他活動。然後找出利益關係人可能對哪部分的博物館或計畫感到興趣。此時考慮的議題包括利益關係人的受益如何？這些計畫會對利益關係人做何種改變？哪些活動可能損及利益關係人或造成衝突？其次，斟酌利益關係人的興趣對於計畫的成功所占的比重。第三，評估來自主要利益關係人的衝擊。仔細推敲要讓博物館成功的各種角色，利益關係人可能扮演正面的角色，也可能帶來負面的反應，其衝擊又如何。第四，區分利益關係人，將那些對於博物館或計畫具有高度興趣與鉅大影響潛力者列為優先。最後，思考一下領導者要做些什麼事，才能獲得利益關係人的支持而減少對抗。而後，想辦法接近列在優先順位的利益關係人。什麼事可以激勵他們？他們想要知道何種信息？讓利益關係人涉入計畫過程的重要性如何？有其他的個人或團體會左右利益關係人的支持嗎？這些利益關係人會影響其他潛在的利益關係人嗎？

博物館的潛能主要來自內部的利益關係人，包括被委任與參與執事的董事或是政府當局，因受到尊重與徵詢博物館的願景而受到激勵的專業館員，還有被鼓舞的義工和捐助者。在1990年代早期，當我新任館長時，曾和資深館員與一位管理顧問共同草擬出博物館的目標。首要的目標是「觀眾優先」。從此，我知道「將員工擺在第一位」會是一個好目標。要吸引或留住優秀而積極的員工，必須給與專業發展與個人成長的機會，同時建立一致的核心價值。在芮林美術館，我們對於價值觀的共識是：溝通、尊重、領導、團隊以及責任等。每一項核心價值皆隱含某種行為承諾。例如，我們認定的「領導」必須有下列特質：

一、能認知「每一個人都是領導者」
二、以身作則
三、教導、鼓勵和開發能力
四、鼓勵創新，懷抱新觀念
五、提供專業發展的環境

核心價值是最珍貴的，它能立即反映組織目前所處的情境背景，而且也能顯示我們所處的文化與社會的多元價值。在某些環境中，以團隊為基礎的管理是組織文化的價值傾向而且有其適當性。在「全品質管理」的環境中，則須採用一些量化的指標做為管理的評量依據。另外，以威權領導的科層結構組織也仍然存在。無論何種情況，博物館要成功，必須找出也必須知道共同的核心價值，也要珍惜自己的員工，並能充分授權；同時要瞭解其外部利益關係人，並與之建立良好關係。根據我個人經驗，一位領導者無法事必躬親，也不可能料事如神，對於現在情勢和未來方向的判斷或選擇，三個臭皮匠通常會勝過一個諸葛亮。這從團體會議上的發言，或在非正式的場合，或在餐廳的對談中皆可見一斑。博物館館員的最佳表現無法由組織圖看出，而是由日常瑣碎的社會互動中產生（Friedman, 2007）。我認為人力是博物館最佳的資產，那麼，一位好的領導者必須知道核心價值之所在，並為此而累積人力資源，設法增加員工的潛能，相關作為包括聘僱適當人才、開發人力資源、充分授權及知人善用等。

效能及評量

一座好的博物館是能發揮效能的博物館。博物館是否發揮效能，主要在於它的收支平衡而且預算恰當，或在於它的蒐藏及展示數量的成長，或在於參觀博物館及參與活動的觀眾數量，或在於博物館會員及義工人數。就像許多博物館館長一樣，我也採用數量作為博物館體質好壞的指標，並且以此為數據來說服政府或私人繼續支持博物館。雖然這些數字收集或報告的撰寫都很容易，但是卻無法明白顯示它對觀眾個人的意義。無法看出觀眾花時間在展示廳探索的情況，也無法瞭解博物館會員涉入博物館的程度，以及他們對於博物館的認同度。

評量博物館成功與否，較好的方式是評量組織的產出（outcomes）如何，例如：博物館的服務對象，包括觀眾、其他社群、利益關係人或是社區民眾，有哪些有形或無形的獲益。「產出」在1990年代的美國，成為非營利管理方面的流行用語。例如：不論是基金會或是地方、區域，甚至聯邦政府在資助博物館時，會同時要求博物館該負擔某種責任，通常會要求博物館對經費資助下的活動提出報告，以評估其影響及結果。這些產出結果可以透過各種不同方式加以評量（Anderson, 2004），但其評量都得以博物館的的本質、使命及其在社區中的角色為依據。

產出結果必須和博物館的宗旨及使命有所關連（Fox, 2004），且須擴及於服務的觀眾和利益關係人。具有企圖心的博物館，利用評估或評價來闡明博物館的宗旨為何，如何達成目標，以及這些目標是否真的達成，而博物館是否對其支持者有所交代等等。有明確宗旨的博物館，它的宗旨就是規劃展示、各項計畫及活動等之指導方針，也是業務執行的導向。產出結果的評量，也就是對效能的評價。同樣的理念也須落實在業務層次的評量，例如展示是否符合全館的目標；在組織層級的評量亦然，例如評量時最重要的問題應該是組織是否延續它的使命、是否依核心價值行事，而不是問觀眾人數是否增加。評量可以讓博物館的領導者、館員及其支持者聚焦在三項重要的問題上：我們的目的地為何？我們如何到達目的地？我們的表現又如何？這些問題可讓領導者塑造出一個從規劃、執行、評估到反省的循環歷程，使博物館能成為 Korn 所稱的「意圖明確的博物館」，而能在變動的環境中持續不斷地學習與改進。

宣傳獲得支持

假如博物館有明確的宗旨、潛能，並且經過評量之後能夠顯示博物館很有效率地以合乎成本效益的情況達成目標，那麼，博物館的領導者將有一個動人的博物館故事可以侃侃而談。然而，博物館仍須訴諸於不同的群眾以獲得支持。針對不同的群眾，要用不同的溝通方式給予不同的信息。作為一位館長，對於潛在的捐助者，我借助於學童的積極參與博物館活動來示範博物館的教育價值；在政治運作上，我依賴主要捐獻者到州議會和立法委員溝通。不必贅言，請求利益關係人協助釐訂博物館想要傳達的意向，博物館就可以靠著他們來執行這些任務並獲得支持。博物館的宣傳資訊必須有明確的研究結果來支持，最好是以量化的研究資料來呈現博物館對社會之影響，再輔以強而有力的報導，讓願景的實現具體化，也令人信服。另外，在作法上也要明確，並且提供多元方式讓博物館的支持者能夠參與並且一起鼓吹。

博物館在宣傳上的努力，有些有令人滿意的結果，有些則否。重要的是要

取得回饋，藉以評價針對何種群眾所做的努力成果較為豐碩，何種則不如預期。宣傳本身需要花費時間和金錢，一旦著手進行宣傳活動，切記只是曇花一現，就算困難也要持續下去。宣傳必須持續，它為領導者在領導生涯中長期的職責。另一方面，如果宣傳的信息能符合博物館的宗旨和潛能，且對群眾而言又深具意義，那麼，這種宣傳就可讓領導者能量十足，因為它讓領導者有機會對大眾述說一則既有關聯又很重要的故事。

博物館的領導者，為了宣傳，其注意力是對外的。但是，也不要忘記讓自己的館員參與信息的發展過程，並讓他們付諸實現。芮林美術館的一位教育人員就給了我驚奇，她建議我去拜訪佛州州內參加過芮林研習活動的老師們，請他們去告訴當地的議員，說明博物館對當地所提供的教育服務。這項工作促使州政府對博物館的支持，是最有效益的宣傳工具之一。

博物館領導者必須面對很多問題，例如博物館治理的去中心化，被要求要負責任、在館內形塑核心價值，以及授權和激勵支持者等問題。如果「博物館的運作機制，以及管理理念」夠透明的話，博物館的領導者將會展現其在宣傳及領導方面的最佳效能（Anderson, 2007: 14）。所以，一個領導者不必孤軍奮鬥。

收稿日期：97年9月5日；接受日期：97年10月13日

作者簡介

本文作者為美國麻州哈佛大學哲學博士，曾任加州蓋提中心（Getty Center）教育與學術中心主任與佛州芮林美術館館長。目前任教於美國賓州州立大學，為藝術教育研究所副教授暨該所博物館與文化機構課程負責人。

中華民國九十七年十月