

Exploring Cultural Leadership Ecosystems and Their Role in Urban Regeneration

Dr. Jan Brown, Liverpool John Moores University, UK.

Abstract

Purpose: In post-industrial urban economies the importance of the role of creative industries in influencing the direction of urban development has been clearly identified (Scott, 2008). Within these industries cultural leaders act as key catalysts for urban renewal and redevelopment. Understanding who these leaders are and how value is formed within the cultural group, ecosystem, may be of vital importance to the success of urban regeneration projects and the wider urban ecosystem(s). This paper proposes the use of a service ecosystem framework explore and develop new models cultural leadership.

Design/methodology/approach: In order to explore cultural leadership in practice a service ecosystem approach (Vargo *et al.*, 2010) was used in a four-stage nested multidisciplinary primary research project to map the actor-to-actor value co-creation systems of a number of emerging and established creative industries within one city. In the first three stages of the project cultural leaders operant and operand resource applications were identified for each specific creative industry sector, ecosystem, separately. The final stage of the project will be a multi stakeholder conference, to be held in September 2015, at which the key members of the creative industries will be brought together to discuss their own specific ecosystems and the cultural leadership resources used within. A nested collaborative ecosystem that encompasses all three individual ecosystems will then be developed and key elements of cultural leadership, synergy and difference will be identified. This nested collaborative ecosystem will form the basis of a new cultural leadership model.

Findings: In this paper an analysis of the application of operant and operand resources used by cultural leaders in the skateboarding community will be presented. Key masterfully developed resources are identified and a potential new type of resource category emerged.

Originality/value: This paper contributes to a new understanding of cultural leadership and to the development of the operant resource categorization within service dominant logic.

Keywords: service-ecosystems, masterful operant resources, cultural leadership, urban regeneration

Paper Type: Research paper

1. Introduction

In post-industrial urban economies the importance of the role of creative industries in influencing the direction of urban development has been clearly identified (Scott, 2008). Within these industries cultural leaders act as key catalysts for urban renewal and redevelopment. Peltoniemi (2015, p.41) identified that:

“research on cultural industries has become increasingly popular. This has been motivated by the growth of the economic importance of such sectors (e.g. United Nations 2010), by the introduction of cultural and creative industries policies (e.g. DCMS 2008)”.

Research into cultural leadership is currently in a period of theoretical evolution with one key area of focus being creativity and change (Dinah, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden and Hu, 2014). This movement towards a more complex and dynamic view of cultural leadership is seen by many scholars as requiring a new model of cultural leadership (Denis, Lamothe & Langley 2001; Mumford, Scott, Gaddis & Strange 2002; Jaussi & Dionne 2003; Burns & Wilson 2010; Jones 2010; Leicester 2010; Veneer 2010; Matarasso 2012).

One potential contribution towards the development of new cultural leadership models is to base conceptualizations of cultural leadership using a service dominant logic ecosystem mindset. This mindset allows researchers to explore the value added by cultural leaders and the identify specific resources that they employ to create this value from an alternative theoretical perspective.

2. Service Dominant Logic & Service Ecosystems

The emergence of service dominant logic in 2004 and its continued evolution provides scholars with a wide range opportunities to explore key theoretical constructs using an alternative theoretical perspective. The axioms and foundational premises on which service dominant logic is based provides potentially exciting insights of what actually cultural leadership is and means from a new perspective.

2.1. Service Dominant Logic

The four core axioms on which service-dominant logic has been derived, see Figure 1, (Akaka, Vargo & Lusch 2013) are appropriate for the application to the theoretical development of cultural leadership. Service and its exchange are important concepts in cultural based industries as exchange is often based on both elements of goods and services, for example theatre performance. The importance of gaining a clear understanding of which intangible

and dynamic resources are of value to this sector is an ongoing debate within the creative industries and value is co-created in performance and experience in multiple ways. Within the creative industries there are a wide range of creative endeavours that produce value and therefore understanding the context in which these endeavours add value and to whom is also important.

Figure 1: Four Core Axioms of Service Dominant Logic

Axiom	Description
1	The application of resources in reciprocal <i>service exchange</i> (Vargo & Lusch 2004)
2	The integration of <i>intangible and dynamic (i.e. operant) resources</i> that create new resources (Vargo & Lusch 2004, 2008)
3	The <i>co-creation of value</i> through interaction and collaboration within networks of actors (Vargo & Lusch 2008)
4	The importance of the <i>context</i> through which value is created and evaluated uniquely by a beneficial actor (Chandler & Vargo 2011; Vargo, Maglio & Akaka 2008)

Source: Akaka, Vargo & Lusch (2013, p.6)

2.2. Value Co-creation

Of particular importance to the development of cultural leadership could be the supposition that value is co-created within a network of actors and that “co-creation is the joint, collaborative, concurrent, peer-like process of producing new value, both materially and symbolically.” Dalli (2014, p.644).

Of the ten foundational premises of service dominant logic foundational premises (FP) 4, 6 & 10, see Figure 2, are identified as providing some important theoretical foundations on which to explore cultural leadership and specifically the resources need to in act cultural leadership.

Figure 2: Service Dominant Logic Foundational Premises and Implications for Cultural Leadership

FP	Definition	Implications for Cultural Leadership
FP4	Knowledge is the fundamental source of competitive advantage. Operant resources are the fundamental source of competitive advantage.	Identification of the forms of knowledge needed to in act cultural leadership
FP6	Customer is always a co-creator of value. Implies value is interactional.	Identification of the various actors included in the cultural ecosystem
FP10	Value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary.	Identification of the value systems cultural leaderships identify within their ecosystem

In terms of FP4, which states that “knowledge is the fundamental source of competitive advantage”, this premise draws researchers focus towards in-depth explorations of the knowledge systems on which cultural leadership draws upon and is developed to provide effective leadership within a creative industry. In terms of FP6, identifying that “the customer is always a co-creator of value”, this premise draws researchers focus to the actor-to-actor interactions within the industry and concepts of cultural leadership need to have customers at the heart of their definitions. In terms of FP10, which states that “value is always uniquely and phenomenologically determined by the beneficiary”, this premise draws researchers focus towards the inclusion of potentially multiple definitions of value and the need for research methods to include actors to be able to define value in their own terms.

2.3 Operand & Operant Resources

The identification of the difference between operand and operant resources in FP4 is key to exploring the resources used by actors within a community or industry to in act leadership. The terms operand resources (natural resources) and operant resources (human skills and knowledge) have been used to distinguish between the two basic types of resources with operant resources being capable of acting on operand and other operant resources to create value (Constantin & Lusch, 1994 cited in Wieland, Polese, Vargo & Lusch 2012).

Proposed theoretical development contributions to the categorisation of operand and operant resources originally developed by Constantin and Lusch (1994) have been provided by a number of scholars from a variety of specialisms (Arnould, Price & Malshe 2006; Madhavaram & Hunt 2008; Wieland, Polese, Vargo & Lusch 2012). From a consumer cultural theory perspective Arnould, Price & Malshe (2006) identified three types of consumer operant resources: physical, social & cultural, see Figure 3.

Figure 3: Consumer Operant Resources

Operant Resource	Description
Physical	Sensorimotor endowment, energy, emotions, strength
Social	Family relationships, brand communities, consumer tribes, commercial relationships
Cultural	Specialized knowledge and skills, life expectancies and history, imagination

Source: Arnould, Price & Malshe (2006, p.96)

From a resource advantage theory perspective Madhavaram & Hunt (2008) contributed to the development of operant resource categorization by extending Barney (1991) resource classifications, see Figure 4. However it should be noted that the resource categories of financial (for example cash resources and access to financial markets) and legal (for example trademarks and licences) identified in Barney's (1991) original classification seem to have been omitted in the Madhavaram & Hunt (2008) classification.

Figure 4: Resource Advantage Theory Categorization of Operand and Operant Resources

Operand	Operant
Physical e.g. raw materials	Human e.g., the skills and knowledge of individual employees
	Organizational e.g., controls, routines, cultures, competences
	Informational e.g., knowledge about market segments, competitors, and technology
	Relational e.g., relationships with competitors, suppliers, and customers

Source: Madhavaram & Hunt (2008, p.69)

Further classification development from within service dominant logic into the sources of resources occurred in 2012 by Wieland, Polese, Vargo & Lusch by identifying three types of sources, See Figure 5.

Figure 5: Resource Sources

Source	Description
Private	Self, friends, family
Market-facing	From other entities, through barter or economic exchange
Public	Collective access from communal and governmental sources

Source: Wieland, Polese, Vargo & Lusch, (2012, p.14)

In order to consolidate the various theorists development of the operant resource categorization and resource sources the author consolidate the developments into one overall categorization, see Figure 6, to be used to analyse cultural leadership.

Figure 6: Consolidated Operand and Operant Resource Categories

Resource	Type	Description	Sources
Operand	Physical	Raw materials, natural resources, plant, equipment	Private
Operant	Human & Physical	Skills and knowledge of individual employees and sensorimotor endowment, energy, emotions, strength	Market-facing
	Organisational	Controls, routines, cultures, competences	Public
	Informational	Knowledge about market segments, competitors, and technology	
	Social & Relational	Relationships with competitors, suppliers, and customers and family relationships, brand communities, consumer tribes, commercial relationships	
	Cultural	Specialized knowledge and skills, life expectancies and history, imagination	

Source: Adapted from Arnould, Price & Malshe 2006; Madhavaram & Hunt 2008; Wieland, Polese, Vargo & Lusch 2012

Another theoretical contribution that was also deemed important for the analysis of cultural leadership was the identification of operant resource mastery by Madhavaram & Hunt (2008 p.76) who stated that “be it firms or people, differences can be found between having a capability and the mastery thereof. Many are competent; few are masterful.” Madhavaram & Hunt (2008) defined a masterfully developed operant resource as meeting four criteria, see

Figure 7, and the important of depth of skill and breadth of time taken to develop the resource are clearly identified within the criteria. This concept of mastery has the potential of being highly significant in the development of cultural leadership skills.

Figure 7: Masterfully Developed Operant Resources

Criteria	Description
1	Lower-level resources display a high degree of tacit knowledge
2	Result of systems in organizations that are purposely planned to promote learning that involves increments in core knowledge, as well as fundamental changes to core and integrative knowledge.
3	Taken a long time to develop
4	Enables firms to consistently produce, efficiently and/or effectively, valued market offerings

Source: Madhavaram & Hunt (2008, p.76)

2.4. Service Ecosystems

Mars, Bronstein & Lusch (2012, p.274) identified that “organisational ecosystems are comprised of diverse actors and organizations, which often enter into relationships and participate in exchanges based on a wide range of intentions”. By viewing cultural leadership as occurring within a service ecosystem allows scholars to investigate the various actors and explore the resources used within the ecosystem and gain an understanding of where the perceived boundaries lie, identify interactions with other ecosystems and determine the changes and movements in that ecosystem over time. Vargo & Lusch (2011) defined a service ecosystem as a “relatively self-contained, self-adjusting systems of resource-integrating actors connected by shared institutional logics and mutual value creation through service exchange”. The usefulness of conceptualising cultural leadership as occurring within and between ecosystems is further reinforced by Akaka, Vargo & Lusch (2013, p.5-6) stated that “...a service ecosystems approach draws attention to understanding the fundamental drivers and dynamics of complex social and economic systems that influence and are influenced by exchange (Vargo & Lusch, 2008).”

The organic and emergent nature of organizational ecosystems is clearly identified by Mars, Bronstein & Lusch (2012, p.274-275) who stated that “...organizational ecosystems should be mostly understood as emergent phenomena that result from a tenuous balance between actor agency and social structure, rather than purposeful engineering...[and should be]” viewed more as organic structures that develop over time.” Within these ecosystems specific resources can act as keystones and ecosystems are embedded through “economic and non-

economic arrangements of exchange that are made between actors and organizations” (Mars, Bronstein & Lusch 2012, p.275). Leaders within these ecosystems “...must consider a multitude of factors that extend well beyond their own immediate goals and agendas when considering the position of their organizations within given networks and systems” (Mars, Bronstein & Lusch 2012, p.279).

2.5 Nested Micro, Meso & Macro Service Ecosystems

An important development for the understanding of cultural leadership is to conceptualise leadership and ecosystems as being part of a larger system. Akaka, Vargo & Lusch (2013, p.6) stated that “building on the cornerstones of S-D logic, a service ecosystems view integrates a sociological perspective (e.g., Giddens 1984) and emphasizes the embeddedness of simple microlevel actions and interactions (e.g., dyadic) within more complex meso- and macrolevel systems and structures.” The understanding of the nested nature of these ecosystems is of key importance to the success, resiliency and development of each ecosystem and Frow, McColl-Kennedy, Hilton, Davidson, Payne & Brozovic (2014, p.333) identified that “within a service ecosystem there are arguably three levels – micro, meso and macro. Value propositions operate within each level, between the levels and also serve to shape the levels.”

2.6 Past Applications Of Service Ecosystems And Contextualization Of Service Ecosystems To New Areas

A range of different scholars have applied the service ecosystems framework to develop a number of theoretical concepts and/or explore a number of different industries. Ordanini & Parasuraman (2012) formulated a service ecosystem framework based on application to the recorded music market; Kuppelwiesser, Simpson & Chiummo (2013) conceptualized service ecosystems and value creation using YouTube as a case study; Viljakainen & Toivonen (2014) conceptualized value co-creation and the futures of magazine publishing; Akaka, Corsaro, Kelleher, Maglio, Seo, Lusch & Vargo (2014) explored the relevance of symbols in ecosystems using LEGO as a case study and Eliot, Cherian & Elaydi (2015) applied of service ecosystem design to ethnic markets. In this series of primary research projects value creation within various nested cultural leadership ecosystems is explored. In this first of a series of papers the exploration of the operant resources needed to be utilised and developed as a cultural leader within one ecosystem is explored.

3. Cultural Leadership

Cultural leadership is an evolving concept that is currently applied to leaders within the cultural and creative industries sectors. These sectors include multiple skills and many definitions about what is cultural and what is creative. As conceptualizations of value move away from a goods and services based logic towards a more inclusive understanding of value in service dominant logic there is the potential of culture and cultural leadership to become more important for industry sectors and actors within these industries who currently perceive themselves as outside the creative and cultural economy.

3.1. Cultural Leadership Development

The need to develop the understanding of what cultural leadership actual is has been clearly identified by a number of scholars from within the cultural industries sector and from a broader governmental perspective. From within the cultural industries sector Jennings & Jones (2010, p.25) believe that “[we] require a new [cultural] leadership model. This model will need a new type of language to express the value of culture.” However the development of such models has seen by many scholars as being inhibited by hierarchical and siloed models that have held sway for over a century (Jaussi & Dionne 2003; Jennings & Jones 2010; Burns & Wilson 2010). From a broader governmental perspective Douglas & Harris (2013, p.2) identified that “cultural leadership has become a key term in cultural policy in the UK.” However a crisis in cultural leadership in the UK was identified as far back as 2004 (Hewison 2004) and the challenges faced by such leadership is still beginning debated a decade later (Arts Council England 2006; Kay, Venner, Burns & Schwarz 2010). At a national level the importance of cultural and creative talents to national success was clearly highlighted by Heywood (2015, p.9) observed that:

“...the extraordinary cultural and creative talents we share contribute to the well-being of our society, our economic success, our national identity, and the UK’s global influence. These are precious returns, a powerful cocktail of public good and commercial return...insufficient attention has been paid to the synergies between the interlocking sectors of the cultural and creative industries ecosystem.”

The need to view leadership from cultural current leaders’ perspectives was clearly identified by Veneer (2010, p.6) who stated that “in thinking about leadership development, it’s worth remembering just how much can’t ‘be taught’, but is experienced.” This gives rise for the need to develop a pluralistic understanding of cultural leadership and one that is collective in its

approach (Denis, Lamothe & Langley 2001; Mumford, Scott, Gaddis & Strange 2002). This view is supported by Burns & Wilson (2010, p.88) who believe that “the ‘map’ of leadership theory and frameworks does not precede the practice of leadership. Instead, the territory or practice precedes the map, and theory should be both a reflection of, as well as a guide for, what is happening on the ground.”

This movement within the cultural industries to view leadership from a more complex and pluralistic perspective clearly provides opportunities for research based on a service dominant logic ecosystem mindset to contribute to this literature base. The ecosystem perspective together with an analysis of cultural leadership application of both operand and operant resources to achieve success is clearly in line with the thinking of Dinh, Lord, Gardner, Meuser, Liden & Hu (2014, p.55) who state that “efforts to advance leadership theory and research will require that we pay attention to the processes that underlie phenomenon and occur at multiple levels of analysis.”

4. Multi Stage Nested Primary Research Project

In order to explore cultural leadership from multiple perspectives a service ecosystem approach (Vargo *et al.*, 2010) was used in a four stage multidisciplinary primary research project to map the actor-to-actor value co-creation systems of a number of emerging and established creative industries within one specific city. The city used in this research project was one of the core city in the UK, Liverpool in the North-West of England, that has a stated objective of using culture for regeneration purposes (Crouch & Dennemann 2000).

In the first three stages of the project the cultural leadership ecosystems of individual creative industry sectors, identified as key drivers to urban regeneration in that particular city, were analysed separately. The final stage of the project will be a multi stakeholder conference, to be held in September 2015, at which the key members of the creative industries will be brought together to discuss the results of the individual studies and a nested cultural leadership ecosystem(s) will be mapped from all participants perspectives. This nested collaborative ecosystem mapping will be used to form the basis of a new cultural leadership model.

4.1. Study One: Cultural Leadership in the Skateboarding Community

One creative industry sector that was identified as an important cultural group within the city was the skateboarding community. This was identified from actors within the skateboarding community and from local government (Jones 2013; Davies 2015; Rampworx 2015). This

community had a very strong identity and is present in many cities in a number of different countries (Beal 1995; Chiu 2009; Siefert & Hedderson 2010).

In order to identify the cultural leaders within this community the local skateboarding blog was used to ask actors to identify the cultural leaders within their community together this was verified by informal enquiries in the city centre skateboarding shop. Two important cultural leaders were identified by the majority of actors, one shop owner and one creative artist who works with commercial organizations producing artwork relating to skateboarding. Both leaders asked to identified within this research by their first initial.

4.2. Critical Dialogue as Research Method

In order to explore their perspectives on cultural leadership a critical dialogue research method was used in which both leaders were brought together to discuss their opinions about what cultural cache and leadership meant to them (Kincheloe & McLaren 1998; Karlsson 2001). This research method allowed both leaders to talk freely and allowed a genuine dialogue to occur so that ideas and meanings were exchanged and developed. These exchanges allowed some of the more complex thoughts and values relating to cultural leadership to be developed (Buber 1961). The critical dialogue was led by a member of academic project team who was known to and was credible to the leaders. Data was collected in a number of ways: notes were taken during the session, the event was recorded and the dialogue was transcribed verbatim post event, video footage and images were presented by the leaders to explain certain points in the dialogue. For this paper analysis was undertaken on the transcripts only.

5. Findings

The analysis clearly identified a number of potentially important contributions to understanding how value is formed in relation to cultural leadership. The key themes have been identified below and a number key masterfully developed operant resources were clearly identified.

5.1. Cultural Leadership Often Forms Organically And Changes Over Time

One key trait of cultural leadership identified by J. was the possession of the private operant resource, human understanding and experience, that acknowledges that leadership within the ecosystem develops over time. Also the clear understanding that the lack of one private human operant resource, physical skills in skateboarding, could be replaced by the masterful

development of other human operant skill, for example drawing, to be accepted as a leader within the ecosystem. The use of the market-facing operand resource, Instagram, allowed actors within the ecosystem to use their private social operant resource, relationships with other these actors, to identify who they believed were the cultural leaders within their group:

"I wanted to be in the skateboard culture from an early age. I was a rubbish boarder but I wanted to be part of it so I started to draw...I fell back into skateboarding...I fell back in love with it. Skateboarders found the work on Instagram" J.

One key market-facing operand resource, physical and online boarding store, was identified as being a keystone resource and vital to the sustainability of the ecosystem. This was identified by both J. & M.:

"when I started the store I sold paint instore for the graffiti arts then built it up" M.

"[boarding] shops are not just a place for selling product but more of a hub. Skateboarding is a weird intersection. It feels like a dynamic place" J.

This physical and virtual space acted as much more than a commercial site to the ecosystem and was identified as a hub, intersection and dynamic place in which one ecosystem mingled with another ecosystem, graffiti artists.

The understanding of which operand and operant resources where credible to the actors within the ecosystem was identified as a vital trait for successful cultural leadership. As M. identified a credible keystone market-facing operand resource, the shop, became key to the development of their own private social, relational and cultural operant resources:

"I agree...the shop is an extension of how I like to skate" M.

However J. clearly identified how actors within the ecosystem were very critical of outsider actors from other ecosystems, often commercial ecosystems, who were trying to appropriate leadership but misunderstanding the core values of the ecosystem and would therefore never be credible or accepted:

“Companies are trying to make cycling like skateboarding, a lifestyle. Trying to create it in a very artificial way. It needs to be created organically” J.

“It is so obvious when things are run by non skateboarders. Some brands are very good at hiring people who are into skateboarding. Not just marketing people moving up the career ladder” J.

5.2. Cultural Leadership Recognizes That The Ecosystem Is Part Of But Different From The Nested Ecosystems

Another key trait of cultural leadership was the clear understanding of the similarities and differences of the values of their own ecosystem compared to other nested ecosystems and being to negotiate and navigate an acceptable route for all ecosystems. This involved the masterful use of both informational and relationship operant resources. These resources could be either private, market-facing or public or a combination of the three.

One key challenges for the cultural leaders was to negotiate the use of the public operant resource, city space, which for the larger nested ecosystem in which they were embedded, the city, and the governing body, the city council, wanted to restrict their use of:

“Skateboarders still go skateboarding on the streets [as opposed to skate parks] because that is what is the attraction. We want to be in the city not on the outskirts” M.

“We don’t want to be told to be in one space. This is why there are the protests on the Southbank [London, UK]. Skateboarding is not like basketball where it is confined to one space” J.

This was a key challenge for the cultural leaders and one they felt very strongly that they had to speak for the other actors about. The use of the collective noun ‘we’ demonstrated clear ecosystem affiliation.

The cultural leaders also showed a very specific understanding of how important certain private physical and relational resources were to the actors within the ecosystem in relation to the public operant resource, the city, compared to the value placed on them by those outside of the ecosystem. M. identified using the public operant resources very differently from actors who were not part of the ecosystem and areas of the city defined as ‘dead space’

to some actors was not seen as that to those within the ecosystem. Also actors within the ecosystem developed very different private physical operant resources in terms of sight and touch and also the speed at which these physical operant resources were experienced:

"[when skateboarding] you see the whole city. There is no dead space...every alley, every part of the city you visit. We see the city differently. We feel the city differently and experience at a different speed to most people." M.

These differences were deeply ingrained within the actors and M. identified that the development of these private physical operant resources occurred whether actors had their most important private operand resource, the skateboard, with them or not:

"Even when we don't have our skateboards we check out the environment for the possibility of it being used. We feel the surfaces and explore in our minds how we would use the space" M.

5.3. *Ecosystem Based on a Philosophical Not Commercial Principles*

One of the most important traits needed to be displayed in order to provide sustained cultural leadership over an extended time period was the possession of key private operant resources of personal knowledge. The combination of this personal knowledge was then used to develop a masterful operant cultural resource that was used for successful cultural leadership. Successful leaders understood that engagement in the ecosystem as a life philosophy and not just a commercial enterprise or short-term hobby.

J. identified that being part of the ecosystem was a long term journey:

"...the least interesting part of skateboarding are the tricks. Skateboarding is a philosophy. Art is a journey not a product. Art and skateboarding are philosophies" J.

The need to continually develop independent private operant resources was clearly identified by M.:

"Skateboarders have a DIY mentality and you need to stay true to yourself" M.

This philosophy based on the development of key operant resources allowed a variety of different actors to become part of the ecosystem:

“Skateboarding can accommodate many types of people” J.

A core trait of the cultural leader was to possess the private and market-facing philosophical operant resources of perceiving membership of the ecosystem as being part of their own long-term journey:

“Skateboarding is the philosophy, the end product. The pleasure is in the doing of it. Skateboarding should be seen as the journey.” J.

6. Identification of Cultural Leadership Masterfully Developed Operant Resources

Within the ecosystem cultural leaders demonstrated the masterful development of a number of key operant resources. These resources have been identified in Figure 7.

Figure 7: Masterfully Developed Operant Resources Needed for Cultural Leadership

Resource	Type	Description
Operant	Cultural	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Masterful level achieved by the understanding of the combination of operant resources and the need to change and adapt over time
	Human	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Knowledge of ecosystem development over long time - Clear understanding of which market-facing operant resources are keystones to the ecosystem - Clear understanding of which market-facing actors are credible and authentic to the actors within the ecosystem
	Organisational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear understanding of the differences in the use of operant resources
	Physical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Possession of a variety of skills that are deemed credible by the ecosystem actors - Understand of the difference in physical, senses, resources that are specific to the ecosystem
	Social & Relationship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ability to negotiate between the similarities and differences of the various nested

		ecosystems
	Informational	- Understand how the various ecosystems operate, how various ecosystems operate and understand how the ecosystems are nested

The identification of key operant resources needed to in act cultural leadership allows attention to be given to the necessary resources. Mars, Bronstein & Lusch (2012, p.278) also identified that “...attention should be given to nurturing the conditions under which organizational ecosystems can emerge and thrive. This is more useful than efforts devoted to trying to construct (or force) the development of ecosystems.”

The key findings also demonstrated importance of cultural leaders as being or becoming part of the cultural ecosystem and becoming co-creators of value themselves (FP6). In this ecosystem understanding (FP4) that part of the leadership skills required for being accepted in this group was perceiving membership of the ecosystem as a long term philosophy and membership was not just for short term commercial gain. This was is vital to gaining an understanding of the more complex, nuanced and dynamic nature in which value that was created, and was regularly changing, for this ecosystem (FP10). Understanding these complexities, nuanced and changes allowed leaders to perceive the value of the ecosystem from various actors perspective, to adapt quickly when external negotiation with other nested ecosystem(s) actors was needed and also to develop and change their own skills and interests over time.

One new type of operant resource or source, depends on one’s the understanding of the term ‘philosophy’, was identified in this paper. This was the perception held by the cultural leaders that skateboarding was a long-term philosophy. This philosophy was both deeply felt and this passion and commitment endured over time. Currently the development of the service ecosystem thinking includes various scales or sizes of ecosystems, that is the nested nature of micro, meso and macro ecosystems, but the length and depth of participation in the value co-creation within the ecosystem that actors commit to needs to be developed further. Within the second and third study in this multi stage nested primary research project this new category will be further explored.

7. Conclusions

By using a service ecosystem framework to explore cultural leadership from the perspective of leaders from within one specific cultural ecosystem a number of key findings have emerged. The analysis of the data from study two and three will allow the author to further

develop the conceptualizations of cultural leadership from other cultural ecosystems perspectives. The final stage of the project in September 2015 will allow all of the results to be combined and a new cultural leadership model to be formed based on a nested service ecosystem perspective.

References

- Akaka, M.A., Corsaro, D., Kelleher, C., Maglio, P.P., Seo, Y., Lusch, R.F. & Vargo, S.L. (2014), "The role of symbols in value cocreation", *Marketing Theory*, Vol.14 Iss.3, pp.311-326.
- Akaka, M.A., Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2013), "The Complexity of Context: A Service Ecosystems Approach for International Marketing", *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol.21 No.4, pp.1-20.
- Arts Council England (2006), *Developing Leadership: the challenge for the cultural sector*, London, Arts Council England.
- Burns, S. & Wilson, K. (2010), "Trends in leadership writing and research: a short review of the leadership literature", in Kay, S., Venner, K., Burns, S. & Schwarz, M. (Eds.). *A Cultural Leadership Reader*, UK, Creative Choices. pp.86-95.
- **Chandler, J. D. & Lusch, R.F. (2015), "Service Systems: A Broadened Framework and Research Agenda on Value Propositions, Engagement, and Service Experience", *Journal of Service Research*, Vol.18 Iss.1, pp.6-22.
- ***Corvellec, H. & Hultman, J. (2014), "Managing the politics of value propositions", *Marketing Theory*, Vol.14 Iss.4, pp.355-375.
- Crouch, C. & Dennemann, A. (2000), "Urban regeneration and sustainable development in Britain: The example of the Liverpool Ropewalks Partnership", *Cities*, Vol.17 Iss.2, pp.137-147.
- Dalli, M.G.D. (2014), "Theory of value co-creation: a systematic literature review", *Managing Service Quality*, Vol.24 Iss.6, pp.643-683.
- Davies, H. (2015), "Liverpool waterfront showcased in skateboarding video", *Liverpool Echo*, 18 March.
- Dinah, J.E., Lord, R.G., Gardner, W.L., Meuser, J.D., Liden, R.C. & Hu, J. (2014), "Leadership theory and research in the new millennium: Current theoretical trends and changing perspectives", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Vol.25 Iss. 1, pp.36-62.
- Elliot, E.A., Cherion, J, & Elaydi, R. (2015), "Service Ecosystems Design in Ethnic Markets." in Robinson, L. (Ed.), *Marketing Dynamism and Sustainability: Things Change, Things Stay the Same...Proceedings of the 2012 Academy of Marketing Science Annual Conference*, New York, Springer, p.290.
- Frow, P., McColl-Kennedy, J.R., Hilton, T., Davidson, A., Payne, A. & Brozovic, D. (2014), "Value propositions: A service ecosystems perspective", *Marketing Theory*, Vol.14 Iss.3, pp.327-351.
- Hewison, R. (2004), "The crisis of cultural leadership in Britain", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol.10 Iss.2, pp.157-166.
- Heywood, V. (2015), "Foreward by Vikki Heywood", in Neelands, J., Belofore, E., Firth, C., Hart, N., Perrin, L., Brock, S., Holdaway, D. & Woodis, J. (Eds.), *Enriching Britain: Culture, Creativity and Growth*, Coventry, University of Warwick.

- Jennings, N. & Jones, H. (2010), "Engaging hearts and minds: leadership and taking part", in Kay, S., Venner, K., Burns, S. & Schwarz, M. (Eds.), *A Cultural Leadership Reader*, UK, Creative Choices, pp.24-31.
- Jones, V. (2013), "Street Skating Is Fucking Brilliant: It's More Than Just Four Wheels, A Piece of Wood & A Pair of Vans", *Open the City*, 22nd Feb.
- Kay, S., Venner, K., Burns, S. & Schwarz, M. (Eds.) (2010), *A Cultural Leadership Reader*, UK, Creative Choices.
- Kuppelwieser, V.G., Simpson, M.C. & Chiummo, G. (2013), "1 + 1 does not always equal value creation: The case of YouTube", *Marketing Letters*, Vol.24 Iss.3, pp.311-321.
- Leceister, G. (2010), "Real cultural leadership: leading the culture in a time of cultural crisis", in Kay, S., Venner, K., Burns, S. & Schwarz, M. (Eds.) *A Cultural Leadership Reader*, UK, Creative Choices, pp.16-23.
- Madhavaram, S. & Hybt, S.D. (2008), "The service-dominant logic and a hierarchy of operant resources: developing masterful operant resources and implications for marketing strategy", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.36, Iss.1, pp.67-82.
- Mars, M.M., Bronstein, J.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2012), "The value of a metaphor: Organizations and ecosystems", *Organisational Dynamics*, Vol.41 Iss.3, pp.271-280.
- Ordanini, A. & Parasuraman, A. (2012), "A Conceptual Framework for Analyzing Value-Creating Service Ecosystems: An Application to the Recorded-Music Market", in Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (Eds.) *Review of Marketing Research Volume 9 Special Issue: Toward a Better Understanding of the Role of Value in Markets and Marketing*, Bingley, UK, Emerald Group Publishing, pp.171-205.
- Peltoniemi, M. (2015), "Cultural Industries: Product-Market Characteristics, Management Challenges and Industry Dynamics", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vo.17 Iss.1, pp.41-68.
- Vargo, S.L. & Akaka, M.A. (2012), "Value Cocreation and Service Systems (Re)Formation: A Service Ecosystems View", *Service Science*, Vol.4 Iss.3, pp.207-217.
- Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2004), "Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing", *Journal of Marketing*, Vol.68 Iss.1, pp.1-17.
- Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2008), "Service-dominant logic: continuing the evolution", *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Vol.36 Iss.1, pp.1-10.
- Vargo S.L. & Lusch R.F. (2011), "Service-dominant logic: Looking ahead", *Presentation at the Naples Forum on Service*, June 14–17, Isle of Capri, Italy.
- Venner, K. (2010), "A cultural leadership reader: Introduction", in Kay, S., Venner, K., Burns, S. & Schwarz, M. (Eds.), *A Cultural Leadership Reader*, UK, Creative Choices, pp.4-7.

Wieland, H., Polese, F., Vargo, S.L. & Lusch, R.F. (2012), "Toward a Service (Eco)Systems Perspective on Value Creation", *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, Vol.3 Iss.3, pp.12-25.