

International Film Festivals: For the Benefit of Whom?

By Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen & Carmelo Mazza

Abstract

Film festivals have become a widespread phenomenon over the last fifty years and are leading events establishing the reputation of film professionals and constitute a well-established field in itself. Studying the cities of Copenhagen and Rome the authors are asking why the public authorities of these cities establish their own film festivals in an already saturated field of international film festivals? The focus is on the strategic responses and work made by two late adopters of film festivals – Copenhagen and Rome and their international film festivals, CIFF and ‘Festa del Cinema di Roma’ (FCR). The comparative case study is based on qualitative data and methods. It investigates how the two festivals establish, legitimate and position themselves within the existing, institutionalised field of international film festivals. Combining the classical work on early and late adopters in the diffusion of ideas and practices (Tolbert & Zucker 1983) with forms of legitimacy (Suchman 1995) and institutional work (Lawrence & Suddaby 2006), it is demonstrated how different and sometimes conflicting demands from various stakeholders, like public authorities and the film industry, have shaped the frames used to position and legitimize the film festivals.

Keywords: Film festivals, late adopters, legitimacy, institutional work

Introduction

Why do authorities in Copenhagen and Rome establish their own film festivals when there are plenty of film festivals already? Events and awards ceremonies have become an increasingly fashionable and widespread phenomenon appearing across industries in the form of trade fairs, professional conferences, technology contests and so forth (Lampel & Meyer 2008; Moeran & Strandgaard Pedersen 2011). Well-established and broadly publicized events and awards in culture industries, including for example the Oscar (motion pictures), Grammy (music), Tony (theatre) and Emmy (television) events and awards, have become global cultural icons, signifying popular and critical success (Caves 2000; Anand & Watson 2004). Events and award ceremonies are occasions for the industry to meet and celebrate themselves and their products (Ruling & Strandgaard Pedersen 2010), building identities (Anand & Watson 2004) and creating distinctions and classifications (DiMaggio 1987; Strandgaard Pedersen & Dobbin 1997) through nominations and awards giving (Mezias et al. 2011).

Film festivals are seen as a specific type of events and award ceremonies, operating as leading events establishing the reputation of film professionals and as a meeting place for the film industry, mediating between art and business. Film festivals appear to constitute a well-established field in itself with a quite crystallized structure. In countries with a tradition in the film industry, cities with film festivals have been present for the last 6-7 decades or more (e.g. Venice in Italy, Cannes in France, Berlin in Germany, and Moscow in Russia) and specialization among festivals has been an emerging feature profiling festivals on the basis of the participating movies, directors and actors. Nobody knows exactly how many film festivals exist today on a global basis, but estimates have been made that more than 3500 film festivals exist. Such a structured and mature field constitutes an interesting domain for studying how new entrants (or late adopters) legitimate their existence and justify the need for yet another film festival. The focus is on the strategic responses and efforts made by two late adopters of film festivals – Copenhagen with Copenhagen International Film Festival (CIFF), launched in 2003, and Rome with ‘Festa del Cinema di Roma’ (FCR) launched in 2006 – in their attempt to establish themselves as legitimate players within the international film festival field.

First we present the theoretical framework to frame the issue of late adopters and the strategic dilemmas and issues of legitimacy they face within such an institutionalized field. Second we present an account of the emergence and development of the international film festival field and its institutionalization. Third, we present and discuss the two cases of late adopters within this field and analyze how conflicting demands from various stakeholders, like public authorities and the film industry, have shaped the frames used to position and legitimize the film festivals, which we then conclude on.

Theoretical Framework

The institutionalization and diffusion of organizational forms and practices has been a significant object of analysis for many institutional contributions for the last three decades. Instrumental arguments (Dowling & Pfeffer 1975), social and cognitive arguments (DiMaggio & Powell 1983; 1991; Scott 1995; 2008; Czarniawska et al. 2005, Greenwood et al. 2008) have been developed to understand why certain forms and practices are adopted by organizations. Several attempts and suggestions have been made to define the various stages in the process leading towards institutionalization and diffusion of practices (e.g. Tolbert & Zucker 1983; Strang & Meyer 1994; Greenwood, Hinings & Suddaby 2002). These theoretical contributions end up emphasizing the role of the external environment and of social norms in enhancing the diffusion within the organizational fields by means of isomorphic pressures.

Institutionalization and diffusion have been largely investigated from a ‘practice perspective’. In this approach, the research agenda is concerned with understanding how given practices – such as, among others, TQM (Westphal, Gulati & Shortell 1997), health care procedures (Scott et al. 2000), caesarean birth (Goodrick & Salancik 1996), multidivisional forms (Davis, Diekmann & Tinsley 1994) – are circulated and become widely adopted within a particular organizational field. Yet, within this array of research, differences existing among the adopters and the time profile of the adoption have received only a scant attention. A significant exception is provided by Tolbert and Zucker (1983), whose seminal paper on the adoption of Civil Service reforms in US cities in the early 20th century, first raised the issue of the presence of different logics behind the adoption of institutionalized practices. They outline how timing affects the rationale of adoption and envision a two-stage model, wherein the authors distinguished *early adopters*, their decision depending on ‘the degree to which the change improves internal process’, from *late adopters*, who adopt certain practices ‘because of their societal legitimacy’ (Tolbert & Zucker 1983: 26). This two-stage model brought legitimacy and history back as main determinants of diffusion patterns. Mazza, Sahlin-Andersson and Strandgaard Pedersen (2005) have provided further descriptions of the different rationales inspiring early and late adopters of management practices by studying the diffusion of MBA educations in Europe.

Late adopters are seen to be inclined to conform to institutionalized forms and practices so displaying symbolic alignment with taken for granted practices paying less attention to substantial impacts on effectiveness and overall performance. In this sense, late adopters can be seen as prone to conservative strategic responses (Oliver 1991) in order to minimize the potential conflicts with the external environment. This argument resonates with other arguments like liability of newness and power dependence. Liability of newness would suggest that late adopters choose a conformity profile since acquiescence may reduce the risk of sanctions (Oliver 1991). Power dependence would suggest that alignment with the external

environment could help attracting the needed resources by reproducing the existing dependency patterns with suppliers (Oliver 1991). In both cases, late adopters' rationales are driven by symbolic and rhetoric (Green 2004) alignment rather than by the expectation of performance improvement.

In spite of the impressive body of literature on institutionalization and diffusion of practices (for overviews see Scott 2008 and Greenwood et al. 2008), we suggest that the late adopters' rationales for change still deserve a more careful academic scrutiny. In particular, the specific case where late adopters are also new comers in a given organizational field has been largely neglected. It is the case where an organization enters in a new field being late at adopting given practices. Existing research have so far neglected to investigate how pressure to conformity for organizations already acting in a field and deciding to (late) adopt institutionalized practices may differ from how pressure acts upon organizations which are entering in a new field.

We deal with two late adopter cities, Copenhagen and Rome, and their newcomer film festivals, CIFF and FCR, operating in the already institutionalized field of film festivals. We argue that late adopters face an inclusion-exclusion dilemma when trying to establish themselves within an institutionalised field. This dilemma has also been framed as 'optimal distinctiveness' (Brewer 1991) and studied, among others, by Alvarez et al. (2005) and Svejenova et al. (2007). Such cases are interesting since they link the selection of forms and practices to adopt (i.e. the diffusion issue) with the creation of the legitimacy of late adopters in the field. The latter dynamic provides an additional rationale for the late adopters' decision. Besides liability of newness and resource dependency, we argue that legitimization plays a major role in framing the strategic response to environmental pressures by late adopters.

Legitimacy makes certain forms and practices desirable, as they are congruent with existing social norms and values (Dowling & Pfeffer 1975; Suchman 1995). Legitimacy also makes organizations understandable to themselves as their existence is explained by established cultural accounts. Finally, legitimacy makes organizations taken for granted so that deviance from socially constructed patterns – such as economic profitability and performance – can go unnoticed and survival ensured despite economic failures (Meyer & Zucker 1988). Following Suchman (1995) legitimacy is 'a perception or assumption in that it represents a reaction of observers to organization as they see it' (Suchman 1995: 574). In this sense, legitimacy, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder(s) and in some cases they may have conflicting views and opinions on what is to be considered legitimate. Legitimacy is therefore a key concern for late adopters' (new comers) rationalization and theorization of their courses of action in an organizational field.

According to this approach, late adopters, such as Copenhagen and Rome and their film festivals CIFF and FCR, have to adapt to the existing conventions and isomorphic pressures and, resemble the other organizations existing in the field. In

this way, they can be accepted as legitimate players and attract resources (Meyer & Rowan 1977). Capturing the concerns of legitimacy facing the two festivals we build upon Suchman's (1995) taxonomy. He describes three types of legitimacy organizations fight for: a) *pragmatic*, resting 'on the self-interested calculations of an organization's most immediate audiences' (Suchman 1995: 578), b) *moral*, resting "not on judgements about whether a given activity benefits the evaluator, but rather of judgements about whether the activity is 'the right thing to do' (Suchman 1995: 579) and c) *cognitive*, resting not on evaluation but rather on taken for granted-ness; as Jepperson argues, 'one may subject a pattern to positive, negative, or no evaluation, and in each case (differently) take it for granted' (Jepperson 1991: 147).

We focus on certain specific features of legitimacy that we find are significant in the case of new film festivals. First, within pragmatic legitimacy we investigate how the film festivals in Copenhagen and Rome aim to attract support of main constituencies by appearing as 'responsive to their larger interests' (Suchman 1995: 578). In this sense they had to be constructed providing ex post rationalizations and ad hoc justification of their existence as tools to improve city marketing and increase reputation as hosts of large media events as well as tourist inflows. Second, within moral legitimacy, we focus on how the two film festivals had to profile themselves in an original way in order to distinguish themselves from the existing film festivals and so create a distinct identity within the field. By creating an identity of their own, these festivals aim at gaining the status of regular events within the city's cultural landscape. From a legitimacy perspective, this means to become unchallenged givens, things that is literally unthinkable to be otherwise (Zucker 1983). Film festivals in Copenhagen and Rome may have an ambition of becoming unchallenged givens though they have been only running for few years (respectively since 2003 and 2006). Finally, we assume a strategic action and agency perspective (DiMaggio 1988; Oliver 1991) within the institutional view of diffusion of forms and practices in order to investigate how these festivals have been constructed by the work of key actors involved. Such a strategic action perspective has been applied by other scholars under various headings like 'social skills' (Fligstein 1997) 'institutional entrepreneurship' (DiMaggio 1988; Rao, Morril & Zald 2000; Seo & Creed 2002; Maguire, Hardy & Lawrence 2004; Boxenbaum & Battiliana 2005; Strandgaard Pedersen, Svejenova & Jones 2006), 'institutional work' (Lawrence & Suddaby 2006; Lawrence, Suddaby & Leca 2009; Boxenbaum & Strandgaard Pedersen 2009) outlining the role and relevance of such institutional entrepreneurs and their activities.

Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) illustrate how actors may pursue different, sometimes competing, institutional strategies to legitimize organizations. Institutional strategies are defined as 'patterns of organizational action concerned with the formation and transformation of institutions, fields and the rules and standards that control those structures' (Lawrence 1999, quoted in Lawrence & Suddaby

2006: 218). The kind of institutional work undertaken by the actors involved is categorized, following Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), as *a) creating institutions*, *b) maintaining institutions* and *c) disrupting institutions*. The authors provide a theoretical taxonomy of the type of institutional works that can be undertaken by actors in the different operational contexts. The case studies of the two film festivals in Copenhagen and Rome allow us to investigate how the different forms of institutional work are undertaken by various actors – like public administration, local government, film industry, other events, private investors, local citizens and other constituencies – involved in the creation and maintenance of the festivals.

In the next sections we will first present the data and methods for the study. Then we outline the emergence and institutionalization of the international film festival field. After this, we describe the two cities as late adopters of film festivals within the international film festival field and the legitimization processes and institutional work they have undertaken in the creation and maintenance of the festivals. Finally, we compare and discuss the findings and draw some conclusions concerning late adopters with regard to institutional work, legitimization and stakeholders.

Data and Methods

The study is a comparative case study of two cities and their film festivals – Copenhagen International film festival (CIFF) established in 2003 and Festa del Cinema di Roma (FCR) established in 2006. Both cities are *late adopters* and as such newcomers to the field of international film festivals. They are also *capitals* in their respective countries, both having *a long tradition for film production, cultural policy and public subsidies*. The two cases studied are built on data collected from archival sources, following Ventresca and Mohr (2002) and generated through field observations and interviews from the first five years of the life of the two festivals.

For the Festadel Cinema di Roma (FCR) we have collected data on the 2006 to 2010 editions of the FCR festival from the website (www.romacinemafest.org) which extensively reports information both on the festival and the preparatory stages. We have reviewed official publications concerning the festival (e.g. festival programs, flyers, festival news papers etc.) directly issued by the festival organization in order to capture its profile and self-presentation to the public. We have collected articles on the festival published by the two main (in terms of circulation) Italian newspapers – Il Corriere della Sera and La Repubblica – and the related daily supplements on Rome to capture the statements of the city, local government and public authorities as well as other stakeholders involved. We also conducted four interviews with festival managers in charge of strategy and planning, human resource management, film selection and procurement. Interviews were used to integrate archival data and provide further information on the festival

mission and its operational procedures. The interviews were useful in tracing the evolution of the festival organization related to the refinement of strategy and positioning. Finally, we also visited the Festival in 2007 in order to have a 'live' view and first hand experience of the operations and the different elements of the festival.

For the Copenhagen International Film Festival (CIFF) data about the festivals from 2003-2006¹ were collected from the website (www.copenhagenfilmfestival.com) for information about the festival organization, program, rules and regulations, awards, key-figures from previous festivals and so forth. Official publications (festival programs, festival news papers etc.) issued by the festival organization were also gathered and analyzed. Newspaper articles on the festival were collected by an extensive database search on the Info media database including all Danish newspapers. This search resulted in 139 articles covering the years (2002-2007), which provided background information on the founding context, history, changes and critical incidents in the life of the festival. Five interviews have been conducted with: two representatives from the Danish Film Institute (DFI) involved in the founding and funding of the festival; a festival manager, two festival experts and CIFF participants on the perceived role and profile of the CIFF film festival. In 2007, we visited the festival in order to have a first hand experience of the festival, its operations and physical presence.

Data on the film festival field relies primarily on archival sources consisting of data from The International Federation of Film Producers Association (FIAPF) reports and FIAPF homepage, books on the history of film and film festivals (Blum 1953; Griffith & Mayer 1957; Dayan 2000; Jacobsen 2000; Touran 2002; Cousins 2004; Ezra 2004; Elsaesser 2005; De Valck 2006), together with insights generated from several field visits to international film festivals (2007-2009), observations and interviews with festival organizers, festivalgoers and film industry professionals.

The Film Festival Field²

Europe appears to be the cradle of the film festival phenomenon (Harbord 2002; Elsaesser 2005; de Valck 2006) born in the context of the particular geopolitical situation in Europe, during the 1930s, (leading up to World War II) and the new political order in Europe, during the late 1940s and early 1950s, (in the wake of World War II). The world's first major film festival was founded in Italy under the Fascist government and held in Venice in 1932. It took, thus, almost forty years from the first public screening in December 1895 by the Lumière brothers to the world's first major film festival was founded. The way the Venice festival was run soon gave rise to criticism that films from Italy and Germany were favoured even though the first editions have hosted films from several countries. According to Turan (2002) and supported by Mazdon (2007),

In 1937, Jean Renoir's 'La Grande Illusion' was denied the top prize because of its pacifist sentiments, and the French decided if you wanted something done right you had to do it yourself (Turan 2002:18).

This became the birth of what we today know as the Cannes film festival. Cannes won out as the preferred site for the film festival after a competition with Biarritz on the Atlantic coast (Turan 2002; Mazdon 2007). The film festival in Cannes was originally scheduled to take place for the first three weeks of September 1939, but the festival was cancelled, because of the German invasion of Poland, September 1 1939 and the Cannes film festival did not start up again until 1946 (Turan 2002: 18-19).

Another early adopter or 'first mover' within the film festival field is Moscow and the Moscow International film festival (MIFF) that was founded in 1935 and, thus, is the second oldest film festival in the world, after the Venice film festival. MIFF was, however, not continued until 1959, and has been redesigned several times – in 1959, 1969 and 1989 – and from 1959 to 1995 it was held every second year in July alternating between Karlovy Vary and Moscow. Since 1995 it has been held annually. This means that up to World War II only three film festivals were established, respectively Venice (1932), Moscow (1935) and Cannes (1939). The other early adopting cities and major international film festivals - like Locarno, Karlovy Vary, and Berlin and so forth - are a post-war phenomenon dating back to the late 1940s and early 1950s (for an overview of early adopters of film festivals see table 1.).

1932	Venice International Film Festival (Italy)
1935	Moscow International Film Festival (Russia)
1939	Cannes International Film Festival (France)
1946	Karlovy Vary International Film Festival (Czech) Locarno International Film Festival (Switzerland)
1951	Berlin International Film Festival – Berlinale (Germany)
1952	The International Film Festival of India (India)
1953	Donostia – San Sebastian International Film Festival (Spain)
1954	International Short Film Festival Oberhausen (Germany), Sydney Film Festival (Australia) Mar del Plata International Film Festival (Argentina)
1956	The Times BFI London Film Festival (England)
1958	Bilbao International Festival of Documentary and Short Films (Spain)

Table 1. Overview of early adopters of film festivals³

Table 1 shows that film festivals started out as a European phenomenon, but soon proliferated and diffused to other parts of the world (India-Asia, 1952; Sydney-Australia, 1954; Argentina-South America, 1954) ⁴ and from 1954 specialization start taking place with 'International *Short Film* Festival Oberhausen' and 'Bilbao International Festival of *Documentary and Short Films*' (Italics by authors). These early adopters have been the festivals that have come to define what an international film festival is and as such the film festival model that late adopters have

had to relate to later on. Nobody knows exactly how many international film festivals exist today, as the number keeps changing every day, but an estimated figure is more than 3500 festivals on a global scale.

Harbord (2002) links the creation of European film festivals to European post-war regeneration and rebuilding and she argues that the origins of such major film festivals are marked by two different discourses:

One is a broad historical project of rebuilding Europe, a rebuilding of the social infrastructure ravaged by the Second World War, and a consolidation of Europe as a significant player in a global economy. Importantly, by the post-war period, culture has become a means of representing the status of place and facilitating local economies through cultural events. The other discourse, from film societies and guilds, is concerned with the definition of film as a form, with the aim of broadening categories of definition in contrast to the studio format of Hollywood film. (Harbord 2002:64)

The relevance of these two discourses – one discourse concerned with *identity building* in relation to either nations or cities and, another discourse concerned with *defining film as form* – will be further explored in the analyses of the two cases as issues a city and festival have to relate to. Thus a festival can be instrumental in building the identity of a city but founding a festival must, however, also entail a search for recognition as an ‘international film festival’ within the film industry and the field of international film festivals. The evolution of such film festivals has a history and institutionalized practices have been established and defined by the early film festivals (like Venice, Moscow and Cannes) as well as other regulating bodies (like FIAPF) in the film industry.

Regulation and Accreditation of Film Festivals

Film festivals are accredited as International Film Festivals by The International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF)⁵ founded in 1933. FIAPF is a global organization representing the interests of the film production communities worldwide with 26 national producers’ organizations in 23 of the world’s leading audiovisual-producing countries (FIAPF 2008:3). According to FIAPF (2008),

The FIAPF international film festivals’ accreditation system was created as a response to demands from the film industry that a Minimum Standard of quality and reliability be defined for international film festivals: one which international festival organizers must pledge to uphold and apply when they become FIAPF-accredited. (FIAPF 2008:3)

De Valck (2006) states that FIAPF ‘decided during the Berlin film festival of 1951 that the boom in national and regional film festivals had to be channelled to prevent festival (award) inflation’ (De Valck 2006:19). Cannes and Venice received immediate FIAPF accreditation (in 1951) and, Berlin followed in 1956 (Jacobsen 2000:18). According to FIAPF (2008:4) ‘*by international film festival, FIAPF, understands an event:*

- bringing together films of the world, many of which originate from countries other than the organising country, that are being screened in front of audiences including a significant number of accredited international industry, press and media representatives as well as general public,
- taking place for a limited duration of time, once a year or every second year, in a prior defined city.’

FIAPF began their accreditation and classification system with ‘Competitive Film Festivals’ like Cannes, Venice and Berlin and other early film festivals.⁶ Over the years the FIAPF classification system was expanded to include more festivals and different categories like ‘Competitive Specialised Film Festivals’ (26 festivals and among these for example Brussels International Festival of Fantastic Film); ‘Non-Competitive Film Festivals’ (6 festivals and among these for example Sydney Film Festival); and ‘Documentary and Short Film Festivals’ (5 festivals and among these for example Tampere International Short Film Festival).

In order for a film festival to apply for and to be considered for accreditation by FIAPF a festival has to comply with ‘the FIAPF Festivals’ Minimum Standard’. FIAPF describes its accreditation this way:

The accreditation delivered by FIAPF gives the producers, distributors and sales agents, the guarantee that they will commit to festivals with a true international dimension, endowed with a strong and structured organization, involving industry professionals. FIAPF regulations stipulate a framework of protection between rights holders and festivals for the presentation of screened films. For example, a maximum number of screenings, the obligation to request any additional screenings, the obligation to ask for the permission of the rights holders in case of cuts required by the censorship authorities, the right of withdrawal of the film in this case, the return of the print within 15 days after the event. [...] To guarantee an optimal level of services, accredited festivals are visited by FIAPF on a regular basis. (FIAPF 2008: 4)

FIAPF appears as a central actor and ‘authorizing agent’ (Lawrence & Suddaby 2006) concerning the field of international film festivals. Jacobsen (2000) claims, that FIAPF has had a quasi monopoly on international film festivals for many years (Jacobsen 2000:18). Following Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), FIAPF has been active in *creating institutions* via construction of the rule system and defining the boundaries of membership through accreditation and the FIAPF ‘Minimum Standard’, hereby defining the relationship between a legitimate actor and the field of international film festivals. FIAPF has also been active in the creation and specification of categories of types of film festivals, thus creating a classification system (DiMaggio 1987). In the role as the important ‘authorizing agent’ FIAPF, today has a central role in *maintaining institutions* and in keeping their definition of the international film festival circuit.

Late Adopters in the Field – Two Cities and their Film Festivals

Copenhagen and Copenhagen International Film Festival (CIFF)

The first edition of Copenhagen International Film Festival (CIFF) was launched in August 2003. However, the idea for the festival was conceived already in 2002. One of the prime drivers behind the initiative was 'HovedstadensUdviklingsråd' (The Development Council for the Wider Copenhagen Area), who in the wake of the international success for Danish film, decided to donate money for two purposes. First, they donated money (Euro 70 000) for a regional film commission for the 'Öresund region' to attract international production of film, TV and commercials to the Öresund region. Second, they donated money (Euro 70 000) to support the new CIFF and money (Euro 35 000) for the film festival for children's films ('Buster') (Dabelsteen 2002). CIFF also received money (Euro 65 000) from the Danish Film Institute (DFI) and were promised another Euro 70 000 on top of this amount of money. Apart from this financial support CIFF also received money from the municipality of Copenhagen (main contributor with Euro 500 000) and the Ministry of Culture (donating a yearly amount of Euro 150 000 for a four year period), so that the festival altogether received approximately Euro 900 000 in public subsidies. On top of this financial support CIFF was also met with moral and political support from prominent politicians in Copenhagen (Hjort 2002). With this support of the local authorities, CIFF is tacitly expected to cooperate in the branding of the city (Ooi & Strandgaard Pedersen 2010).

Right from the beginning CIFF, however, was met with some criticism. In particular, the director of the Odense Short and Documentary film festival aired some critique of the timing of CIFF, as the festival director feared that CIFF would take focus away from the Odense Short and Documentary film festival (Dabelsteen 2002). Apart from this critique other critical voices in the film industry doubted if Denmark needed yet another film festival as Copenhagen already had Gay & Lesbian Film Festival, founded in 1985, 'NatFilmfestivalen' ('The Night Film Festival') founded in 1990, 'Buster' (Children's films) founded in 2000 and CPH:DOX (on documentary films) also founded in 2003 (Eising 2004).

Nevertheless CIFF also received substantial support from various prominent stakeholders in the Danish film industry as well as industrialists and politicians (Politiken Weekly 2002). CIFF was established as a foundation and hired a festival director, Janne Giese, who had also been one of the prime drivers behind the initiative. With regard to positioning, CIFF on one hand was 'inspired by the large international film festivals like Berlin, Cannes and Venice', but on the other did not want to compete with these festivals, but instead collaborate with the existing Danish film festivals (Giese 2002).

An argument for establishing CIFF came from the Mayor for Culture in the Municipality of Copenhagen (Martin Geertsen), stating that,

When we are good at doing something, as we are in the case of filmmaking, we should not be afraid to boast and show it. The festival will create experiences and provide energy to the city and expand the international pulse already existing in Copenhagen. ... The goal is to make it the best Scandinavian film festival and a major international event. (Dabelsteen 2002)

With regard to the profile and positioning of the film festival, Henning Camre, at that time director of the Danish Film Institute, reasoned that,

‘the new Danish film festival has a chance as they have decided to focus very strongly on European film. No other film festival has done that.’(Dabelsteen 2002).

The first edition of CIFF ran August 13-20, 2003 with 10 series and more than 150 film (from Spanish Western comedies to Dutch musicals). An international jury, headed by the Greek film director Theo Angelopoulos and membering film directors Jan Troell, Jutta Brückner, Marion Hänsel and Bille August,⁷ lead a competition with 14 international films and awarding the ‘Golden Swan’ designed by Line Utzon.⁸ Apart from the focus on European films a special series on African film was shown. The festival director, Janne Giese, commented the opening this way,

‘Any major city with self respect ought to have a film festival. I cannot understand, why we have not already had one long time ago.’ (Ritzaus Bureau 2003)

In the first edition no real film market was established (Lange 2003a). On top of the public money, CIFF was also to attract private money but failed in getting a main sponsor and had to cut down on some of the activities, among other activities, the film market (FyensStiftstidende 2003). The Danish Film Institute had to come up with yet another Euro150 000 in support and guarantee in the case of a deficit (Straarup 2003a).

CIFF started out with a goal of 30 000 tickets sold, then adjusted it to 20 000 tickets, but finally ended up with only around 15-16 000 tickets sold of which approximately 5000 tickets were handed out for free. The blame for the lack of attention from audience was given to the weather. The festival director, Janne Giese, estimates that the festival lost about 10-15 000 tickets because of the heat wave in August (Lange 2003b). Concerning key figures for CIFF see table 2.

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007/2008 ⁹	2009
No. of films	153	111	117	148	no info	180
EU ratio	75%	74%	100%	93%	no info	-
Screenings	269	240	235	300	no info	-
Accredited	290	364	400	no info	no info	-
Tickets	16.688	23.814	22.571	25.273	no info	37.000

Table 2. Copenhagen International Film Festival (2003-2009)¹⁰

Table 2 shows that ticket sales increased and so did the number of screenings and accredited. After the first edition (2003), the issue of festival rescheduling came up again to avoid the criticized overlap with Odense film festival (Straarup 2003b). It was, however, not easy to agree on scheduling a new date for CIFF as

several conflicting interests were raised. The international film festival schedule leaves little room in the busy festival calendar and, the cinema theatre owners wants to fill their theatres during the low summer season, whereas CIFF wants to get away from the warm and low season (Ritzau Bureau 2003; Jensen 2003). In addition, after the first season changes occurred in the composition of the board of CIFF. Zentropa CEO Peter Aalbæk Jensen (and one of the strongest critics of CIFF) together with Nordisk Film CEO Kenneth Plummer, entered the board of CIFF in order to strengthen the relations to the Danish film industry. The head of the program was also changed (Ritzau Bureau 2004). Since 2004, Jacob Neiiendam has been in charge of the program and in 2005 he further strengthened the European profile of CIFF (Ritzau Bureau 2005). The changes of the festival were directed at pleasing the film industry, not in promoting the city image.

From very early on, and in particular articulated by Zentropa CEO Aalbæk Jensen, a merger of CIFF and Natfilmfestivalen was suggested (Bjerre 2004). CIFF organizers declare that they are positive, whereas Natfilmfestival organizers are more sceptical concerning this suggestion. Nothing happens, however, with regard to merging the two festivals and, CIFF and Natfilmfestivalen (as well as Buster and CPH:DOX) continue their business as usual. Every year the politicians bring up the suggestion about merging the two film festivals, but very little happens.

In spring 2005, CIFF, however, embarks on collaboration with Buster, in particular on the sponsoring and marketing of the two festivals (Eising 2005a). Another initiative, Copenhagen Screenings is launched in July 2005. Copenhagen Screenings is an initiative that invites 170 foreign film buyers to Copenhagen, creating a kind of local film market, however, promoting Danish films. The initiative is carried out in collaboration with The Danish Film Institute, Trust Film Sales and Nordisk Film International Sales (Enggard 2005).

From 2006, CIFF also changes its schedule and moves from August to September in the hope of attracting more festivalgoers (Eising 2005b). Festival director, Janne Giese, argues that now when CIFF is placed after Venice, Toronto and San Sebastian better quality films are likely to be given free for CIFF and other festivals (Eising 2005b). In 2006, CIFF also embarks on a new sponsor strategy and manages to attract three main sponsors (Irma, Café Noir and Nokia Nseries) together with a media partner, the daily newspaper Politiken (Solgaard 2006) and Lars Von Trier's film 'The Boss of Everything' is the opening film that year.

In Spring 2007, the collaboration between CIFF and Buster is extended in the way that CIFF takes over the responsibility for Buster and it seems in reality to be a merger between the two festivals (Thielst 2007). The 2007 edition of CIFF looks now like a grand international film festival with large posters in town, a big screen on the square in front of the city hall, a red carpet in front of the central festival theatre ('Imperial'), press, lots of films, sponsors, visiting filmmakers, local (Danish) stars, a permanent staff of around 25-30 people and around 80 volunteers. But still too few tickets are sold and too little attention attracted from the audience.

Again this year, the annual suggestion from politicians about merging the two major festivals is reiterated and that time with much more success than the previous years.

During fall 2007, it is announced that the politicians want to merge all four film festivals taking place in Copenhagen (CIFF, Natfilmfestival, Buster and CPH:DOX). After a series of meetings and negotiations, the two foundations behind the two festivals ('Natsværmerfonden' and 'Fonden Copenhagen International Film Festival') are merged into a new foundation ('Fonden de Købehavnskefilmfestivaler') responsible for the festivals from fall 2008. The four festivals are merged into three festivals – Buster (Children's films) taking place in September, CPH-DOX staying in its current position in November and, CIFF and Natfilmfestival are merged into one festival, CPH:PIX, taking place in April. Head of the Royal Danish Theatre, Michael Christiansen is appointed chairman of the new foundation. A managing director is found, former head of actors at the Royal Danish Theatre, Mikkel Harder Munck-Hansen and his job is to lead the three festivals and create a new profile for the newly merged festival. In Spring 2009, the managing director Mikkel Harder Munck-Hansen, however, resigns after critique about lack of knowledge about the film industry and, June 1, 2009, and he is replaced by a new managing director, Jørgen Ramskov, former CEO of Nimbus Film and Head of the section for Production and Development at The Danish Film Institute. On a budget of DKK 6 million (Euro 900 000) CPH:PIX opens April 16-26 2009 with 180 films and 37 000 tickets sold.

Rome and La Festa del Cinema di Roma (FCR).

The Mayor of Rome 2001-2008, Walter Veltroni provides the following statement concerning the main rationales behind FCR,

The festival is the proof that out of so many cities, Roma really is 'the cinema'. And not just because of its marvellous legacy of history and culture, or its incomparable blend of architecture and space, or harmony and time, but because it is capable of linking this tradition to projects for the future, and turning its strengths and universal appeal into economic investment.

Rome is one of most frequently mentioned cities in the film history and has been the stage of several Italian film masterpieces, among others, 'Roma città aperta' by Rossellini and 'La dolce vita' by Fellini. Nevertheless, Rome had until recently no film festival and no major events besides some premieres of movies taken in the city. But by the initiative of Walter Veltroni – who, as editor of L'Unità, made the decision of creating a film supplement of the newspaper, starting a trend in the entire Italian press – Rome filled this gap in 2006, in a wave of cultural initiatives located in the big Auditorium, owned by the local government, run by the Fondazione Musica per Roma, designed by Renzo Piano and opened for the Millennium jubilee.

The decision to launch FCR, thus, appears to be part of a wider city marketing strategy promoted by the local government and supported by Roman politicians.

In Rome, the majority of the main cultural spaces is owned by the local government and the related institutions are led by politicians directly appointed by the local government. This is also the case of the foundation Musica per Roma managing all the Auditorium events. In 2006, FCR was created as a division of the Musica per Roma running the Auditorium. The first edition of FCR, in 2006, was organized around a task force model consistent with the idea that FCR was a specific event in the agenda of Musica per Roma foundation. For the second edition, in 2007, an ad-hoc foundation, Fondazione Cinema per Roma, was created. The Fondazione Cinema per Roma has about 25 employees, almost all of them coming from the Fondazione Musica per Roma. The decision to form the ad-hoc foundation followed the success of the first edition and the confirmation of Walter Veltroni as Mayor of Rome. The foundation's logo was designed by Renzo Piano as a gift to the institution running the Auditorium. The mission of the foundation is,

to create, promote and exploit cinema and audiovisual culture in general in harmony with the needs and demands of cultural, social and economic development in the metropolitan area of Rome, the Lazio region and the whole country.

FCR was the film event Rome had never hosted in the past. However, FCR was, at the same time, the opportunity to challenge one of the major criticisms for the centre-left coalition governing Rome since 1993; namely that the periphery is neglected and all the events are concentrated in the central area of Rome. For this reason, FCR's main events were located at the Auditorium (which is outside the central area) and FCR hosted many events with the goal of bringing films and stars to the periphery. From this perspective, FCR aimed at being a popular event, addressing common people, different from star-based events such as Cannes or Venice with their rituals and glamour at *la croisette* or at the *Lido*. In the words of Goffredo Bettini, (President of the Cinema per Roma Foundation),

(the event) is designed for the public at large and quality cinema in one, the perfect forum for dialogues and exchanges between film lovers, film experts and trade professionals'.

It is also signified in the choice to take the word festival out the event name. FCR is thought of as a 'Festa' (Feast) rather than a 'Festival' in order to underline an event for the public at large rather than a competition for a prestigious award. As the latin says 'in nomen omen' (the destiny is in the name), and the label 'festival' defines an event for the film industry and a celebration of stars. Festa sounds as a popular word, looking at the participation of people and, in the mind of the founders, spreading throughout the entire city involving its inhabitants. A Festa is thought of as an event for the audience just as much as for the industry. This mission of FCR is also signified by the way the jury is composed; it consists of 50 non-professional cinema-goers, selected during the year, and guided by a well known director and different from the traditional festival jury composed by industry professionals (e.g. directors and actors).

In 2006, FCR hosted 14 films in competition, 22 premieres and 8 out of competition special events, the most important on India. FCR also hosted a business section ('The Business Street') centred on events taking place in the Via Veneto area (used by Fellini in 'La dolce vita', perhaps his most famous film abroad) and a film market ('New Cinema Network'). In order to display FCR mission to involve the whole city in the event, a special section 'Alice nellacittà' presented films and exhibitions for children in different areas of Roma. In the first edition in 2006, FCR hosted about 480 000 visitors, showed 117 films from 33 countries, sold 102 000 tickets and accredited 6837 professionals (including 2.462 journalists and 447 participants in the Business Street). More significantly for FCR mission, 78 schools and more than 16 000 children and teen-agers have been involved in the 'Alice nellacittà' events. Key figures for the FCR editions are reported in table 3.

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
No. of films	117	102	97	177	172
Nationalities	33	46	34	51	53
Screenings	650	670	615	no info	no info ¹
Accredited	6.837	7.010	7.558	7.720	8.598
Tickets	102.000	110.000	115.000	102.000	118.000

Table 3. Festa del Cinema di Roma (2006-2010)¹¹

During the Festa, up to 150 people are mobilized. The strategy to involve people for the Festa days followed the idea of involving the population of Rome. Most of these people are volunteers contacted through the 3 Universities in Rome and through non-profit organizations. In this way, the aim of the foundation, to gather highly motivated, film-loving people, is maintained. As said by an interviewee,

The foundation is managed like a family. Though the Festa requires high professionalism, everything is in the hand of very young people. This is quite a unique case in Italy.

The budget is funded 50% by private investors (primarily banks) and 50% by public institutions, especially the local government of Rome, the Province, Lazio Region and the local Chamber of Commerce. This funding structure makes FCR highly dependent on the political balances in Rome. It is perceived a potential weakness of FCR that it is not yet fully institutionalized to survive in case of deep political turmoil at the level of government. This is further accentuated by the fact that FCR has been highly criticized for not being needed for city marketing and for not solving any problem of the periphery.

Timing of the event was also a highly debated issue concerning FCR. Timing reflected the strategic positioning of FCR as a third major film festival in Italy. The issue was raised by Venice in 2006 and by Turin in 2007 (chaired by the internationally acclaimed Italian film director Nanni Moretti). The choice of mid-October was implicitly signalling a competition with Venice, traditionally scheduled at the end of August. However, the reason behind the mid-October choice was again related to city marketing. Due to the warm temperatures in early fall, October is one of the months with the highest number of tourists in Rome. At the

same time, Rome is full time working – schools are open and university courses have started – and FCR takes place in a city full of tourists and young students. Furthermore, in terms of time, October is far enough away from the other major European film events (Berlin in February and Cannes in May). Thus, FCR is able to host most important commercial premieres pushing for media coverage.

From a strategic positioning perspective, FCR has not complied with all features characterizing the grand film festivals accredited by FIAPF. First, FCR is, unlike Venice and Cannes not a ‘competitive film festival’ as defined by FIAPF, since competition is not the main issue of the event. The award (called Marco Aurelio) is not the focus of FCR, which gains attention from the premieres, important guests and city-based events. This is also reflected by the choice of a non-professional jury mentioned previously.

Second, people involved in the selection of films for FCR are not working in exclusivity. Many of them have experiences from working at other festivals (especially Locarno and specific sections of Venice). This implies a kind of cross-fertilization among festivals even though organizing a film event is considered by one of our interviewees a ‘standardized enterprise’. FCR benefits from cross-fertilization due to its implicitly hybrid nature: a Festa and not a Festival, low relevance of competition, high relevance of commercial premieres and prestigious guests.

Finally, after several editions, FCR organization is still ‘under construction’. The first edition was organized around a task force model consistent with the idea that FCR was a specific event in the agenda of Musica per Roma Foundation. For the second edition, an ad-hoc foundation was set up to plan and execute the festival, as mentioned above. In both cases, the single sections of the Festa (premiere, competition, special events, Alice nelle città) enjoyed high managerial and organizational autonomy. This is also encouraged by the role played by the President, whose political exposure (as a member of the Senate and among the leaders of the new Democratic Party) did not allow him to have any operational involvement. So managers could settle their own practices in line with their previous festival experiences and the demands of the industry.

After the general election taking place in April 2008, the institutional environment of FCR changed dramatically. During the electoral campaign, the right-wing candidate to be the Mayor of Rome, Gianni Alemanno, strongly criticized FCR and suggested a severe fund reduction and threatened to cancel the event. When elected, his position got softer and funds and support were granted to FCR. However, the team of founders resigned and the newly appointed chairman, Gianluigi Rondi – a well known movie critique with a long lasting experience in the field – presented a festival focusing more on the domestic products and less on the US star system. The overall size of the event is not changing – a slight decrease in the number of films and visitors has been balanced by an increase in media coverage while the budget did not reach the 2007 level. As for the immediate future, dark

clouds still remain on FCR, once again raising the issue of time-competition with Venice. At the same time, the film festival in Turin, headed by Moretti, has gained visibility by directing attention to US films, exemplified by presenting, as the main event in 2008, the 'premiere' in Italy of 'W', the controversial movie by Oliver Stone on former US president George W. Bush. In spite of this, FCR has survived the critiques, competition and political issues surrounding the festival and keeps growing as shown in table 3.

Discussion

A comparison between the two cities and their film festivals shows some similarities as well as differences (cf. table 4). First, Rome and Copenhagen are both capitals in their respective countries but different in terms of their number of inhabitants. With 2.7 million inhabitants Rome is almost three times as big as Copenhagen with about 1.1 million inhabitants. *The size of the festivals* (measured by the number of tickets and by their budgets) is also very different (CIFF operates at around 10 per cent of the budget of FCR and less than 7 per cent of the FCR tickets) not entirely following the difference in size of their hosting cities, which is one to three. Thus, in the starting point Copenhagen and CIFF seems much less ambitious than Rome and FCR in terms of the number of resources allocated to the festival. However, measured in terms of the number of films CIFF (with 153 films) is larger than FCR (with 117 films), whereas in terms of screenings FCR (with 650 screenings) has more than twice the number of screenings as that of CIFF (with about 269 screenings) and more than twenty times the number of accredited (FCR 6.837 and CIFF 290 accredited).

The two festivals are, however, also comparable on other dimensions, showing similar traits (cf. table 4). Both festivals are categorized as *international film festivals (IFFs)* and they have been launched for rather similar reasons and in tight connection with the development projects of the *two capital cities*. Interestingly, the two cities have relevance and exposure vis-à-vis the film industry. Danish filmmakers are experiencing an unprecedented success in the film industry and Rome is still the core of the Italian film industry and a shooting location for European and US films. Both film festivals are *publicly subsidized* and about 50 per cent of their budgets consist of public money.

As late adopters in the field, *the strategies for gaining legitimacy* of the two cities and their festivals can also be compared. As for the two specific features of pragmatic and moral legitimacy the two cases are effective examples of how late-comers *attract main constituencies* by appearing responsive to their interests. FCR was launched as a response to claims of the periphery to host events formerly concentrated in the central area of the city. CIFF was an attempt to link city marketing with the increasing success of Danish film industry. In both cases, the main constituencies – the local administration, authorities, tourism bodies and film in-

dustry associations – are involved in the creation of CIFF and FCR. The extent to which the interests of the main constituencies are actually pursued and realized may later become the main argument *against* the legitimization of the festivals depending on how these interests are pursued and played out in the longer run.

	CIFF	FCR
City population:	CPH: 1.1 million	Rome: 2.7 million
Status in the field:	Late adopter	Late adopter
Date of foundation:	2003	2006
Size of festival:¹²		
<i>Budget:</i>	1 million Euro	12,6 million Euro
<i>No. of Films:</i>	153 films	117 films
<i>No. of Screenings:</i>	269 screenings	650 screenings
<i>No. of Tickets:</i>	16.688 tickets	102.000 tickets
<i>No. of Accredited:</i>	290 accredited	6.837 accredited
Public subsidies:	appr. 50 per cent	appr. 50 per cent
Inst. entrepreneurs:	Public authorities	Public authorities
Main motive:	City branding	City branding
Identity:	IFF ('European film')	IFF ('Festa')
Significant others:	A-film festivals and 'local competition' (Natfilmfestival/Odense)	A-film festivals and 'local competition' (Venice/Turin)
Strategy for legitimacy:	City marketing-Danish film success	Rome-periphery
Main constituencies:	Politicians, municipal administration, business and trade organizations, film industry associations	Politicians, inhabitants of Rome, universities and non-profit organizations

Table 4: Comparison of the cases

Interestingly, constituencies are profiled differently in the two cases. For FCR, constituencies are the local administration, local universities and non-profit organizations that take part in the festival by providing human resources and logistic support. In the FCR case, the final constituencies are the inhabitants of Rome, who are asked to be part of the 'Festa' and are less directed towards the film industry. For CIFF, the main constituencies are the politicians and municipal administration, business and trade organizations together with some parts of the Danish film industry. In this sense, Copenhagen was seen as in need of an international film festival to provide Copenhagen as a city and Danish film with visibility and a

market for ideas and exchanges among international filmmakers in the field and as less of an audience event.

From the moral legitimacy perspective, Rome and FCR has tried to attract as many visitors as possible in order to enter very quickly into the picture of the main events in Rome. A similar strategy has been pursued by Copenhagen and CIFF in relation to the existing specialized festivals in Copenhagen. Interestingly, what the two latecomer festivals did was on the one side to build an identity positioning themselves in relation to existing festivals. On the other side, they tried to gain wide media coverage in order to quickly gain taken-for-granted status. Even though criticism was raised on the necessity of the festivals no one really dared to put their existence at stake as they were already part of the city landscape. This is at the core of taken-for-grantedness, accomplished by size and promotion, in the FCR case, and by the involvement of various important stakeholders in relation to the film industry, in the CIFF case. The most recent outcome for CIFF, after pressure from the filmmakers in the film field to reduce the number of film festivals in Copenhagen, has been the merger (effective by 2008-2009) between existing film festivals (CIFF, Natfilmfestival, CPH:DOX and Buster) to remove some of the timing issues affecting the first editions. In the FCR case, the outcome of taken-for-grantedness is not yet entirely established. During the recent campaign for the new Mayor of Rome – and after Veltroni ran for president in Italy but lost to Berlusconi – the relevance of FCR and its original purpose has been posed. What seems to be at stake is FCR's original local purpose versus its international relevance in order to secure its survival.

In both cases, we argue that being latecomers has shaped the strategy for legitimacy of the two cities and their festivals. First, the issue of timing has played a major role in the definition of the festival. The way they have been positioned within the overall EU film industry and IFF circuit has been an important object of reflection in the festivals' start-up. Second, the identity building process has been central since the latecomers need to enter the field with a well-defined identity and communication strategy. CIFF and FCR needed this well-defined identity and communication strategy in order to gain legitimacy within the international film festival field and criticism from potentially competing festivals. These challenges, and the related responses to field pressures, we would argue, are distinct for late adopters, supporting our theoretical argument of a distinction between early adopters and late adopters in their strategies for legitimacy.

The case studies of the two film festivals in Copenhagen and Rome also allowed us to investigate how the different forms of institutional work associated with creating and maintaining institutions are undertaken by the several actors – i.e. public administration, local government, private investors, and other constituencies – involved in the festivals. Interestingly, being latecomers seems to create similarities also in the institutional work undertaken by festivals in order to establish themselves in the field. Being latecomers in an institutionalized field both

festivals benefited from the existence of pre-defined models for IFFs, which meant that the two festivals could be founded and constructed within a fairly short time span. The challenge, however, for this type of designed and top-down driven festival – created by politicians, local authorities and tourism bodies – seems to be to anchor and root the film festival in the wider public – in order to be perceived as a legitimate player if not a taken for granted institution.

Concluding Remarks

Studying the cities of Copenhagen and Rome we asked why the public authorities of these cities establish their own film festivals in an already saturated field of international film festivals? The paper approached this issue by focusing on the inclusion-exclusion dilemma, that late adopters and new comers face when trying to establish themselves within an institutionalised field (e.g. Brewer 1991; Alvarez et al. 2005). On one hand they have to adapt to the existing conventions and isomorphic pressures and resemble the other organizations existing in the field, in order to be classified, recognized and accepted as a legitimate player and hereby attract resources to the organization. On the other hand they have to profile themselves and create a distinct identity within the field. We assumed a strategic action and agency perspective (DiMaggio 1988; Oliver 1991) within the institutional view of diffusion of forms and practices investigating how the festivals have been constructed by the work of the key actors involved. The kind of institutional work undertaken by the actors involved were categorized, following Lawrence and Suddaby (2006), as a) creating institutions, b) maintaining institutions and c) disrupting institutions, however with the main focus on the first two.

First, we showed that within field of international film festivals early adopters, like the festivals of Venice, Cannes and Berlin, together with other field actors, like FIAPF, seemingly have managed to define the field and invent tradition (Ranger & Hobsbawn 1983) and, create and institutionalize a model for international film festivals that appears to have become an ‘unchallenged given’ (Zucker 1983) and thus, provides a prominent example of institutional work (Lawrence & Suddaby 2006).

Second, we demonstrated that the film festivals in Copenhagen and Rome share an ambition of becoming significant players within the field of international film festivals, though they have been running just for a few years (respectively since 2003 and 2006). We saw how the film festivals in Copenhagen and Rome aimed to attract support of main constituencies by appearing as ‘responsive to their larger interests’ (Suchman 1995: 578). In both cases public authorities – city mayors, city councils, regional organizations, ministry of culture – seem to be central in relation to the founding of both festivals. The rationale of these authorities for establishing a film festival in their cities were to a large extent driven by ambitions of branding the city – ‘put it on the map’ as a cool city and attract tourists

and ‘the creative class’ (Florida 2002) – and hereby in the longer run improve the economy of the city. We also saw that both festivals are heavily subsidized by public money in spite of the fact that the two festivals operate on very different budgets. CIFF operating on a budget of approximately 1 million Euro, whereas FCR operates on a more ambitious budget of about 13 million Euro. About 50% of the budgets for the festivals come from public money. In this sense the festival management as well as the political authorities have had to be constructed providing ex post rationalizations and ad hoc justification of their existence as tools to improve city marketing and increase reputation as hosts of large media events as well as tourist inflows.

A major challenge for a film festival therefore seems to be to respond to the demands from the two major constituents – the city and the film industry. This goes back to Harbord’s point about the two discourses surrounding film festivals (Harbord 2002) as one concerned with building the identity of the city and another concerned with defining film as form. The dual challenge can be formulated in terms of how to make the film festival work for the city and how to make it work for the film industry. Furthermore the challenge is often complicated by the fact that neither the city nor the film industry has unitary positions or interests.

Third, we investigated how the two cities and their film festivals had profiled themselves in order to distinguish themselves from the existing festivals and create a distinct identity within the field. In this process it seemed critical for the two late adopting film festivals to have a clear communication and identity strategy. By creating an identity of their own, these festivals aim at gaining the status of regular events within the city cultural landscape. From a legitimacy perspective, this means to become an unchallenged given that is literally unthinkable to be otherwise (Zucker 1983). Here the issue of festival scheduling in both cases turned out to be very important. Huge and protracted debates and controversies took place before dates for the festivals were negotiated and decided. Much of this discussion was of a strategic nature, related to and directed towards other festivals, local as well as international, which thus could be identified as their ‘significant others’ – role models and prime competitors. In both cases the festivals were concerned about the so-called A-film festivals (Berlin, Cannes, Venice, Toronto etc.) and tried to place their festival away from them. In the case of FCR, ‘local competition’ with Venice was clearly a special concern. In the case of CIFF ‘local competition’ was also relevant, but a bit more complex as the city of Copenhagen already had three other film festivals (‘NatFilmsfestival’, ‘Buster’, ‘CPH:DOX’) and furthermore some other Danish film festivals to attend to (notably the Odense film festival where CIFF had a controversy over the dates).

It takes time to build an international film festival. Both FCR and CIFF are still in the process of positioning themselves, shaping their profile and, reconfiguring their festivals. Doing so we have focused on some specific features of legitimacy that we find are significant in the case of new international film festivals. Follow-

ing Tolbert and Zucker (1983) that the rationale behind the adoption of certain practices is different in the cases of late and early adopters, we have focussed our study on late adopters. Combining their work with the concept of ‘institutional work’ by Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) and forms of legitimacy by Suchman (1995), we find that *timing of adoption play a major role concerning legitimacy strategy and the forms of institutional work to be undertaken*. The two case studies of film festivals support the argument that analyses on the diffusion of practices and institutionalization should include time as a major descriptive factor.

Acknowledgements

Several colleagues have commented on previous versions of this paper. We would like to thank Eva Boxenbaum, Tor Hernes, Andy Pratt and the participants at the Harvard-MIT ‘Economic Sociology Seminar Series’ as well as participants at the Creative Encounters conference on ‘Government Encounters’, for their insightful ideas and suggestions for improving the paper.

Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen is professor in Organization Theory and Director of ‘*imagine..*’, Creative Industries Research Centre at CBS. Research interests include: processes of identity creation and legitimacy, strategies for organizing and managing creative enterprises, organization and transformation in the film and media field and international film festivals as field configuring events. His research has appeared in books, refereed international journals and in edited volumes. Email contact: js.ioa@cbs.dk

Carmelo Mazza is affiliated with IE Business School in Madrid, teaching Organizational Behavior and Organization Theory. He has previously been employed at CBS and Grenoble Ecole de Management. Research interests focus on processes of institutionalization and transformation in the film and media field, Haute Cuisine, MBA and educational institutions. His research has been published in international journals as well as in edited volumes. E-mail: cmazza@profesor.ie.edu.

Notes

- ¹ Figures from 2007 has not been obtainable as the festival was reorganized 2007-2008.
- ² When we in the following use the concept film festivals we base our definition and data on The International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF) 2008.
- ³ This list is based on film festivals accredited by FIAPF (2008). This means, for example, that The Edinburgh International Film Festival in Scotland, established in 1947 and one of the

longest continually running film festival in the world is not included as it is not accredited by FIAPF.

⁴ The first North American film festival is claimed to be the Columbus International Film & Video Festival, also known as 'The Chris Awards', held in 1953. The Chris Awards was followed shortly thereafter by the San Francisco International Film Festival held in March 1957 whose emphasis was on feature-length dramatic films, but neither are accredited by FIAPF.

⁵ <http://www.fiapf.org>.

⁶ In their 2008 catalogue of accredited international feature film festivals FIAPF lists the following 12 film festivals in the category of 'Competitive Film Festivals': Berlin International Film Festival; Mar del Plata International Film Festival; Cannes Film Festival; Shanghai International Film Festival; Moscow International Film Festival; Karlovy Vary International Film Festival; Locarno International Film Festival; Montreal World Film Festival; Venice International Film Festival; Donostia San Sebastian International Film Festival; Tokyo International Film Festival, and Cairo International Film Festival (FIAPF, 2008).

⁷ Bille August had to cancel last minute and was substituted by Danish film director Ole Roos.

⁸ Apart from the 'Golden Swan', a Lifetime Achievement Award was handed out to LivUllmann, and two Honorary awards to Theo Angelopoulos and Lars Von Trier.

⁹ Figures from 2007 and 2008 has not been obtainable as the festival was reorganized 2007-2008. Figures for 2009 is for the new festival CPH:PIX a merger between CIFF and Natilmfestivalen.

¹⁰ Source: CIFF website.

¹¹ Source: FCR website.

¹² Festival figures are from their opening year.

Reference

- Alvarez, Jose L., Carmelo Mazza, Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen & Silviya Svejenova (2005): "Shielding Idiosyncrasy from Isomorphic Pressures: Towards Optimal Distinctiveness in European Filmmaking", *Organization*, 12, 863–888.
- Anand, Narasimhan & Mary R. Watson (2004): "Tournament Rituals in the Evolution of Fields: The Case of the Grammy Awards", *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 59–80.
- Bjerre, Michael (2004): "Festival omfavner kritiker", [Festival embraces critic]. *Berlingske Tidende*, 28 January 2004, 4.
- Blum, Daniel (1953): *A Pictorial History of the Silent Screen*, London: Spring Books, Westbook House.
- Boxenbaum, Eva & Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (2009): "Scandinavian Institutionalism – a Case of Institutional Work". Thomas B. Lawrence, Roy Suddaby, & Bernard Leca, (eds), *Institutional Work: Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies of Organizations ('the work')*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 178–204.
- Boxenbaum, Eva, and Julie Battilana (2005): "Importation as Innovation: Transposing Managerial Practices Across Fields". *Strategic Organization*, 3:4, 355–383.
- Brewer, Marilyn B. (1991): "The Social Self: On Being the Same and Different at the Same Time", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17:5, 475–482.
- Caves, Richard E. (2000): *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cousins, Mark (2004): *The Story of Film*. Pavilion Books. London.
- Dabelsteen, Per (2002): "Ballade omfilmfestival", [Trouble concerning film festival]. *Politiken*, 17 December 2002, 3.

- Dayan, Daniel (2000): "Looking for Sundance. The Social Construction of a Film Festival", Ib-Bondebjerg (ed.): *Moving Images, Culture and the Mind*, University of Luton Press.
- Czarniawska, Barbara, Guje Sevòn, Steve R. Clegg & Ralph E. Stablein (eds) (2005): *Global Ideas: How Ideas, Objects and Practices Travel in the Global Economy*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Davis, Gerald, Kristina A. Diekmann & Catherine H. Tinsley (1994): "The Decline and Fall of the Conglomerate Firm in the 1980s: the De-institutionalization of an Organizational Form". *American Sociological Review*, 59: 547–570.
- De Valck, Marijke. (2006): *Film Festivals: History and Theory of a European Phenomenon That Became a Global Network*. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. University of Amsterdam.
- DiMaggio, Paul (1987): "Classification in Art". *American Sociological Review*, 52 (4): 440–455.
- (1988): "Interest and Agency in Institutional Theory". Lynne G. Zucker (ed.): *Institutional Patterns and Organizations; Culture and Environment*, 3-21, Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. & Walter W. Powell (1983): "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields", *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147–160.
- (1991): "Introduction", Walter W. Powell & Paul J. DiMaggio (eds): *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1-38.
- Dowling, John & Jeffrey Pfeffer (1975): "Organizational Legitimacy: Social Values and Organizational Behavior". *Pacific Sociological Review*, 18, 122–136.
- Eising, Jesper (2004): "Filmfestivalønsker at samarbejde", [Film festival wants to cooperate]. *BerlingskeTidende*, 1 November: 5.
- (2005a): "To danske filmfestivaler indgår nyt samarbejde", [Two Danish film festivals form new cooperation]. *BerlingskeTidende*, 28 October 2005, 4.
- (2005b): "Filmfestival flytter", [Film festival moves]. *BerlingskeTidende*, 30 November 2005, 4.
- Enggaard, Michael (2005): "Filmopkøbere inviteret til Danmark i august", [Film buyers invited to Denmark in August]. *Jyllands-Posten* 11 July 2005, 10.
- Elsaesser, Thomas (2005): *European Cinema – Face to Face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Ezra, Elisabeth (ed.) (2004): *European Cinema*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FIAPF (2008): *Accredited Festivals Directory*: www.fiapf.org,
- Fligstein, Neil (1997): "Social Skill and Institutional Theory", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40: 397–405.
- Giese, Ditte (2002): "Splidomnyfilmfestival", [Disagreement on new film festival]. *EkstraBladet*, 17 December: 23.
- Goodrick, Elisabeth & Gerald R. Salancik (1996): "Organizational Discretion in Responding to Institutional Practices: Hospitals and Cesarean Births", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 1–28.
- Florida, Richard (2002): *The Rise of The Creative Class*, Basic Books.
- Green, Sandy E. (2004): "A Rhetorical Theory of Diffusion". *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 653–669.
- Greenwood, Royston, Roy Suddaby & C. Richard Hinings (2002): "Theorizing Change: the Role of Professional Associations in the Transformation of Institutionalized Fields", *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 58–80.
- Greenwood, Royston, Christine Oliver, Kerstin Sahlin & Roy Suddaby (2008): "Introduction", Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Kerstin Sahlin & Roy Suddaby (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1–46.
- Griffith, Richard & Arthur Mayer (1957): *The Movies*, London: Spring Books
- Harbord, Janet (2002): *Film Cultures*, London: Sage Publications.
- Hjort, Anders (2002): "Har du hørt, at...". [Did you hear that ...], *Jyllands-Posten* 19 December 2002, 8.
- Hobsbawn, Eric & Terence Ranger (eds) (1983): *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Jacobsen, Wolfgang (2000): *50 Years International Filmfestspiele Berlin*, Filmmuseum Berlin-Deutsche Kinematek and Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung Beuermann GmbH, Berlin.
- Jensen, Jacob W. (2003): "Flyt så den festival", [Now move that festival], *B.T.* 21 August: 26.
- Jepperson, Ronald L. (1991): "Institutions, Institutional Effects, and Institutionalism", Walther W. Powell & Paul J. DiMaggio (eds), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 143–163.
- Lampel, Joseph & Alan D. Meyer (2008): "Guest Editors' Introduction. Field Configuring Events as Structuring Mechanisms: How Conferences, Ceremonies, and Trade Shows Constitute New Technologies, Industries, and Markets", *Journal of Management Studies*, 45:6, 1025–1035.
- Lange, Anders (2003a): "Filmfestival i pengeød", [Film festival in need of money], *Jyllands-Posten* 30 June 2003, 12.
- (2003b): "Kort snor til filmfestival", [Short leash on film festival], *Jyllands-Posten*, 27 September, 2003, 13.
- Lawrence, Thomas B. (1999): "Institutional Strategy". *Journal of Management*, 25, 161-188.
- Lawrence, Thomas B. & Roy Suddaby (2006): "Institutions and Institutional Work". Stewart R. Clegg, Cynthia Hardy, Thomas B. Lawrence & Walther R. Nord (eds) *Handbook of Organization Studies* [2. Ed]. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 215–254.
- Maguire, Steve, Cynthia Hardy & Thomas B. Lawrence (2004): "Institutional Entrepreneurship in Emerging Fields: HIV/AIDS Treatment Advocacy in Canada", *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 657–679.
- Mazdon, Lucy (2007): "Transnational 'French' Cinema: The Cannes Film Festival". *Modern and Contemporary France*, 15:1, 9–20.
- Mazza, Carmelo, Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson & Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (2005): "European Constructions of an American Model", *Journal of Management Learning* 36:4 471–491.
- Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan (1977): "Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony", *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340–363.
- Meyer, Marshall M. & Lynne G. Zucker (1988): *Permanently Failing Organizations*, Huntington Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mezias, Stephen, Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen, Ji-Hyun Kim, SilviyaSvejenova& Carmelo Mazza (2011): "Transforming Film Product Identities: The Status Effects of European Premier Film Festivals, 1996-2005", BrianMoeran& Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (eds), *The Negotiation of Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Competitive Events*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moeran, Brian & Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (2011): "Introduction", Brian Moeran& Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (eds). *The Negotiation of Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Competitive Events*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oliver, Christine (1991): "Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes". *Academy of Management Review*, 16, 145–179.
- Ooi, Can-Seng & Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (2010): "City Branding and Film Festivals: Re-evaluating Stakeholder's Relations", *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 6, 316–332.
- Politiken Weekly (2002): "De står bag festivalen Copenhagen International Film", [They are behind the festival Copenhagen International Film]. *Politiken Weekly*, 18 December 2002, 21.
- Rao, Hayagreeva, Calvin Morrill & Mayer N. Zald (2000): "Power Plays: Social Movements, Collective Action, and New Organizational Forms". *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 22, 237–281.
- Ritzau (2003a): "ÅbningafDanmarksførsteinternationalefilmfestival", [Opening of Denmark's first international film festival], *Ritzaus Bureau*, 13 August 2003.
- (2003b): "Biografernesigernejtil at flyttefilmfestival", [The cinemas rejects moving film festival], *Ritzau Bureau*, 18 August 2003.
- (2004): "Nyprogramchef for filmfestivalen i København", [New programme director for the film festival of Copenhagen], *Ritzau Bureau*, 23 November 2004.
- (2005): "Copenhagen International Film Festival 100 pct. Europæisk", [Copenhagen International Film Festivals 100 pct. European], *Ritzau Bureau*, 25 May 2005.
- Rüling, Charles C. & Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen (2010): "Film Festival Research From an Organizational Studies Perspective", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26:3, 318–323.

- Scott, W. Richard (1995, 2001, 2008): *Institutions and Organizations* [1st, 2nd, 3rd Ed.], London: Sage Publications.
- Scott, W. Richard, Martin Ruef, Peter J. Mendel & Carol A. Caronna (2000): *Institutional Change and Health Care Organizations. from Professional Dominance to Managed Care*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Seo, Myeong-Gu and Creed, W. E. Douglas (2002): "Institutional Contradictions, Praxis, and Institutional Change: A Dialectical Perspective", *Academy of Management Review*, 27:2, 222–247.
- Solgaard, Michael (2006): "Ny sponsorstrategi giver filmfestival flere penge" [New sponsor strategy provides film festival with more money]. *Markedsføring*, 5 September 2006.
- Straarup, Birgit (2003a): "Sponsorsvigt: Filmfestival sænker ambitionerne", [Sponsor breakdown: Film festival lowers its ambitions]. *Berlingske Tidende*, 4 August 2003, 1.
- (2003b): "Festival skal flytte tidspunkt", [Festivals moves its dates]. *Berlingske Tidende*, 5 August 2003, 2.
- Strandgaard Pedersen, Jesper & Frank Dobbin (1997): "The Social Invention of Collective Actors: One the Rise of the Organization", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 431–443.
- (2006): "In Search of Identity and Legitimation – Bridging Organizational Culture and Neoinstitutionalism", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49, 897–907.
- Strandgaard Pedersen, Jesper, Silviya Svejenova & Candace Jones (2006): "Editorial to Special Issue: Transforming Creative Industries: Strategies of and Structures Around Creative Entrepreneurs". *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15:3, 221–223.
- Strang, David & John W. Meyer (1994): "Institutional Conditions for Diffusion", W. Richard Scott and John W. Meyer (eds), *Institutional Environments and Organization: Structural Complexity and Individualism*: 100-112. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Suchman, Mark C. (1995): "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches", *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 571–610.
- Svejenova, Silviya, Carmelo Mazza & Marcel Planellas (2007): "Cooking up change in haute cuisine: Ferran Adrià as an institutional entrepreneur", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28, 539–561.
- Thielst, Gro H. (2007): "Omdiskuteret festival sluger Buster", [Debated festival swallows Buster]. *Børsen* 16 March 2007, 44.
- Tolbert, Pamela S. & Lynne G. Zucker (1983): "Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880-1935", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 22–39.
- Turan, Kenneth. (2002): *Sundance to Sarajevo – Film Festivals and the World they Made*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Ventresca, Mark C. & John W. Mohr (2002): "Archival Methods in Organization studies". Baum, J.A.C. (ed.). *The Blackwell Companion to Organizations*: London: Blackwell Publishing, 805–828.
- Westphal, James, Ranjay Gulati & Steven S. Shortell, (1997): "Customization or Conformity? An Institutional and Network Perspective on the Content and Consequences of TQM Adoption", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42: 366–394.
- Zucker, Lynne. G. (1983): "Organizations as Institutions", *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, vol. 2, 1–47, (ed.) Samuel. B. Bacharach. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.