

*Collaboration: An artistic investigation of the complex dynamics inherent in
the collaborative process*

Margaret Baguley

University of Tasmania

Australia

This paper examines the complexity of the collaborative process and how various factors, but particularly interactions between individuals, can affect the quality of the outcome for those concerned. This perspective will be described from the perceptions of four groups of artists brought together for a major exhibition, in addition to that of the curator. Significant factors which can nurture and sustain collaboration will be discussed, in addition to examining the importance of leadership, which seems to be antithetical to this process. In addition, the necessity of establishing prior relationships before engaging in collaboration will be examined, including suggestions as to how this can be achieved. This knowledge is relevant to many fields, including educational settings in which collaborative processes are increasingly encouraged through collegial interactions. However, successful and effective engagement in the collaborative process requires a comprehensive understanding of the factors involved so that the benefits for all can be maximised.

Collaboration & Leadership

Socialisation in Western society emphasises competitiveness and self-promotion (Barrentine, 1993; Burns, 1978; Clark, 1996; Hellriegel, Slocum, & Woodman, 1992; Rogoff, 2003; Sharpnack, 2005; Sowers, 1983). Rogoff (2003) described children's participation in the everyday formats and routines of cultural institutions and traditions as engagement with their underlying cultural assumptions (p. 234). She noted that these are often taken for granted without question. Such an environment that prioritises competition does not prepare individuals wishing to undertake a collaborative process. As society moves towards an innovation economy there is greater awareness of the potential of working in a cross-sectoral manner in order to re-contextualise and re-examine traditional approaches. Leadership texts (Barrentine, 1993; Buzzanell, 2000; Henry, 1996; Rickards & De Cock, 1999; Gerger, 2005; Eisler, 2005) revealed that organisations were increasingly incorporating a more devolved form of leadership, which relied on horizontal and diagonal forms of both formal and informal communication, as opposed to the traditional vertical form. Collaboration has emerged as an important asset in organisations because of its links with innovation and creativity. The arts sector, which inherently possesses these qualities, has increasingly been adopting practices which emulate organisations. On the other hand, organisations are looking to creative sectors to develop lateral thinking and innovative approaches.

Collaboration in education is seen as both a learning and teaching strategy, which empowers students and teachers to work together to achieve a supportive and nurturing environment. Henry (1996) states that collaboration is built on cooperation, group effort, and a sense of belonging to a caring community. She believes that such an approach has been displaced in many of our institutions, including schools (p. 133). Schools are also recognising the fact that that they are a part of a wider community, not an exclusive entity within it. Through the valuing and recognition of students' backgrounds, schools are able to provide a more relevant and diverse curricula which will help prepare students more effectively. Historically, teachers, principals, staff, and parents have had very little power to change the larger organisational structures operating within schools. However Henry believes that:

The time is right for a shift to organisational structures and leadership that works against racism, sexism and classism, and truly puts students and their needs at the centre of the educational conversation. People have a right to be involved in schools, and they also have a responsibility. Opening up the schools to parents

and others means that we all have to be prepared to invest more fully in our schools. Schools cannot do it alone. The future of our children depends on the commitment of society's leaders to educate and bring up young people to be socially responsible (1996, p. 193).

The literature also indicates that shifts are occurring within organisational structures; however texts which focussed on collaboration and the arts, routinely neglected leadership as a key factor in collaborative practice (Close, 2004; Green, 2001; John-Steiner, 2000; McCabe, 1984). The exception to this was Farrell's (2001) *Collaborative Circles*, which described three forms of leadership, the gatekeeper, the charismatic leader, and the executive manager. *Collaborating Across the Sectors* (Gardner, Metcalfe, Pisarski, & Riedlinger, 2006), includes the arts sector as part of its research. The authors found that high quality leadership was an important incentive to participants, and 'a project with leadership opportunities for many people provides incentives for members to contribute more fully' (p. 36). As Gardner et al. (2006) noted, collaboration demands an innovative leadership style. Effective leaders are aware of, and work with, the unique characteristics of the participants and the social/cultural environment the collaboration exists within. However as Mattessich, Murray-Close & Monsey, 2004 stated 'the many decisions within a collaborative effort cannot possibly fit the preferences of every member perfectly' (p. 8). The arts have traditionally eschewed various forms of authority, whilst maintaining freedom of expression. This approach appears to have affected, and possibly dissuaded, artists from engaging in collaborative ventures. The artists may be philosophically opposed to being identified as a leader, or engaging in a process with a hierarchical structure.¹

The following case study investigates the dynamics of the collaborative process between four groups of artists who are working in both integrative and complementary modes of collaboration. The key elements of communication, skills and expertise, leadership, and support which resulted in the third entity of the collaboration, and which are transferable to a range of other sectors including education, will be discussed.

The Exhibition

The *Partnership or Perish?* exhibition formed part of a doctoral thesis investigating the dynamics of the collaborative process. To facilitate the investigation, four groups of artists, who publicly acknowledged that working collaboratively was the major process in their art making, were sought for the exhibition. In addition to participation in the exhibition each group of artists was interviewed to discuss their experience of collaboration. This study obtained university ethics approval in which the artists permitted full disclosure of their identities in publications arising from the research. During the course of the research it was determined that emails between the artists and the researcher, particularly in the lead up to the exhibition were an important source of data and consequently an amended ethics form was submitted and approved for inclusion of this material in the study.

Methodology

The creation of work for the exhibition, information from the interviews and email correspondence formed one of the three case studies in the doctoral thesis. The multi-method approach of case study methodology was utilised for this study and provided both depth and breadth to the data gathered. Phenomenological inquiry was used to study the participants'

¹ The philosophical opposition described could be attributed to the guild workshops and subsequent separation of the artist and artisan.

life world as they experience it. As both a philosophy and a research method, phenomenology aims for a deeper understanding of the nature or meaning of everyday experiences. Phenomenological descriptions provide examples for the reader to enable them to see the deeper significance or structure of the lived experience being described. The case study methodology and phenomenological inquiry utilised for this study was appropriate, given the human interaction required in the collaborative process.

The process of collaboration has been acknowledged as being quite complex, and a number of factors needed to be considered when investigating this practice. The data from these interviews were then analysed to determine patterns and categories that were important to the research. This qualitative data was subsequently organised using QSR N6 computer software to code and graphically represent groupings of the data to determine similarities and dissimilarities between the information given by the participants. There has been reluctance in phenomenological enquiry to outline specific steps undertaken to gain and categorise the information. This has been due to the concern that phenomenology will be treated as a research method from the natural sciences. For this study an approach was adapted by Colaizzi (1978), who argued for descriptive research. This process of analysis was particularly valuable in categorising the interview data, and was used to inform the categories used in the QSR software.

The *Partnership or Perish?* exhibition opened on 13 July, 2006 and concluded on 10 September, 2006. The venue was the Academy Gallery, School of Visual and Performing Arts (SVPA), at the Inveresk campus of the University of Tasmania. The four groups of artists selected for the exhibition were: Jennifer Turpin and Michaelie Crawford from the Turpin Crawford Studio; Denise Sprynskyj and Peter Boyd from the fashion label *S!X*; Hobart artist John Vella with Tasmanian students; and weavers Sue Batten and John Dicks from the Victorian Tapestry Workshop, in conjunction with the artist Geoffrey Ricardo. This paper will examine the collaborative process through the artists' working practices. This examination investigated how various relationships were established and/or expanded between the participants.

The Participants

The *Partnership or Perish?* exhibition brought together four diverse groups of artists who publicly acknowledged that they use collaborative processes as a predominant form of their artmaking. Two groups of artists – Denise Sprynskyj and Peter Boyd (*S!X*) and John Vella - work for the University sector and therefore their decision to participate was also guided by the opportunity to enhance their research profile through documented creative output. All of the artists approached were enthusiastic and willing to complete new work or recontextualise existing work for the exhibition premise. The Academy Gallery Director, Malcom Bywaters, also saw the potential of such an exhibition for the 2006 gallery program. I realised that examining such a complex subject and being able to draw the elements of an exhibition together as the curator would also be advantageous for both the gallery and the creative component of the thesis. There were therefore elements of self-interest from each of the participants, a commitment to a shared goal, the building of relationships and sharing of resources and rewards which identified this exhibition as a collaborative venture (John-Steiner, 2000; Farrell, 2001; Gardner, J., Metcalfe, J., Pisarski, A., & Riedlinger, M., 2006; Green, 2001).

The Victorian Tapestry Workshop and Geoffrey Ricardo

The Victorian Tapestry Workshop (VTW) in South Melbourne, Australia, has both a national and international reputation for its excellent standards in tapestry weaving. The VTW began in 1976 and still operates today with skilled weavers who are also trained and qualified artists. During a residency I completed at the VTW in November/December 2004 I was able to observe the beginning stages of *The Bairnsdale Tapestry*, which was a commission for the Bairnsdale Hospital based on a painting by the artist Geoffrey Ricardo. Normally the VTW did not exhibit an artwork and tapestry together. On some occasions artists have directed the VTW to burn their artwork, so that the tapestry exists without reference to anything else.² After discussing this concern with the relevant VTW personnel I received the following email: 'As the subject of the exhibition is about collaboration between artists we are very happy for you to show the tapestry and painting together.'³ After receiving this permission, I contacted Ricardo to see if he would be able to loan his painting for the exhibition to which he responded positively.

I arranged to visit the VTW, during the week of the studio visits (October, 2005), when Susie Shears the Director had returned from leave. When I arrived I immediately spoke to the administration officer with whom I had established a friendship with during my residency. Later I spoke to Shears, and we talked about my residency the year before and also the exhibition premise. Shears emphasised that collaboration was a very important part of the workshop's philosophy, and would therefore be pleased to contribute to the exhibition. Shears then asked me if I had a particular tapestry in mind; I immediately identified *The Bairnsdale Tapestry* which I had seen being woven during my residency. I was particularly interested, in the fact, that Ricardo had deliberately left parts of it unfinished for the weavers. Bywaters and I had both felt that to include the painting which formed the basis of the design for the tapestry, would enhance the exhibition. This would allow the viewer to visually compare the painting with the tapestry, enabling them to see the decisions the weavers had made in their interpretation.

The initial planning stage of the exhibition with the Victorian Tapestry Workshop (VTW), and by default, with Geoffrey Ricardo was quite short. This was due to the already established relationship I had achieved, with the VTW during the artist in residence program. The VTW had previously worked with Ricardo on a number of tapestries based on his paintings. *The Art of Collaboration* (2005) catalogue stated: 'There is a certain freedom in a long association, and now that the Victorian Tapestry Workshop has worked with artist Geoff Ricardo on a number of projects, there is mutual trust and respect between Geoff and the weavers' (VTW, 2005). Ricardo also disclosed his admiration to me personally for the VTW and his confidence in their interpretation of his work.⁴ Therefore the relationships already established helped to also facilitate my connection with this artist. Tajfel and Turner (1979) revealed that social group identity is important to a person's sense of belonging to certain social groups. An individual member of a group strongly identifies with the group, and the individual's social sense of belonging helped to facilitate communication, trust and innovation (Tushman, 1982).

² The previous director Sue Walker refers to one instance of this in her talk "Tapestry and its place in contemporary arts practice" held at the University of Tasmania on the 7/6/91, when she refers to burning a cartoon by Richard Larter who stated that the tapestry was to be the final statement.

³ Email from Kaye Fauckner, Assistant Director Administration & Production, VTW, 1/2/06, 3.54pm.

⁴ Phone interview with artist Geoff Ricardo, 24/5/06.

During the process of organising the exhibition the role of the gallery director and curator were already clearly established and we were both working towards the same goal. There were times when I needed advice and sought it, and Bywaters always gave it willingly. However, we moved rapidly from the formal stage of proposing the exhibition to planning it. I appreciated his expertise and advice with some of the artists, particularly those with international reputations. After working with Bywaters for a while I began to understand the sensibility required to deal with the artists and also maintain the integrity of the curator, director and the gallery program. I felt during this stage that the relationship with Bywaters had had changed to one of co-collaborators, as we worked through the complexities of organising the exhibition.⁵ As the curator it was an interesting process to see how important it was to have knowledge of all the artists and their personalities, in addition to their motivation for being in the exhibition. I felt this knowledge was invaluable to Bywaters as we made decisions regarding placement, order, selection of images and ways of presenting shared authorship on the gallery didactics and in the catalogue.

The reasons why people engage in collaborative practice appear to relate both to support, and to the ability to extend their skills and expertise through working with other people. Given the complexity of the collaborative process, it has evidently not been a practice engaged in for purely economic benefit. In describing collaboration John-Steiner (2000) noted: ‘... managing the relationship is complex. In some ways, [it is] similar to relationships in biological families. Both can involve loyalty, mutual caring, conflict, separations, and the subsequent development of new connections (p. 164). The participants in this case study engaged in the collaborative process for a variety of reasons, however as May (1995) noted collegiality, cooperation and collaboration are ‘complex sociopolitical arrangements, no matter who is involved or how and why such relations are initiated or encouraged’ (p. 67).

SIX - Denise Sprynskyj and Peter Boyd

The studio visit was very important in establishing a more personal contact, beyond the initial phone and email contact, with Denise Sprynskyj and Peter Boyd. They were very welcoming and enthusiastic about the exhibition. We spent some degree of the conversation discussing the nature of how to transform creative output into research ‘points’ in the university context. They were also very aware of the importance of gaining research points through exhibitions and articles. Therefore they were keen, particularly from this academic viewpoint to be involved in the *Partnership or Perish?* exhibition. During the interview it became clear that they saw themselves first and foremost as fashion designers. They also cherished the collaborative relationship they had maintained for the last ten years. This preliminary sharing of information allowed us to formalise our relationship and helped me to clarify Sprynskyj and Boyd’s contribution to the exhibition.

Turpin Crawford Studio - Jennifer Turpin and Michaelie Crawford

Jennifer Turpin and I had a fairly extensive phone and email correspondence before we met in person in October 2005. Turpin said she would be willing to participate as the Turpin Crawford studio in the exhibition. Her friendly nature and welcoming manner on the phone and through email correspondence helped set the tone for an engaging and supportive interaction during the lead up to the exhibition. During the studio visit I found both Jennifer Turpin and Michaelie Crawford to be very warm, thoughtful and well grounded people, who

⁵ This was evident in our meetings, during which we progressed from Bywaters explaining curatorial protocol, to working with me to decide on how to respond to sensitive matters relating to the artists in the exhibition.

were generous with their time and open about sharing in a dialogue regarding their collaborative process. Turpin confided that their partnership had almost finished in terms of joint projects. However, it was obvious that both Turpin and Crawford had enjoyed a collaborative partnership that encapsulated their wonderful sense of humour and valued the contribution of one another.

John Vella and Tasmanian students

John Vella who lives and works in Hobart, was the only local artist included in the exhibition. Initial contact with Vella was made in October/November, 2004. Vella also knew Bywaters quite well and touched base periodically with him about the exhibition. Vella always responded promptly to emails and was enthusiastic. After the studio visit Bywaters and I discussed numerous images of Vella's work, and we both felt his work titled *PlaceMats* was the most appropriate for the collaborative premise of the exhibition. I sent the gallery plans to Vella so that he could begin visualising how the work would look in the Academy Gallery space.

Collaboration

Interviews with artists in the *Partnership or Perish?* exhibition revealed that they perceived there were many different forms of collaboration. They described collaboration from their own experiences, which included artists working with other artists, and artists working with themselves and with formal and informal groups. Their perception of collaboration was necessarily, filtered by these interactions. The artists who worked within a partnership such as the Turpin Crawford Studio and *S!X* had similar training backgrounds and aesthetic. They described their collaboration as: joyous, fun-filled, passionate, complementary and challenging. These artists also described themselves as having the same kind of passion, levels of energy, commitment and standards. Having said this, the interaction between them was exciting and challenging, not passive. Ideas were rigorously debated and viewed from every angle, and the artists in these partnerships described this editing process as happening quite quickly. They felt this was due to their artistic background and knowledge, in addition to the extensive time they have been together. These partnership artists spend a great deal of social time together, and during these times can be inspired with new ideas for their work. The artists also support each other both privately and publicly.

The partnership artists, Sprynskyj and Boyd, and Turpin and Crawford, described the core of the collaborative process as the initial idea phase. An open and trusting environment encouraged each artist to be generous in sharing their ideas. Even though the artists took on other roles and responsibilities during the project, they always come back together to record what they had done and to make connections with each other. When required they utilised specialists in their work, and acknowledged that the collaborative process can become complicated by the needs of other people. In fact, the artists described, the work as becoming the 'third person' and more important than either artist. A long and established history of collaboration enhanced each project, as it helped the artists to understand what works most successfully in the collaborative process. The artists said that the type of collaboration they were engaged in was rare and often difficult to achieve and requires the ability to prioritise and to be generous-spirited. Commitment to their shared vision resulted in signature work, which was not affected by passing trends. The artists insisted on presenting their work jointly, both in terms of documentation and public presentations.

It became evident that Turpin and Crawford and Sprynskyj and Boyd engaged in an integrative model of collaboration which included the following elements: shared ideology,

shared decision making, shared aesthetic, shared social lives, passion and intensity and the merging of ego (John-Steiner, 2000). An integrative collaboration has usually been associated with two people and an intense and durable artistic relationship. Often these types of collaborations have existed for approximately ten years. Integrative collaborations do not exhibit a leadership style. All decisions are made jointly. Participants share an equal risk involved in financial and emotional resources. A 'third artist' phenomenon can be created from integrative collaborations, as both artists involved submerge and then merge their egos. This submergence often results in the work becoming the most important outcome of the collaboration.

Artists such as John Vella and Geoffrey Ricardo, who work with formal and informal groups, emphasised the need to speak a common language with the participants. They also stressed the importance of enabling the participants to feel a sense of ownership with the project. In these situations the artist choreographs a situation to a certain extent, usually by providing the initial design concept, and allowing a degree of flexibility within this context. Vella felt that the collaborative process dissolved divisions and hierarchies between people, their work and/or place. He also noted that there was a difference working with artists and non-artists. Vella believed that artists require equal input in the initial design stage, and if this did not occur then these other artists feel a loss of ownership. Vella felt that non-artists preferred to see themselves physically manifested in the work. He noted that a collaborative leader cannot be too sensitive or inclusive; otherwise the project becomes an exercise in making people happy rather than making good work. Vella and Ricardo said that working collaboratively required both tact and the ability to encourage a group. The surrendering of control was both beneficial and frightening. Vella revealed that the sharing of his practice was seen as one means for breaking down the exclusivity of art and encouraging participants to engage with it. These types of collaborations were usually logistically more complex, costly and generated levels of stress. Working with other artists in a formalised group required trust in their expertise. This type of collaborative process cannot work if the image or idea was controlled every step of the way; otherwise the process would be dominated by one person. The ability to undertake larger scale and more ambitious projects; to have greater physical output and the validation from other people, who want to work with you, were all described as important benefits of the collaborative process.

The type of collaboration described by Ricardo and Vella has been described as complementary collaboration in which participants complement one another with differences in training, skill and temperament to support a joint outcome through the shared division of labour. This type of collaboration has been recommended for arts practitioners working in small groups of eight to ten people (John-Steiner, 2000, p. 70).

From a curatorial perspective, the artists swiftly moved through the traditional forming, norming and performing stages, without an identified storming stage (Tuckman, 1965). From the email correspondence, it was evident that the artists were keen to participate in the exhibition, and were enthusiastic and passionate about informing the public of their collaborative processes and practices. Each group of artists were committed to their work, and were able to eloquently express their views on the complexity of collaboration. The artists were respectful of my curatorial role and involved me in their consideration of the work to be exhibited. The collaborative aspect was emphasised as the performing stage of the *Partnership or Perish?* exhibition was reached. As Gallery Director, Bywaters had organised the gallery volunteers and the installation of the exhibition went smoothly, and was also an enjoyable and aesthetic experience. It was unfortunate that three of the artists were interstate

and were unable to install their work. However, they maintained contact during the installation week and were available if we needed to discuss anything. The comments from the volunteers and Bywaters about the quality of the work were uplifting. I realised from this experience that collaboration can occur on many levels, and there are many groups that work towards the creation of a third entity. Undertaking this curatorial project helped to impress on me the importance of a number of essential aspects which would need to be integrated into a model of collaborative practice.

The *Partnership or Perish?* case study examined collaboration as it occurred in the artists' practice and through various stages which culminated in the exhibition. The collaborative process engaged in by the artists was predominately based on a long term relationship in the case of the Turpin Crawford Studio, *S!X*, and the VTW with Geoffrey Ricardo. These groups epitomised the characteristics of trust, open communication, and the submersion of the artist's ego, which appeared to be typical of effective and long standing collaborative partners or groups. In collaboration, the emotional and financial risks were also shared, as are any rewards or accolades that come from engaging in this process. Vella appeared to have utilised some important aspects of the collaborative process, even though he worked with people on a shorter term basis. The possibility for establishing the type of relationship experienced by the Turpin Crawford Studio and *S!X* in this case study was more difficult to achieve. Integrative collaboration was less common than complementary collaboration due to the intimate relationship between the participants.

The email responses relevant to this case study, provided an overview of the correspondence established with each artist, the gallery director and the curator. The frequency of emails and the change in language from formal to casual indicated the development of these relationships. As the curator I was involved in decisions regarding the selection of work and presentation, both with the artists and the gallery director. During these times, it felt that we were engaging in the performing stage of the group process. The relationships between the artists involved in the *Partnership or Perish?* exhibition encapsulated the key characteristics of an effective collaborative process. The opportunity to be engaged in such a process, which relied on collaboration between the gallery director, the artists and I, allowed me to experience some of the key characteristics of the collaborative process. These included the importance of mutual respect, trust and understanding; leadership; skills and expertise flexibility and compromise; and open, constant and challenging communication.

Conclusion

As this paper has revealed, collaboration is a complex phenomenon which relies on a range of factors, such as communication, skills and expertise, leadership, and support. When each of these elements are combined effectively they result in the third entity, something that combines different sets of expertise, which one participant could not have created individually. In the case study described in this paper the third entity was the *Partnership or Perish?* exhibition.

It is evident that collaborative processes are being increasingly utilised in many sectors, such as education (Chalmers, 1992; Engestrom, 1994; Erickson, 1989; Henry, 1996; Littleton, Miell, Faulkner, 2004). Educators are encouraging students to work together and to use a range of learning styles in order to increase their relational skills. Sawyer (1997) noted that contemporary research in education 'focuses on the benefits of collaborative, participatory

learning, in which the students take an active role, in rich unstructured interactions with both the teachers and with other students' (p. 197). Collaborative activity is inherently creative, and as such this broadens the repertoire of experiences from which children can interpret the set task, and therefore the process and/or end result may not always be directed towards the educational goal that was devised (Littleton, et al., 2004).

Wright (2004) stated that 'collaboration emerges and flourishes under certain sets of circumstances' (p. 533). However, as Mattessich et al. (2004) noted: 'Collaboration is not always effective. It is not always appropriate. Sometimes it might even result in greater costs than independent efforts' (p. 4). Some participants described working collaboratively as creating more work and stress and felt the process was also more costly, needed a great deal of preparation time and was logistically, more complex. This perception has been identified by Rogoff (1990) as 'the difficulty of communicating some ideas or of negotiating mental responsibility,' which may lead some individuals to work alone (p. 144). She noted that some people were concerned about the effort or risk of working collaboratively. The *Partnership or Perish?* case study revealed that the participants were aware that collaborative processes were more complex, but it appeared that in most situations, the human dynamics or process of the collaboration was as at least as valued as the final outcome. It is interesting to note that the notion of exclusivity has been part of the 'aura' of twentieth century Western artistic practice. However, artists who have engaged in collaborative practice have actively sought to break down this barrier and, this is reflected in many sectors of society with the associated benefits of increased communication, collegiality and support.

References

- Barrentine, P. (Ed.). (1993). *When The Canary Stops Singing*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Bruffee, K. A. (1993). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Buzzanell, P. (Ed.). (2000). *Rethinking Organizational & Managerial Communication From Feminist Perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Chalmers, R. (1992). *Collaborative School Management: One Principal's Experience*. Milton, Qld: The Jacaranda Press.
- Clark, J. (1996). Reflections on Lichtenstein. *artonview*(5), 34 - 36.
- Close, C. (2004). *Chuck Close Prints: Process and Collaboration*. Houston, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Colaizzi, P. (1978). Psychological research as a phenomenologist views it. In R. Valle & M. King (Eds.), *Existential Phenomenological Alternatives for Psychology* (pp. 48 - 71). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eisler, R. (2005). The Economics of the Enlightened Use of Power. In L. Coughlin, E. Wingard & K. Hollihan (Eds.), *Enlightened Power* (pp. 21 - 36). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Engestrom, Y. (1994). Teachers as collaborative thinkers: Activity - theoretical study of an innovative teacher team. In I. H. Carlgren, G. & Vaage, S. (Ed.), *Teachers' minds and actions: Research on teachers' thinking and practice* (pp. 43 - 61). Briston, PA: Falmer.

- Erickson, F. (1989). Research Currents: Learning and Collaboration in Teaching. *Language Arts*, Vol. 66(4), 430 - 441.
- Farrell, M. (2001). *Collaborative Circles*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gardner, J., Metcalfe, J., Pisarski, A., & Riedlinger, M. (2006). *Collaborating across the sectors*. Occasional Papers No. 3., November. Council for Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences. Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Gergen, D. (2005). Women Leading in the Twenty-First Century. In L. Coughlin, E. Wingard & K. Hollihan (Eds.), *Enlightened Power* (pp. xv - xxix). San Francisco, CA: Jossey - Bass.
- Green, C. (2001). *The Third Hand: Collaboration in Art from Conceptualism to Postmodernism*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J., & Woodman, R. (1992). *Organizational Behaviour* (6th ed.). St Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- Henry, M. (1996). *Parent-School Collaboration: Feminist Organisational Structures and School Leadership*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- John-Steiner, V. (2000). *Creative Collaboration*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Littleton, K., Miell, D., & Faulkner, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Learning to Collaborate, Collaborating to Learn*. New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.
- Mattessich, P., Murray-Close, M., & Monsey, B. (2004). *Collaboration: What Makes It Work* (2nd ed.). Saint Paul, Minnesota: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- May, W. (2005). Teachers as Curriculum Developers. In R. Neperud (Ed.), *Context, Content and Community in Art Education* (pp. 53 - 86). New York: Teachers College Press.
- McCabe, C. J. (1984). *Artistic Collaboration in the Twentieth Century*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Rickards, T., & De Cock, C. (1999). Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Creativity. In A. Montuori & R. Purser (Eds.), *Social Creativity* (Vol. 2, pp. 235 - 256). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sawyer, R. K. (Ed.). (1997). *Creativity in Performance*. USA: Ablex Publishing.
- Sharpnack, R. (2005). *The Power of Shifting Context*. In L. Coughlin, E. Wingard & K. Hollihan (Eds.), *Enlightened Power* (pp. 39 - 52). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sowers, R. (1983). The Myth of Collaboration. *American Craft*, Dec/Jan, 44 - 45, 96.
- Simpson, J. A., & Weiner, E. S. C. (1989). *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Vol. 3, Chom - Creeky). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & L. Austin (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Chicago: Nilson-Hall.
- Tuckman, B. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 63(6).
- Tushman, M. (1982). Managing communication networks in R & D laboratories. In Tushman, M. & Moore, W. (Eds.), *Readings in the management of innovation*, Boston: Pitman.
- Winer, M., & Ray, K. (2000). *Collaboration Handbook*. Saint Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.
- UTAS, (2006). *Partnership or Perish?* (Exhibition catalogue). Launceston, Tasmania: School of Visual and Performing Arts.
- VTW. (2005). *The Art of Collaboration: Masterpieces of Modern Tapestry from the Victorian Tapestry Workshop (Catalogue)*. South Melbourne, Victoria.
- Wright, S. (2004). The Delicate Essence of Artistic Collaboration. *Third Text*, 18(6), 533 - 545.

