

ORGANISATIONAL BEHAVIOUR THEORIES AND THEIR RELEVANCE TO THE
PRACTICE OF STAGE MANAGEMENT IN A THEATRICAL SETTING
A Discussion

Jennifer Ainsworth

Submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Fine Arts
in the Theatre Arts Program of the School of the Arts

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
May 1, 2014

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Organisational Mechanisms	4
a. Organisational Structure	4
b. Organisational Culture	9
i. Creating Culture	10
ii. Organisational Ethics	26
iii. Trust	29
iv. Organisational Justice	31
3. Individual Characteristics.	35
a. Personality	35
4. Individual Mechanisms	37
a. Motivation	37
i. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs	37
ii. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory	43
5. Conclusion	46
6. Works Cited	48
7. Acknowledgements	50

1. Introduction

This thesis will review and discuss various theories of organisational behaviour that may be useful to the practice of stage management, and examine how they may be successfully applied to a theatrical setting.

Organisational Behaviour “is the systematic and scientific analysis of individuals, groups, and organisations; its purpose is to understand, predict and improve the performance of individuals and, ultimately, the organisations in which they work” (Tosi and Mero 9). It is an interdisciplinary field that began to appear in the late 50s/early 60s and draws on theory and research from a variety of fields, including sociology, psychology, communication, and management. Organisational behaviour is a huge field, and this thesis can only begin to touch on a small, select number of theories.

While a theatrical production may not generally be thought of as a traditional organisation, it certainly fits Merriam Webster’s definition; “a company, business, club, etc., that is formed for a particular purpose” (“Organization”). Since “manager” (“someone who is in charge of a business, department, etc.” [“Manager”]) is half of a stage manager’s job title, it behooves a stage manager to be aware of traditional business/management theories/practices in order to be able to use those that may be applicable to a theatrical setting.

It is generally agreed amongst stage managers that having the ability to manage people (aka “have good people skills) is essential to being a good stage manager. Despite this, most stage management texts devote little, if any, time to how to develop leadership or management skills, instead focussing on the practical minutiae of stage management, such as the various types of paperwork needed at all stages of production, setting up and running rehearsals, lists of things to discuss with directors, maintaining a show and so on. Since the point of the study of organisational behaviour is to try to better understand individuals and the organisation they work in, it provides a useful framework to better understand a theatrical organisation and the myriad personalities that are a part of it, and thereby become a better leader. Whilst this thesis will not directly address theories of leadership and teamwork, both leadership and teamwork are implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) discussed throughout.

This thesis will begin by reviewing and discussing the broad theories of organisational mechanisms and then move on to theories of individual characteristics and mechanisms.

Section 2a will investigate theories of organisational structure. These theories are discussed as knowledge of how organisation can be structured and how information flows through different structures may help a stage manager better understand the often complicated structure of a theatrical organisation and thereby more effectively facilitate the flow of information between the various parts of the organisation.

Section 2b will investigate organisational culture. Firstly, various theories of culture creation and the types of culture that may be created will be discussed. Secondly, theories regarding specific aspects of culture (organisational ethics, trust and organisational justice) will be discussed, and finally, ways in which culture may be changed will be investigated. Theories of organisational culture and their relevance and application to theatre and/or stage management are discussed in great detail in this thesis as culture is what makes an organisation the way it is, and because stage managers have a major role to play in the creation and maintenance of culture in a theatrical organisation.

Section 3 will introduce personality theories and briefly discuss the situations in which personality may manifest itself and affect behaviour in a theatrical setting.

Section 4 will discuss the two of the most popular theories of motivation; Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's two-factor theory. These theories provide insight into what motivates people and in turn how stage managers can better motivate those they work with.

Finally, section 5 will draw conclusions regarding the relevance of the various theories of organisational behaviour and whether they are indeed usefully applicable to theatre and/or stage management.

2. Organisational Mechanisms

a) Organisational Structure

The organisational structure of an organisation “defines how job tasks are formally divided, grouped and coordinated” (Robbins et al 542). The most common ‘traditional’ organisational structures are the simple structure, the bureaucracy and the matrix structure (Robbins et al 549). A simple (also called flat) structure is “characterised by a low degree of departmentalisation, wide spans of control, authority centralised in a single person, and little formalisation” (Robbins et al 549). A bureaucracy (also known as hierarchy) has “highly routine operating tasks achieved through specialisation, very formalised rules and regulations, tasks that are grouped into functional departments, centralised authority, narrow spans of control and decision making that follows the chain of command” (Robbins et al 550). A matrix structure is one that “creates dual lines of authority and combines functional and product departmentalisation (Robbins et al 551). Newer organisational structures are the team structure, which has “the use of teams as the central device to coordinate work activities and the virtual structure which is “a small core organisation that outsources major business functions” (Robbins et al 553).

In a theatrical setting the organisational structure of a production is often not well-defined. Two separate organisations (the production and the theatre) hire staff who work together on the same show, so there is often two separate structures that may not meld

together optimally. There are often several leaders; for example, the director, producer and stage manager. And where does the (living) playwright fit in? This section will attempt to tease out the numerous factors that might go into the creation of the structure of a theatrical organisation, as the stage manager needs to know the structure so that he/she is aware of how and where information flows. There are numerous components that can contribute to creating the structure of an organisation, including specialisation, departmentalisation, standardisation, formalisation, authority, centralisation, configuration, chain of command and span of control.

Specialisation refers to the degree to which employees are divided into specialised roles (Strati 1186). Theatrical productions have a high degree of specialisation; actors act, designers design, carpenters deal with set, electricians deal with lights and fog. This leads to a high degree of departmentalisation (“the basis by which jobs are grouped together” [Robbins et al 544]); for example, there is the lighting department, sound department, actors, general management etc. It could be argued that some jobs overlap departments (e.g. electricians are stagehands, but they are also part of the lighting department), but in general the chain of command places them in one department and not two (e.g. electricians are classified as stage hands as they report to the production manager, house manager and stage manager, rather than being part of the lighting department as the lighting designer does not give them direct commands).

Standardisation and formalisation are, for the purposes of a theatrical organisation, essentially the same. Standardisation is “the presence of standard rules and

procedures”, while formalisation is the “use of written instructions and procedures” (Strati 1186). Theatrical organisations are generally not particularly standardised as each production has different requirements. The standards that are in place generally refer to working conditions (e.g. work hours and breaks), and procedures for requesting leave. The degree of work standardisation depends on the job function. For example, when a carpenter is executing cues during a show, the job is highly formalised; the same input (cue light going off) is handled exactly the same way each performance. However, during load-in or work calls, the carpenter may have more discretion as to how a task is done. During rehearsal formalisation is extremely low and actors may experiment and have a lot of freedom, but, again, once in performance, the degree of freedom decreases markedly.

Authority is “the right of decision, and control a person has to perform tasks and to meet assigned responsibilities” (Tosi and Mero 141). Most people in a theatrical production have a high degree of authority. Some people, such as the director, producer, stage manager, production manager and general manager have a high degree of “traditional” authority – i.e. they are able to give commands and expect them to be obeyed. However, most people have authority in the broader sense as they are generally able to decide for themselves how best to complete their tasks and meet their responsibilities. For example, actors have authority in the way they say their lines, dressers have authority in the way they arrange clothes and do quick changes and props people have authority in the way that they arrange the props backstage. As long as the

job is done, and is done in a sensible and efficient manner, it is unlikely that they will be told that something has to be done in a particular way.

Centralisation refers to “the amount of decision-making authority confined to the top of the organisation” (Strati 1186). Theatrical organisations are surprisingly centralised. While designers and actors make decisions about their work, it is ultimately the director who has the final word on creative decisions, and the producer who makes the financial decisions (and has some input into creative decisions). Once in performances, it becomes a little more decentralised as the stage manager often makes decisions without the input of the director or producer. This is not true decentralisation however, as the stage manager gains decision-making authority as it is delegated to them by the director and producer. If a production tours it becomes even more decentralised due to delegation of authority as the director may not even come in for rehearsals (with the actors being taught by the associate director or production stage manager), and the producer is in a different city, so if changes need to be made (e.g. if the set doesn’t fit into the theatre), it is the stage manager and head carpenter who make those decisions.

Configuration (“long versus short command chains and role structures” [Strati 1186]), chain of command (“unbroken line of authority that extends from the top of the organisation to the lowest echelon” [Robbins et al 546]) and span of control (“the number of subordinates a manager can efficiently and effectively direct” [Robbins et al 547]) are all inter-related as they are most applicable to a fairly hierarchical structure. These structural concepts are often quite problematic for theatrical organisations, as the length

of a command chain can vary, there is generally not a single chain of command (especially as house staff are under the aegis of the theatre, not the production itself), and the span of control can vary from very wide (e.g. the stage manager, who manages everyone who is working on a particular performance), to very narrow (e.g. the wardrobe supervisor who manages the dressers and wardrobe day workers). This can make the life of a stage manager very difficult. Stage managers are broadly responsible for managing everyone who works on a performance, but may not always have the authority to be able to fix a problem. For example, if a local stagehand misses cues repeatedly, the stage manager's only recourse is to discuss the problem with the house manager and ask them to rectify it as the stagehand is employed by the house, and therefore the house manager is responsible for discipline. If an actor has expanded some stage business and it no longer fits with the director's original intent for the scene, the stage manager's duty is to give an actor a note about how the scene should look. If the actor refuses to take the note the stage manager, again has no recourse and needs to talk to the director, general manager or producer about the problem.

The organisational structure of a theatrical production does not easily fit into a traditional organisational structural model (e.g. simple/flat, bureaucratic/hierarchical, team or matrix). In some respects it is hierarchical as the decisions come from the director or lead producer, in some it is a matrix as people report to more than one department head, and in some respects it is extremely team based. The organisational structure is complicated even more by the fact that people working in the theatre on the show may be hired by either the production itself or by the theatre in which the show is

housed, and a person may have to answer to people from both organisations (e.g. a Local 1 carpenter is hired by the theatre so has the house carpenter as his direct report, and the house manager as his boss, but during a show he must work under the production head carpenter and take cues from the stage manager). The stage manager has no control over the structure of the organisation, as it has generally been established by the time he/she is hired. Nonetheless, it is crucial that the stage manager be aware of the structure of the organisation so that he/she can make sure that lines of communication are open and flowing in all the directions that they need to, and that hierarchical aspects of the structure are respected.

b) Organisational Culture

“Culture implies stability and rigidity in the sense that how we are supposed to perceive, feel, and act in a given society, organization, or occupation has been taught to us by our various socialization experiences and becomes prescribed as a way to maintain the ‘social order’. The ‘rules’ of the social order make it possible to predict social behavior, get along with each other, and find meaning in what we do. Culture supplies us our language, and language provides meaning in our day-to-day life. Culture can be thought of as the foundation of the social order that we live in and of the rules we abide by.” (Schein, *Leadership* 3)

i) *Creating Culture*

Organisational culture is “the patterned way of thinking, feeling, and reacting” (Tosi and Mero 123) that creates a “system of shared meaning held by members that distinguishes the organisation from other organisations” (Robbins et al 577). In order for an organisation to form a culture its membership needs to be stable and they need to have a common history (Schein, *Psychologist* 111). Under normal circumstances culture is created gradually as a group of people learns how to survive in their environment and integrate with one another, using behavioural, cognitive and emotional processes (Schein, *Psychologist* 111). The cognitive lessons learnt will affect culture the most as the perceptions, language and thought processes that the group shares will end up determining their feelings, attitudes, values and behaviour (Schein, *Psychologist* 111). A theatrical production is not, however, a normal organisation, and therefore its culture is not formed in the typical way. Theatrical productions are often in existence for only a short period of time, and the members of the organisation will therefore lack the common history generally required to form a culture. However, there is another way to form a strong culture in an organisation, and that is to share “important intense experiences”, and that is exactly what happens when a group of people band together to put on a show (Schein, *Psychologist* 111). The most fundamental act of culture formation is sharing emotional response (Schein, *Leadership* 202), and both theatre itself, and the act of creating a piece of theatre is all about shared emotional responses. The stage manager is probably best able to shepherd the members of the group through the truncated period of

shared learning and emotional responses that occur during the “important intense experience” of creating a show in order to create the culture of the production.

The culture of an organisation is generally created by the founders of an organisation, and their vision (Robbins et al 584). It is difficult to define who the founders of a theatrical production are, as each production is different. In some cases, the producer (e.g. Cameron Mackintosh) is the founder and his/her attitudes will define the culture of the production (e.g. *The Phantom of the Opera*), but in general, while the producer is a founder, he/she tends to only influence the culture of the business practices associated with the production, rather than the production itself. Sometimes the director will be the founder (e.g. Julie Taymor) and he/she will create the culture. However, despite the stage manager not being a “founder” (since he/she is an employee and brought on when the production is already well on under way) he/she is the person who is best placed and best suited to creating the culture of a production as he/she is intimately involved in all aspects of the production, interacts with all people involved in the production, and is present at every meeting, rehearsal and show from pre-production to the very end.

Traditionally, there are three ways in which culture is formed. The first is for the founders to “hire and keep employees who think and feel the same way they do” (Robbins et al 584). This step is applicable up to a point. In order to create a financial and management culture the producers will hire a general manager who is compatible with them, who will then hire a company manager that fits their own culture. The

production manager who is hired will be chosen on their ability to fit with the desired fiscal culture. The production manager will hire production stagehands on their ability to fit into the culture the production manager wishes to create. The producer will probably hire a director on the basis of their talent (or their existing involvement in the project) rather than their ability to fit into the producer's management culture, but if the director does not have a preferred stage manager, the producer and general manager will probably recommend stage managers who fit with the desired management culture in order to influence the director. When a director or designers are hired, they are generally still hired for the way they think and feel, but in a different way to those who are responsible for the management of the production. The vision of the piece, and the creative direction that the production will take is the most important factor at this time. The designers are hired as the director feels that they will be able to enhance his/her vision for the piece. If they have a completely different idea of how the production should look or feel they will not be hired. It is when actors are hired that this step is completely irrelevant. Actors are hired on their ability to bring in audience (e.g. stars), talent, and whether they are "right" for the part (i.e. they fit the director's vision for the character). How the actor thinks, feels and acts when not in character has absolutely no bearing on whether they are employed on a production or not (unless they have a history of being particularly badly behaved, such as Kathleen Battle). The difficulty for stage managers is that they have (almost) no influence on who is hired, yet must quickly create a culture that will benefit the production once everyone begins to meet. The one area that a production stage manager can really apply this first step in culture creation is when hiring the members of

the stage management team, where it is vitally important, as the culture of the rehearsal room and performance space is created by the stage management team as a whole.

The second factor in the creation of culture is to “indoctrinate and socialise these employees to their way of thinking and feeling” (Robbins et al 584). The producers will do this with the managers, the production manager will attempt to do this with the stagehands, directors will do this creatively with the designers and actors, and stage managers will do this with everyone, but particularly the actors and stage management team. The “indoctrination and socialisation” of the stage management team will start early; during (or perhaps even before) pre-production, so that the culture of the stage management team is built before going into rehearsals, where, as a team, they will begin to build the culture of the rehearsal room.

The third factor in the creation of culture is to ensure that the “founder’s own behaviour acts as a role model that encourages employees to identify with them and thereby internalise their beliefs, values and assumptions” (Robbins et al 584). This is the probably the most important factor in the creation of a production’s culture. The director will create the creative culture through the way that he/she talks about the piece and the way he/she interacts with and treats people, including how much creative freedom he/she gives the actors and how notes are given. The stage management team will create the culture of the production through the processes and procedures they create, their application, and the way they interact with others, and the way they expect others to interact. The producer, director, production manager and production stage manager (if

present) begin to create the production's nascent culture during the pre-production period through the way that meetings are run, and how communication between creatives and managers occurs; i.e. if it is respectful, and creative problem solving occurs, or if it is disrespectful and argumentative. Whilst the culture of the pre-production period will not necessarily affect the culture of the rehearsal room, if a positive, respectful culture is created in pre-production, it will be helpful once tech rehearsals begin and the design/production management culture meets the culture created in the rehearsal room. The stage management team and the director together form the culture of the rehearsal room. It is important to have established a respectful and creative culture in the rehearsal room as once in tech and performance other people and other cultures need to be merged together. "The rules and procedures you set up in rehearsal will serve as the foundation for the rules and procedures for performance" (Ionazzi 77). The cultures that meet during tech are the culture of the actors/director/stage managers that has been created during rehearsal; the culture of the stage hands (both production and house) that the production manager has created during load-in; and the culture of the producers, designers, general management etc that has been created from pre-production on during meetings. The stage manager needs to meld these cultures together to create the culture that will be present during the performance period.

There are numerous ways for a leader to create culture by embedding their views into the culture of the production, some of which are more applicable to stage managers and theatre than others. The most effective principles are: what is paid attention to, measured or controlled; how critical incidents and crises are reacted to; deliberate role

modelling and coaching; criteria for allocation of rewards and status; and criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement and excommunication (Schein *Psychologist* 115). Other factors can articulate and reinforce these views and help them to become part of the culture; the design and structure of the organisation; the systems and procedures in place; the design of the physical space; stories, legends, myths, and symbols; and formal statements of organisational philosophy, creeds, or charters.

The stage manager can use these principles of embedding views to create culture. The first principle is based on the importance of “what is paid attention to, measured or controlled”. This principle can be used as a method to instil culture in all areas of the production. The thing that is most paid attention to in a production, and has therefore become part of the theatrical macroculture, is time. Everyone involved in a theatrical production is overtly conscious of time as performances must start by a particular date. The producers and managers are conscious of time as time costs money. Designers need to have their designs in on time; sets, costumes, sound plots etc have to be built on time; there is only a certain amount of time for rehearsal and tech; performances have to begin on time or overtime can be a factor; and stagehands need to perform their cues on time or the show will not run well. The one area in which the importance of time seems to become lost is actors arriving to rehearsal and performance on time. Stage managers can aim to reduce or eliminate lateness by paying attention to it, measuring it and ideally controlling it. This can be done by making an announcement during the first rehearsal talking about lateness, and what to do if you are unavoidably late (i.e. arrange with the stage manager beforehand or call/text stage manager in cases of emergency or massive

MTA issues). It is helpful to measure lateness by noting down every time someone is late so that if lateness becomes habitual you are able to talk to the person about their lateness and have proof. While not always ideal, the most effective way to control lateness is to follow Equity rules to the letter and write up everyone who is even a minute late so that their pay is docked if it becomes a repeated issue. Another big thing that is “paid attention to, measured and controlled” is lines. The playwright (if alive and in the room) and stage managers pay close attention to the lines to make sure that they are being said as written, and will call attention to incorrect lines through giving and correcting lines during rehearsal. They are measured when line notes are taken and given to actors, and are controlled by ensuring that the actors get the lines perfect through repetition and line throughs. The director and stage manager pay close attention to the artistry of the actors performance, and ensure that it is repeated. The actors know that the stage managers are paying attention to the blocking and intent of performance when they are given notes. Performances are both measured and controlled by the stage managers recording the blocking and taking notes as to the director’s intentions for a scene.

The second principle of embedding views into culture is “how critical incidences and crises are reacted to”. The theatrical macroculture of this principle is “the show must go on”. It is the stage manager who is most responsible for creating the culture associated with crises, as they most often happen in the theatre. It is essential that the stage manager creates a culture where critical incidents and crises are viewed as an opportunity for people to quickly problem-solve and step up to challenges. The culture created must be one of open communication so that everyone knows what the problem is,

who is working to solve it, and at what stage of being fixed it is at. If the problem cannot be fixed in a timely manner then the problem-solving and communication must be around how to keep the show going without an element, and how long it will take to organise a work-around solution (e.g. if an actor falls during a show, how long will it take to get the understudy costumed and ready to go on. Incidences must also be communicated upwards to general management and producers, particularly if it is something that will affect ticket sales. For example, if a star is running late, the producers may decide to hold the house in order to allow the star to go on rather than risk audience members asking for refunds if the understudy goes on. By creating a culture where open communication and problem-solving are the default position if a critical incident or crisis occurs the stage manager makes upper management and actors feel safe that the show can go on even if there is a problem, and most importantly, that if the show does go on, it is safe for it to go on.

The third principle of embedding views into culture is “deliberate modelling and coaching”. The production stage manager may deliberately coach the members of their stage management team to ensure that the team is modelling the desired culture, but they are unlikely to formally coach anyone else on the production. The entire stage management team, however, will constantly be deliberately modelling the desired culture for the production. As a general rule, the desired culture that the stage management team (and the director, hopefully) will create and model is one of mutual respect, where the rehearsal room/theatre is a safe space. The stage management team models a culture of respect in very simple ways. They are polite, friendly, and open to everyone, observe

simple courtesies such as saying please and thank you, and always maintaining a calm, even demeanour. They never yell and never put down anyone. If a conflict arises it is handled privately. They demonstrate respect for the physical property of the theatre by handling props and set pieces with care and only handling them when necessary. If actors are seen mishandling physical property they are politely asked to stop.

Stage managers have very little (if any) control over the principles of “criteria for allocation of rewards and status; and criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement and excommunication”, as the theatrical macroculture for these principles is talent; or the ability to sell tickets in the case of stars. When it comes to allocating rewards and status it is the theatrical community that controls the awards, and it is agents and general managers who determine whether an actor has a clause in their contract where he/she gets a financial bonus for a Tony nomination or win. In the rehearsal room, the star or principals may have greater status, or may try to have greater status, but the stage manager should aim for a culture of equality, where every person is treated the same. The most conspicuous symbol of status in the theatre itself is an actor’s dressing room; its size, location, and whether it is shared (and if shared, with how many people). While stage management does officially allocate dressing room assignments, the status implied by certain dressing rooms is often pre-determined as stars and principals will often have dressing room choice and/or requirements stipulated in their contracts.

In general the criteria for recruiting, selecting, promotion and retirement are, again, talent and star power. The stage manager can have input into “promotion” when

deciding what understudy to put on if there is not a contractual first understudy. The ideal culture is to treat understudies equally and to divide available performances equally, but this is only possible if both/all understudies are equally prepared, suitable for the role and perform it equally well. If this is not the case, again, the culture is that talent is the most important factor, and one understudy will go on more than another. The stage manager may also have input into “retirement”, which will happen most often on a show where age is a huge factor in casting. An example of this would be “Annie”, where the orphans either need to be cast in an older role or leave the show as they get older. If Annie herself, in particular, looks too old, the timbre of the show changes completely. A PSM of one Annie production has said that he knows that an orphan is getting too old and needs to be replaced when the stagehands start looking at her differently. “Excommunication” is something of a taboo topic in theatre. While the Equity contract specifically prohibits “blacklisting”, if a person behaves extremely badly or makes everyone’s life miserable they may find it difficult to find work. However, since talent trumps (almost) all, a lot of bad behaviour may be tolerated due to a person’s talent or ability to sell tickets.

When considering the other factors that can articulate and reinforce the views that become embedded in culture, the most relevant to theatre are the systems and procedures put in place; the design of the physical space; and the stories, legends, myths, and symbols associated with the organisation. Of little importance is the design and structure of the organisation (as discussed previously) and formal statements of organisational philosophy, creeds, or charters, which are highly unlikely to exist in an industry as

nebulous as theatre. As discussed elsewhere in this paper the systems and procedures put in place (and applied equitably) by stage managers aid in creating a culture of trust, that employs work in a fair organisation (procedural justice) and can help to meet motivational hygiene needs.

The design of the physical space of the rehearsal room (where various departments have their tables in the room, how close together the production stage manager and director sit, whether there are set pieces in the room or it is taped out, where the hospitality table is located, the presence/location of extra chairs etc) can reinforce culture as it gives an indication of how organised and collaborative the organisation is, and how a stage manager feels about various departments. Setting up the rehearsal room can pose some challenges for stage managers to ensure that everyone has enough room to do their job, that everything and everyone is accessible, and that it is still a comfortable and welcoming space to create work in. No-one has any input into the design of the physical space of the theatre itself. When the producer is booking a theatre he/she will be looking at availability, the size of the house, the size of the stage, and whether the theatre will be able to cope with the technical demands of the show. This then leaves it completely up to chance as to how the myriad design aspects of a theatre that affect how people interact with each other on a day to day basis, (for example, whether the dressing rooms are accessible only by stairs, how accessible the stage is, if there is a green room, where the dressing rooms are located with regard to the stage, if there is a cross-over on stage level or if the only cross-over is via the basement) may impact the desired culture of an organisation. The one theatrical design aspect that the stage management team can

control is to ensure, when allocating dressing rooms, that the stage management office is easily accessible, and should ideally be located in a place where people will pass it as they go about their day, to ensure that lines of communication between stage management and everyone else in the building remain open and easy.

Many stories, symbols, myths and legends (to which “superstitions” should be added when discussing theatre) are part of the theatrical macroculture and help to maintain the mystique associated with the industry. The best known of these theatrical superstitions are not saying the name “Macbeth” in a theatre (and the rituals that occur should someone say it), saying “break a leg” (or other local variations such as “merde” or “chookas”) instead of wishing a performer “good luck”, and leaving a light on in the theatre at all times in order to appease the ghosts of the theatre. Many shows will have stories (or possibly myths in the case of long running shows) that can have the effect of making the people who work on the show feel like a part of an exclusive club, which may help to form closer teams, leading to more effective teamwork.

“Indulge ceremonies or superstitions, such as a company, prayer or whatever the local “Macbeth” ritual happens to be, even if you don’t believe or participate. These are all little things that make the company feel ‘taken care of’”(Dollar 14).

Stage managers may not be aware that they are form the culture of the production, especially during the rehearsal period, but much of what a stage manager does creates culture. There are numerous stage management texts, none of which refer directly to theories of organisational culture, but the authors do use the techniques of various

organisational culture theories to create their desired culture. When Thomas Kelly discusses first rehearsals his assertion that

“positive energy and good-natured efficiency and control will kick the show off to a strong start. In this way, the stage manager becomes the calm center of the storm of emotion that will inevitably arise as the creative process begins” (89)

he is using the techniques of ‘deliberate role modelling’ and ‘reaction to crises’ to create his desired rehearsal culture, which is one in which actors feel “comfortable and safe” (Kelly 91). Carissa Dollar also believes that deliberate role modelling creates cultures, as demonstrated when she says that the “mood that is set for this first rehearsal will determine the productivity, creativity and general atmosphere of every rehearsal that follows” (Dollar, 11) and that a “SM who loses her cool or complains all the time has no chance of creating [a good culture]” (Dollar 19). She uses deliberate role modelling to create a culture (although she describes it as an “atmosphere”) called “The Comfort Zone” where “anything is possible”, which is a “safe” space for “the cast to experiment in as the show grows and evolves” (Dollar 11, 13). Ionazzi’s process of creating culture focusses more on creating and implementing processes and procedures, believing that it is “important that everyone involved in rehearsals has a clear understanding of what is expected of them and what they can count on others to do” (77). All three authors use the technique of “paying attention to important things” to create a culture where being on time, safe and precise are valued.

Four distinct types of cultures are identified by what is known as “The Competing Values Framework” (Cameron 9). These are the clan, adhocracy, market and hierarchy

cultures (Cameron 8). The ideal theatrical culture is a mix of clan and adhocracy culture, with a little hierarchical culture.

Clan culture “is typified as a friendly place to work where people share a lot of themselves. It is like an extended family with best friends at work. Leaders are thought of as mentors, coaches, and, perhaps, even as parent figures. The organization is held together by loyalty, tradition, and collaboration. Commitment is high. The organization emphasizes the long-term benefits of individual development with high cohesion and morale being important. Success is defined in terms of internal climate and concern for people. The organization places a premium on teamwork, participation, and consensus” (Cameron 9).

A theatrical organisation does not wholly conform to all aspects of clan culture, but its culture closely resembles a clan culture. They are (ideally) friendly places to work, and most people will share a lot of themselves (if not personally, then creatively). It can often become an extended family, especially on a long run or on tour, and close friendships are often formed, especially amongst actors. The director, as a leader can be considered to be a coach, and the stage manager is often considered to be a parental figure. The culture of the rehearsal room and performance space (if not the organisation as a whole) is typified by loyalty and collaboration. High cohesion and morale of all members who work on the performance is highly desirable, and a premium is placed on teamwork. The areas in which a theatrical organisation does not resemble a clan culture are on measures of success, as having a “good” (however that is defined) show that runs for a long period of time and is profitable are generally the measures of a successful organisation.

The adhocracy culture is “characterized as a dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative workplace. People stick their necks out and take risks. Effective leadership is visionary, innovative, and risk-oriented. The glue that holds the organization together is commitment to experimentation and innovation. The emphasis is on being at the leading edge of new knowledge, products, and/or services. Readiness for change and meeting new challenges are important. The organization’s long term emphasis is on rapid growth and acquiring new resources. Success means producing unique and original products and services” (Cameron 9).

Adhocracy culture is another culture that closely resembles the culture of a theatrical organisation. Theatrical organisations have to be dynamic, entrepreneurial and creative, and almost everyone take risks. The producers and investors have a high level of financial risk and all the creatives (designers, director and actors) take creative risks to try to get the best product. Depending on the show, there is often a commitment to experimentation and innovation, and while there may not necessarily be an emphasis on being at the leading edge of new knowledge or services, some shows do develop new technology (e.g. the flying technology in “Spider-man: Turn Off the Dark”), and some immersive shows create new services to further engage their audience (e.g. an immersive dinner experience can now be had before entering “Sleep No More”). Everyone who works for a theatrical organisation needs to be ready for change (especially during rehearsal, tech and previews when changes occur every day) and be able and willing to meet new challenges. Ionazzi states that stage managers perform their job better if they

understand they are managing change, and if they learn to love chaos (75). For a new play or musical, success is defined as “producing unique and original products” (Cameron 9), and this can sometimes be true of a revival depending on the organisation. The major ways that theatrical culture differs from adhocracy cultures are that there is no long –term plan for rapid growth (perhaps gradual growth with touring) or acquiring new resources (since every new commercial show is a new entity).

The culture of a theatrical culture will contain aspects of a hierarchy culture, mainly because the culture of the stage management team is likely to have a high degree of hierarchy culture. A hierarchy culture is

“characterized as a formalized and structured place to work. Procedures and well-defined processes govern what people do. Effective leaders are good coordinators, organizers, and efficiency experts. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is important. The long-term concerns of the organization are stability, predictability, and efficiency. Formal rules and policies hold the organization together.”

Stage managers create processes for themselves to work by, and for others (e.g. actors) to work by. Stage managers are, in general, excellent coordinators, organisers and efficiency experts who aim to make the running of the production as smooth as possible. Stage managers also aim to keep both themselves and the production stable, predictable and efficient.

The culture of a theatrical organisation should ideally have only a touch of market culture.

“Leaders are hard-driving producers, directors, and competitors. They are aggressive and demanding. The glue that holds the organization together is an emphasis on winning. The long-term concern is on competitive actions and achieving stretch goals and targets. Success is defined in terms of market share and penetration. Outpacing the competition, escalating share price, and market leadership dominate the success criteria.”

Producers and general managers are concerned with trying to increase ticket sales (which corresponds with market share and penetration) and outpace the competition (other shows), but it is generally not done in an overtly aggressive way, and market culture should be confined to the general management and producing offices, and not spread to the rehearsal room or performance space lest finance becomes more important than creativity.

ii) *Organisational Ethics*

Organisational ethics are “the rules, principles, standards or beliefs that commonly define right and wrong”, that are “involved in all facets of business from decision-making to budgeting, from personnel issues to leadership” (Sims 310). The culture of an organisation is key to setting values that will result in ethical behaviour. Organisational leaders set the moral tone of the organisation through their policies and procedures (some organisations may even have a written code of ethics), but mainly

through deliberately modelling the desired behaviour: “they need to set high ethical standards, demonstrate those standards through their own behaviour, and encourage and reward integrity in others” (Robbins et al 347).

Stage managers can often be faced with ethical dilemmas as they are the primary communicator and facilitator of the production, so generally know everything that there is to know about everything and everyone. While the company manager is theoretically something of a human resource manager for a production, the stage manager often partially fulfils that role as they are always around and have (hopefully) built a high level of trust with everyone, and so people will often take sensitive information to the stage manager. The stage manager, along with the Equity Deputy, also has a role in making sure that union rules are adhered to, which can be ethically difficult sometimes. An example of an ethical issue is if the director wants to add full or partial nudity into a scene, but the actor may not feel comfortable being nude on stage and not want to do it. As the production contract requires that the actor gives written consent prior to appearing nude (Actor’s Equity Association, 76) it should be easy for the actor to refuse, however, unless the actor is a star, she may not verbalise her discomfort to the director or producer as she does not want to lose her job or be labelled as “difficult” and find it hard to get work in the future. If the actor goes to the stage manager to let them know about their dilemma, it is difficult for the stage manager to know what to do, especially if the actor has told the stage manager not to do anything about it due to her career fears. The stage manager then has quite an ethical dilemma – to do nothing (if the actor requests it), or to talk to the director, the producer, or the general manager?

Sexual harassment is potentially more difficult to define and deal with than in a traditional business culture due to the nature of theatre. Broadly generalising, theatre people are more tactile than the average person, probably due to the physical and often intimate nature of the work they do. In traditional business culture it is often highly unusual for employees to strip to their underwear in the middle of the office and change clothes, or for them to stand in front of people and give a speech partially or completely nude. This may mean that situations/conversations/bodily handling that may be inappropriate elsewhere is considered perfectly normal, harmless, or even just plain friendly in a theatrical setting. Some theatres or theatrical organisations may have written codes of conduct regarding acceptable behaviour, but the best way for stage, and other theatrical, managers to determine whether sexual harassment is an issue is whether a person is being made to feel uncomfortable. If anyone goes to a stage manager complaining of sexual harassment, or indeed any kind of harassment, it should be investigated, and other, more senior members of the organisation (e.g. general managers or producers) should be brought into the discussion. Unfortunately, sometimes the result will be that (as previously discussed) talent wins out, and the harasser may not be disciplined. There was a case many (10 – 15) years ago where the star of a show was sexually harassing the stage manager. Instead of firing or disciplining the star the producers chose to replace the stage manager, but continued to pay the original stage manager her full salary and benefits for the entire run of the show although she was no longer working there. Since this occurred many years ago, it is hoped that any sexual

harassment issues that arise on a show are handled in a more appropriate manner these days.

iii) Trust

Trust is “a positive expectation that another will not – through words, actions or decisions – act opportunistically” (Robbins et al 437). It is vital that an organisation that is strongly team-oriented (such as theatre) has a strong culture of trust, as trust is essential for effective teamwork. Trust is embedded into the culture primarily by the leader(s) modelling behaviour. When leaders exhibit trust, they engender an environment in which trust is reciprocated, which increases trust as a whole, leading to increased cohesion, which then improves teamwork as team-members trust that their team-mates will help them if needed (Robbins et al 440, 441). In addition, when people (e.g. actors) trust their leader (stage manager), they are more likely to listen to that leader (Dollar 11).

The key dimensions of building trust are integrity, competence, consistency, loyalty and openness (Robbins et al 438), and stage managers should aspire to be all these things. While honesty (a component of integrity) has been shown in studies to be the most important factor in building trust (Robbins et al 438) for “traditional” organisations, the most important way that a stage manager builds trust is by demonstrating competency. Designers are much more likely to trust a stage manager who is organised, and has some technical knowledge. At the very least, stage managers should be able to have a conversation about technical matters or it will be very difficult for the designers to trust

them in tech. Having a knowledge of technical matters also help stagehands trust the stage manager, as if there are technical problems during the show, the stage hands can trust that the stage manager understands what they are telling them and are therefore able to understand the potential solution being presented or that the stage manager will be able to suggest a solution to the problem. As Dollar puts it, “the best way to gain the trust of any company is to be able to quickly and efficiently deal with any situation which arises” (11). Having interpersonal skills that are at least competent is hugely important given the amount of communication and facilitation that a stage manager does. Having artistic knowledge or sensibility helps directors to trust the stage manager, especially when it comes to maintaining the show after they’ve left, as they know that the stage manager understands their vision and intent. Stage managers show competency in the smallest of ways such as providing pre-hole punched scripts to actors; having spare pencils, highlighters and erasers available during rehearsal; having fresh coffee ready for breaks; and generally being able to provide anything that anyone wants before they know that they want it. While these things are small and may seem insignificant, it helps build trust as it is assumed that if a stage manager has time to take care of the smallest details, then he/she must have the big issues sorted as well.

Bryant believes that “consistency of behaviour is the most important thing in running a group of people” (31). In this setting, consistency refers to the way situations are handled, and in particular, if words match deeds. For example, a consistent stage manager who professes to believe in treating everyone the same will not mark a stars birthday any differently from the birthday of an ensemble member.

Stage managers can use loyalty to build trust by not bad-mouthing the show, cast or director in public, and by not using any information that is learnt opportunistically. As Kelly puts it, stage managers should never “take sides, play mind games or call the personnel names” (24). Dollar is more realistic, saying that “stage managers can complain to each other in private as much as they need, but don’t let anyone in the company hear your negative comments” (19). Stage managers also show loyalty by supporting the actors in whatever way they need. Integrity and openness are less important for stage managers when building trust. While stage managers need to have a high sense of personal and artistic integrity, when discussing trust, integrity is more synonymous with honesty rather than morals, and sometimes honesty is not the trait required from a stage manager. There are numerous circumstances in which full honesty and openness would be detrimental to building trust (e.g. in cases of conflict), or when it is good business practice to withhold information (e.g. if the producer has told the stage manager that the show is closing but has not told the cast), and in cases like these, it is actually discretion that builds trust, not openness and honesty.

iv) Organisational Justice

Organisational justice is the “overall perception of what is fair in the workplace” (Robbins et al 198). Ensuring that an organisation is considered to have a “fair” culture can be difficult as fairness is subjective, and therefore everyone will perceive the justness

of the organisation differently (Robbins et al 198). Organisational justice consists of three dimensions: distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Robbins et al 199).

Distributive justice refers to “the perceived fairness of decision outcomes, such as pay” (Colquitt and Greenberg 165). It can be promoted by following appropriate norms for allocating resources and distributing them according to equity, equality, seniority or need (Kals and Jiranek 221). Resources can include things other than salary and bonuses, such as material goods, responsibilities, rights and privileges (Kals and Jiranek 221). Stage managers do not deal with financial resources such as pay, but a stage manager may be able to exercise distributive justice when dealing with other resources. An example of when a stage manager might be able to exercise distributive justice is if understudy costumes are being built slowly and on a rolling basis. The stage manager could recommend that costumes be built on a need basis. This need could be based on time, for example, the costumes of an actor who is scheduled to cover a role in two weeks’ time get built before the costumes of an actor who may or may not end up covering the role. The need could also be based on actor size or current costumes, for example if an understudy is much smaller or bigger than the lead he covers, then he is unable to use the lead’s costume if he suddenly needs to cover the role, or if an understudy usually plays a peasant, but covers a noblewoman, none of the understudy’s current costume pieces can be used to cobble together a facsimile of the proper costume in an emergency. A stage manager could also decide that costumes should be built in order of seniority, so that standbys or contractual first understudies of the leads have their costumes built first. An example of when stage managers may be able to exercise

distributive justice using the norm of “equality” is if there are two or more understudies for a role, and they have the ability to decide which understudy goes on if the lead is out (i.e. if there is not a contractual first understudy). If all understudies perform in the role equally well the stage manager can exercise distributive justice by ensuring that the understudies cover the role equally when the lead is out sick or on vacation.

Procedural justice refers to “the perceived fairness of the procedures used to make decisions” (Colquitt and Greenberg 165). Stage managers can contribute to the perception that procedural justice is fostered by being consistent, unbiased, having accurate information when making decisions, and being open to appeals (Robbins et al 198). It is also important that people have a sense that they are able to contribute to the decision-making process (process control), and that a clear explanation as to how the decision was made is able to be provided (Robbins et al 198). Ionazzi’s statement that “rules and procedures will be more accepted if you provide a clear and reasonable explanation for their existence” (77) is a practical example of how principles of procedural justice can be used. To ensure a sense of procedural justice, stage managers need to ensure that policies and procedures are clearly outlined in writing, and that they are followed consistently. There should be written policies and procedures for actors and stage managers to request leave, which should also cite examples of the reasons why a leave request may be declined. If requests for unpaid leave above contract requirements are made, everybody should be treated equally, with no special dispensation for the leads or stars. If leave is declined and the actor is unhappy with the decision then the stage manager should talk to the person about why the request was declined, try to come up

with an alternate solution, and bring in the company manager or general manager for advice if necessary. Having a policy on dealing with lateness, either to rehearsal or to half hour, is also important. Whether the policy is to write the actor up as soon as their call time has passed, or whether the policy is more lenient and requires the actor to notify stage management if they will be late, it should be applied consistently. While an actor may feel that it is unfair to be written up if they are only a minute late for their call time, if every single person is written up if they are a minute or more late, procedural justice is still being followed.

Interactional justice refers to “the perceived fairness of how decisions are enacted by authority figures” (Colquitt and Greenberg 166), which includes whether a person has been treated with dignity, concern and respect (Robbins et al 199). Stage managers should always treat everyone with dignity, concern and respect for a myriad of reasons, not just to ensure a perception of interactional justice.

3. Individual Characteristics

a) Personality

Personality, in the context of organisational behaviour theories is “the relatively stable organisation of all a person’s characteristics, an enduring pattern of attributes that define the uniqueness of a person” (Tosi and Mero 23). It can affect many aspects of work, ranging from culture to motivation, and is therefore important to have an idea what aspects of personality can affect behaviour and how and when personality may manifest itself.

Personality will manifest to a greater or lesser degree, depending on the situation. Its impact will be less in a “strong situation”, where “constraint such as clear and precise cues, rules and task demands act to limit behaviour” (Tosi and Mero 24). Given this definition, it could be assumed that the personality of a stage hand should not overtly manifest itself when he/she is performing cues given by the stage manager during a show. Conversely, a “weak situation” is one that is more ambiguous and loosely structured, with few rules and policies, which means that personality characteristics may become more evident as an explanation and cause for behaviour (Tosi and Mero 25). A rehearsal room is often a weak situation, which is why the personality of actors, particularly stars, is likely to come out and be a greater cause for consideration. “You often see prima donna singers or musicians act very individualistically in rehearsals, expecting to be

treated as special because of their unique skills” (Tosi and Mero 25). However in a strong situation like a performance, the personality of these same actors is less likely to be a cause of their behaviour as “when it comes time to go on stage, a more controlled situation, usually they play the part and sing on key” (Tosi and Mero 25).

Should a stage manager wish to gain a greater understanding of personality attributes there are numerous theories that may be studied to provide insight into a person’s behaviour in an organisation. These include core self-evaluation, which is determined mainly by self-esteem and their locus of control; Machiavellianism, narcissism, self-monitoring, risk-taking, Type A/B personality, and proactivity (Robbins et al 111 – 15).

4. Individual Mechanisms

a) Motivation

Motivation is a key function of all managers, and stage managers are no exception. Some situations that require an understanding of motivation are, for example, when actors are having difficulty finding their character or learning lines, getting notes or during a long run. Directors can also need motivation, especially if they are having difficulties with the playwright or producer, or if a scene is not working. A stage manager may need to motivate designers to speed up their process and get a design in. Stage hands may need to be motivated to feel a part of the production team, and of course, a stage manager must ensure that the members of their stage management team are motivated in order for the team to do its best work for the production.

There are a huge number of motivational theories, and it is useful to have an understanding of them in order to understand how a person may be motivated, and how the motivational factors of each person are different.

i) *Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs*

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is probably the most widely known, and most popular, of the motivational theories. It is very useful for managers as it is primarily an

“on the average” theory, in that it does not stress individual differences, but considers groups of individuals who are defined in part by their external circumstances (Miner 139). Maslow posits that there are five motives or needs within an individual that, when combined with other factors (such as biological, cultural and situational), determine behaviour (Miner 134). He placed these needs in what he called a “hierarchy of prepotency”, meaning that a need lower in the hierarchy must be significantly met before the next need becomes a motivational factor (Miner 136). The needs, in order of prepotency, are “Physiological”, “Safety”, “Love” or “Belongingness”, “Esteem” and “Self-Actualisation” (Miner 135). It should be noted however, that it is not a strict hierarchical structure, despite what many people think. Maslow himself said that a more

“realistic description of the hierarchy would be in terms of decreasing percentages of satisfaction as we go up the hierarchy. For instance, if I may assign arbitrary figures for the sake of illustration, it is as if the average citizen is satisfied perhaps 85 per cent in his physiological needs, 70 per cent in his love needs, 40 per cent in his self-esteem needs, and 10 per cent in his self-actualisation needs” (qtd. in Miner 136)

In addition, the emergence of higher level needs is a gradual process which can take an unspecified time period, which means that higher level needs will attain a proportionally greater influence over behaviour as a lower need is increasingly met (Miner 136). Prepotency has not been supported by research, except in a very general way; physiological and safety needs must be met before any other needs can be addressed (Miner 142). However, regardless of whether prepotency exists or where a person is in

the “hierarchy” it is important to know and think about the needs and how they can affect behaviour.

Physiological needs are the chemical needs of the body and include such things as food, sex, and sleep (Miner 135). Stage managers have very little control over this as a motivational factor, except when it comes to caffeine. While Maslow would probably disapprove of the inclusion of caffeine as a physiological need, for those working in the theatre, particularly during tech, it most certainly classifies as one (as a substitution for the sleep need that is not being met). The provision of a hospitality table with coffee and tea available is a small gesture, but one that goes far in the motivation of theatrical professionals. It can also help to start to meet the need of (emotional) safety.

Safety needs refers to the need to be protected from physical and emotional harm (Robbins et al 181). A vital role of the stage managers is to ensure that all people involved in a production work in a physically safe environment. While things like calling “clears” during a performance and ensuring that a floor is not slippery are obviously an occupational health and safety issue, it is more than just that. When an actor (for example) knows that the stage management team is looking after their physical safety, their safety need is met, and they can move onto to higher levels of need, which will enable them to move to the levels that affect their craft. The same can be said of the emotional safety need. When the stage management team creates a safe rehearsal environment, where mistakes can be made and emotions can be expressed, the emotional safety need is met and higher level needs can be worked upon.

Love or Belongingness needs (the terms are used interchangeably), is the need to feel part of a group; to have social acceptance and approval; to both give and receive love (Miner 135). Actors in particular have a great need for love/belongingness, which is demonstrated by how quickly a cast tends to bond, and the grief that occurs when a cast member leaves or a show ends. Stage managers need to foster the sense of being a group working together towards a common goal, with everyone who is involved in the production. If the designers feel involved and included in the group they may communicate more. If stage hands are made to feel part of the team they will be invested in the show. An example of a way to build a bond with stage hands is to participate in small backstage rituals. For example, on many shows there are small dance or hand moves that the deck stage manager and stage hands do in a certain part of the show. For instance, on *Wicked*, the deck stage manager and head carpenter link arms and do a modified “yellow brick road” walk as they cross stage behind a set piece as it moves into place. These rituals cannot be forced to occur, but if a stage manager sees one being developed, it will increase his/her bond with the crew if he/she joins in. Social needs have been shown to have neurological basis as the brain’s primary threat and reward centre is activated by social threats and rewards (Bryant 55). This means that it is very important that if measures are put in place to increase a feeling of group belonging (e.g. going bowling after Sunday matinee) that everyone should have the opportunity to be included. If someone feels left out of an activity the brain activates the pain regions of the brain, and when that person remembers the social exclusion later, they will feel that same pain

again (Bryant 55), which defeats the purpose of trying to satisfy love/belongingness needs by encouraging social events.

Esteem needs can be divided into two categories; internal and external. Internal esteem needs include feelings such as autonomy, strength, achievement, confidence, and self-respect (Miner 135). External esteem needs derives from outside sources such as reputation, status, recognition, attention, importance, and appreciation (Robbins et al 181). Most people who work in theatre are likely to have high esteem needs which are probably met to a greater or lesser degree by their craft. In some cases, the degree to which their esteem needs are met may in fact impact the quality of their creative work. Un-met esteem needs can lead to feelings of helplessness and inadequacy (Miner 135), which are not conducive to producing great work. The esteem needs of the creative members of the production are likely to take up a lot of a stage manager's time and energy. If someone (whether it be an actor, designer or even the director) has un-met internal esteem needs and is feeling very vulnerable and insecure as a result, they are likely to require greater external esteem inputs, and may in fact demand it by stressing their status or fame/reputation and requiring special treatment to validate their external esteem needs. While stage managers cannot really do anything to boost internal esteem, it is possible to easily contribute to external esteem needs. By paying attention to people when they talk, paying attention at meetings and rehearsal, expressing appreciation for actions or talent and recognising people's worth stage managers can help to satisfy external esteem needs.

Self-actualisation is the most difficult need to quantify as Maslow himself was very vague about it. In his words, it was “to become more and more what one is, to become everything that one is capable of becoming” (qtd. Miner 135). Another definition: “includes growth, achieving one’s potential and self-fulfilment” (Robbins et al 181). Despite this vague definition, it should be quite easy for stage managers to motivate people with creative potential (e.g. actors, directors, designers), as manifesting this potential (i.e. acting, director or designing) is self-actualisation. The probable best way for stage managers to try to help people with their self-actualisation needs are to encourage them to do the best that they can.

Maslow postulated two other needs, which he did not include in his order of prepotency. They are not very well known and were not well-developed, however they may have relevance to a stage manager. The first are cognitive needs, which can be divided into two components. The first component, “desire to know”, could be applicable to directors and actors as it involves “being aware of reality, getting the facts and satisfying curiosity” (Miner 135). This motivation can be of importance during tablework, when the director is trying to understand the play, or when an actor is trying to understand his/her character and their motivations. The other component of the cognitive need is one that relates to “understanding and explanation” and includes the “desires to systemise, organise, analyse, and seek out relationships and meanings” (Miner 135). Dramaturgs could possibly be motivated by this need. The second additional need postulated is the aesthetic need, which refers to “a craving for beauty in one’s surroundings and, when ugliness prevails, a real sense of deprivation, even sickness”

(Miner 135). This need is probably present in many set, costume and lighting designers. For example, there are many lighting designers who refuse to use certain gel colours as they find them irredeemably ugly. It would also be reasonable to presume that some directors have aesthetic needs; for example, it could be assumed that Julie Taymor has high aesthetic needs due to the attention and money she spends on design aspects for each production. It is likely that stage managers themselves have high aesthetic needs, and that it is one of the few needs that stage managers will allow themselves to indulge in. With the possible exception of the calling and blocking scripts, stage managers need for all their paperwork to look pretty. Stage managers (their production assistants or interns) will spend a lot of time formatting documents (from scripts to character-scene breakdowns to the cover sheet for their binder) until they are aesthetically pleasing. While there is an aspect of usability to this obsessive formatting (that is, trying to make sure that anyone could read and use the document should the author be taken ill), a lot of it is driven purely by aesthetics.

ii) *Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory*

The two factor theory postulated by Herzberg is another useful motivational theory for stage managers to be aware of. This theory suggests that there are two sets of factors that impact job satisfaction; hygiene factors and motivator factors (“Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory”). The presence of hygiene factors will lead to job dissatisfaction, but their absence will not lead to job satisfaction, whereas the presence of motivator factors will lead to increased job satisfaction (“Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory”).

Hygiene factors include quality of supervision, salary, working conditions, company policy, relations with others (including supervisor) and job security (Robbins et al 184). Motivator factors include responsibility, achievement, the work itself, recognition and growth opportunities (Tosi and Mero 76).

Many hygiene factors are covered in union contracts, and it is incumbent upon stage managers to ensure that these are adhered to. Pay is covered in all union contracts, and while it is not a stage manager's job to ensure that everyone gets an adequate salary, they do contribute to this hygiene factor for actors and other stage managers by ensuring that they accurately communicate the number and type of hours worked (e.g. normal time, over time, holiday pay, understudy performing a role etc) and the additional assignments that an actor may have (e.g. understudy, dance captain) to the company manager so that they are paid correctly each week. Working conditions are also covered in union contracts – both occupational health and safety conditions, and conditions regarding time management such as hours worked, breaks taken etc. All contracts have safe and sanitary clauses that deal with occupational health and safety, and stage management (in conjunction with other departments and the theatre) need to ensure that these are met. For example, when allocating dressing rooms stage management must ensure that the wardrobe department is not located next to any animals that may be in the show, and that there are not too many actors in a dressing room for the number of wash basins that are present. Stage managers also need to make sure that they are aware of time management working conditions, such as the number of hours that can be worked in a week (before overtime), and the breaks that need to be taken. This role is especially

important once a production is in a theatre as the stage manager then needs to consider the break needs and work day rules that pertain to IATSE members as well as those that pertain to members of Equity. Problems could occur if an IATSE member felt that the hygiene needs of Equity members were treated with more respect than the hygiene needs of IATSE members.

Some hygiene factors are not covered by union contracts and can therefore be a little more nebulous. Stage managers are supervisors, and so need to ensure that they are fair, give useful feedback and maintain a good working relationship with everyone. The need for relations with others is similar to the Maslow's social need, so is likely to be met in a theatrical setting. Stage managers can help to ensure that the company policy factor is met by ensuring that clearly stated, transparent policies (e.g. requests for vacation time) are in place, and that these policies apply equally to everybody. There is one hygiene factor that is almost impossible for anyone in the theatre to meet, and that is job security due to the inherently unstable and freelance nature of the industry. As the saying goes, "Every show must close (eventually)". However, as job insecurity is a known quantity in theatre, it is unlikely that job security is a major hygiene factor for most theatre folk.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to review and discuss various theories of organisational behaviour that may be useful to the practice of stage management, and examine how they may be successfully applied to a theatrical setting.

Theories of organisational structure allow stage managers to have a better understanding of how a theatrical organisation is likely to be structured, since it is unlikely to be structured in any of the traditional ways. Theatre is highly specialised, which leads to a high degree of departmentalisation. Since communication between departments is essential for effective work to occur, stage managers need be aware of departmental lines and ensure information flows between departments. Stage managers also need to be aware that people in a theatrical organisation tend to have a high degree of individual authority (making micro-management ill-advised), whilst, surprisingly, the organisation is quite centralised, with most decision-making authority held by the producer, director and stage manager.

It is this author's opinion that creation of a positive culture is one of the stage manager's prime functions, and that theories of culture creations can be very useful. The most applicable of these theories are role modelling, paying attention to important things, response to crises, and systems and procedures. Most stage managers use these principles even if they do not realise it, but it is important that stage managers actively

work to create a positive culture early in the rehearsal process to ensure an engaged and productive culture once in the theatre.

Understanding the different cultures identified in the competing values framework may help the more hierarchically cultured stage managers better understand and interact with the clan and adhocracy cultural aspects of the organisation, while having an understanding of the theories of organisational ethics, trust and organisational justice may help stage managers to deal with situations where complicated social mores may come into play.

It is important for stage managers to understand what motivates people as it can help to explain behaviour. Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's two-factor theory are able to be help stage managers understand the motivations of most people in the theatre.

In conclusion, it is evident from this thesis that there are many theories of organisational behaviour that have relevance to theatrical organisations and which may be used by stage managers to better their practice.

6. Works Cited

Bryant, Adam. *Quick and Nimble: Lessons from Leading CEOs on How to Create a Culture of Innovation*. Collingwood: Schwartz Publishing Pty Ltd, 2014. iBooks file.

Cameron, Kim. "A Process for Changing Organizational Structure." *Handbook of Organizational Development*. Ed. Thomas G. Cummings. CA: Sage Publishing, 2008. 429 – 445. Web. 27 April 2014. Page numbers referenced are from a word document: <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/83281/CULTURE%20CHANGE%20CHAPTER%20Revised%20-%20OD%20HANDBOOK.doc?sequence=1>

Colquitt, Jason A., and Jerald Greenberg. "Organizational Justice: A Fair Assessment of the State of the Literature." *Organizational Behavior: The State of the Science*. Ed. Jerald Greenberg. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2003. 165-210. Print.

Dollar, Carissa. *Stage Managers Do Make Coffee: A Handbook for Stage Managers*. 2000. Web. 28 April 2014. http://jahc.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/sms_do_make_coffee.pdf

"Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory" Heery, Edmund and Mike Noon. *A Dictionary of Human Resource Management* (2nd rev. Ed). Oxford UP, 2008. Web. 7 April 2014

Ionazzi, Daniel A. *The Stage Management Handbook*. Cincinnati: Betterway Books, 1992. Print.

Kals, Elisabeth and Patrick Jiranek "Organizational Justice." *Justice and Conflicts: Theoretical and Empirical Contributions*. Ed. Elisabeth Kals and Jürgen Maes. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. 219-235. Web. 9 April 2014.

Kelly, Thomas. *The Backstage Guide to Stage Management: Traditional and New Methods for Running a Show from First Rehearsal to Last Performance* (3rd Ed). New York: Back Stage Books, 2009. Print.

"Manager." Def. 1. *Merriam Webster Online*. Merriam Webster, n.d. Web. 27 March 2014

Miner, John. *Organizational Behavior: Foundations, Theories, Analyses*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002. Print.

“Organisation.” Def. 1. *Merriam Webster Online*. Merriam Webster, n.d. Web. 27 March 2014

Robbins, Stephen P., Timothy A. Judge, Bruce Millett and Terry Waters-Marsh. *Organisational Behaviour*. 5th Ed. Frenchs Forest: Pearson Education Australia, 2008. Print.

Schein, Edgar H. “Organizational Culture”. *American Psychologist* 45.2 (1990): 109 – 119. Web. 15 April 2014.

Schein, Edgar H. *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (4th Ed). Hoboken: Jossey-Bass, 2010. Web.

Sims, Ronald R. *Managing Organizational Behavior*. Westport: Quorum Books, 2002. Print.

Strati, Antonio. “Organizational Structure.” *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*” Ed. Stewart R. Clegg and James R. Bailey. Sage Publications Inc. 2008. 1186 – 1189. Web. 14 April 2014.

Tosi, Henry L., and Neal P. Mero. *The Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior: What Managers Need to Know*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. Print.

7. Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and express my immense gratitude to all the stage managers that I have had the fortune to be taught by over the past 2 years, especially the inestimable Michael Passaro who has guided me through it all; the stage managers who I have worked with, from whom I have learned so much; and the classmates that I have had the good fortune to learn from, fight, cry and laugh with. Without all of these people I would not have been able to write a thesis as I would not have known all that I now know about theatre and stage management.

I would also like to express my undying gratitude to my parents, Geoff Ainsworth and Laura “Vicki” Olsson, who have supported me through all my crazy theatrical adventures and allowed me to follow my dreams to America, even though they don’t really know what on earth I do. I also need to thank them profusely for reading multiple drafts of this thesis and providing incredibly cogent advice, sometimes on very short notice.

Professors and Guest Speakers

Michael Passaro
Arturo Porazzi
Bonnie Panson
Danielle Ventimiglia
Diane DiVita
Ira Mont
Jim Semmelman
Laura MacKinnon
Linda Marvel
Mary Beth Abel
Peter Lawrence
Ray Menard
Tripp Phillips

Colleagues

Peter Silver
Sophie Mackay
Kathleen Munroe
Brendan O'Brien
Liz Elise Richards
Robert "Bob" Bennett
Lauren Klein
Chris De Camillis
Buzz Cohen
Heather Englander
Luke Andersen

Classmates

Elizabeth Goodman
Alison Anderson
Caroline Watters
Colleen Lacy
Jill Woodward
Alayna Graziani
Alexx Hall
Danielle Thomsen
Garrett Rollins
Kat Hollands
Kate Dial
Krystle Henniger
Michael Tosto
Polly Hidalgo
Whitney Dearden
Zhenghao Zhang