



RELICI

“I AM NOT A MANAGER”: AN ANALYSIS ON CULTURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN BRAZILIAN FILM PRODUCTION FIRMS¹

*“EU NÃO SOU UM GERENTE”: UMA ANÁLISE SOBRE EMPREENDEDORISMO
CULTURAL EM EMPRESAS PRODUTORAS DE FILMES NO BRASIL*

Luiz Eduardo Kogut²

Fernando Antonio Prado Gimenez³

ABSTRACT

This paper analyzed the discourse of three entrepreneurs in the film industry in the city of Curitiba, Brazil, about their managerial practices. Data were explored to identify common points in their speeches that could be related to cultural entrepreneurship. In addition, the way in which the interviewees recognized or not their qualities related to management and entrepreneurship was highlighted, revealing a potential entrepreneurial identity.

Keywords: culture; cultural entrepreneurship; cinema; creative economy

RESUMO

Este artigo analisou o discurso de três empreendedores do setor cinematográfico da cidade de Curitiba, Brasil, sobre suas práticas gerenciais. Os dados foram explorados para identificar pontos comuns em suas falas que pudessem estar relacionados ao empreender cultural. Também, foi destacado como estes reconheceram ou não suas qualidades relacionadas à gestão e ao empreendedorismo, revelando uma potencial identidade empreendedora.

Palavras-chave: cultura; empreendedorismo cultural; cinema; economia criativa

¹ Recebido em 20/12/2021. Aprovado em 27/12/2021.

² Universidade Federal do Paraná. luizeduardokogut@gmail.com

³ Universidade Federal do Paraná. fapgimenez@gmail.com



RELICI

INTRODUCTION

As a new area of study, cultural entrepreneurship still presents itself as a topic under construction and with several possible interpretations and readings. Its starting point is the relative lack of entrepreneurship and management discussions within cultural studies. This is so, specially linked to understanding how culture, entrepreneurship and management intersect and possibly complement each other.

Albinsson (2017) points out the primary difference between two approaches to the reading of the term “culture” in entrepreneurship studies. One approach, that is more common in institutional economics and anthropology studies, considers culture as the aggregate produced by society, so the studies usually focus on analyzing the link between entrepreneurship and local culture. The other, which is adopted for this article, focuses on the use of culture linked to the development of the arts and related sectors. Studies within this approach can also focus on the so-called cultural industry and its production chains. The studies take place in areas such as music, theatre, cinema, tourism, and visual arts, among others.

These studies tend to be empirically based, with interviews and analysis of the trajectory of agents operating within the sector, aiming to understand how there are elements linked to entrepreneurship and management within a universe known primarily for artistic innovation. This approach aims to see how work in the cultural sphere, often marked by artistic innovation, also needs to encompass elements of entrepreneurial management to make it possible. Thus, studies may look at practices or processes present at different stages of cultural production, from the acquisition of resources to their application in cultural production and market offerings. Also, the assumption or not of a cultural entrepreneur identity may be investigated in this line of research.

Starting from views on entrepreneurship, cultural producers or artists may be seen as entrepreneurs within the most diverse perspectives. According to



RELICI

135

Schumpeter (1957), the entrepreneur would not only be the manager and creator of a business, but also the one who innovates within the presented dynamics. Thus, the artist who, in addition to managing his cultural production, also innovates artistically, has all the key characteristics to be an entrepreneur from a Schumpeterian perspective, but only those who practice artistic innovation. This view, in a way, limits the scope of the definition of cultural entrepreneurship. On the other hand, Klamer (2011) states that the cultural entrepreneur is just one who seeks, as main result, cultural production. In this perspective, the economic elements involved in this production should only be seen as means to cultural achievement, not its main objective. A similar view is espoused by Kolsteeg (2013, p. 2) asserting that “cultural entrepreneurship is found in cultural (arts) organizations that produce products or services that communicate a symbolic, cultural value”.

The understanding of cultural entrepreneur adopted for this study is of an actor in the growing appreciation of a cultural economy, acting in production to meet the new demand for goods and services of symbolic value, as cultural products are seen, and often meeting specific demands and fulfilling specific functions (ELLMIEIER, 2003). Thus, the purpose of the research was to describe how the dynamics of cultural entrepreneurship exist within the audiovisual reality of the city of Curitiba. Curitiba is the capital state of Paraná, a Brazilian Southern state that has witnessed, in the last ten years, an increase in the number of firms engaged in film production, being an appropriate locus for this kind of research (GIMENEZ & ROCHA, 2017). The focus is also on the possible assumption of a cultural entrepreneur identity revealed on how cinema producers/directors may talk about their presence in this market.



RELICI

CULTURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN THE CINEMA INDUSTRY

Cultural entrepreneurship is not a new concept. As far as the beginning of the 1980s, the term was used in the analysis of the creation of the Boston Symphony Orchestra and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston (DIMAGGIO, 1982a; 1982b). However, its widespread use would emerge only in the beginning of this century (BANKS ET AL., 2000; LOUNSBURY; GLYNN, 2001; ELLMEIER, 2003)

Hausmann and Heinze (2016) described a systematic review of articles published in regular scientific journals about cultural entrepreneurship since 1996. They noted the use of the terms cultural entrepreneurship and creative entrepreneurship with a broader meaning, informed in the creative industries in general, and entrepreneurship in the arts with a more restricted use in the field of arts. On the other hand, among many definitions, Hausmann and Heinze (2016, p. 17) published the following “cultural or creative entrepreneurship, as we see it, can be defined as a number of individual activities undertaken to discover, evaluate, and exploit a commercial business opportunity within the cultural and creative industries”.

Albinsson (2017) commented that cultural entrepreneurial studies should pay attention to four dimensions: artistic innovation, economic prosperity, social change, and institutional development. Thus, understanding the role cultural entrepreneurs play in a society has to do with investigating artistic innovative practices and its relationship to economic results, present in the assumption of an entrepreneurial identity. Also, innovative artistic practices are intertwined with social and institutional changes that may result from collective entrepreneurial actions in the cultural arena.

In this sense, Gimenez (2018) highlighted that the assumption of an entrepreneurial identity by cultural and arts producers is relevant for an appropriate process of starting a business in the cultural sector. This entrepreneurial identity is composed by a subjective dimension related to the way that artists and cultural producers express their creativity, and an intersubjective dimension that is present on



RELICI

137

the interaction with other actors that operate under a market logic that has to be understood and used by artists and other cultural actors.

A similar approach was found in a study about the entrepreneurial trajectory of two Brazilian artists – Ivaldo Bertazzo in the field of Dance and Chico Pelúcio in the Theater (Corá, 2016). In her study, the author addressed the strategies for the enterprise, the discursive construction of the enterprise value and the use of cultural practice as a resource for the enterprise. In summary, the study revealed that

such entrepreneurs have only become a reference in the artistic sectors in which they work because they are renowned artists and, above all, because they are visionaries in the construction of innovative cultural products that become differentials in the cultural and artistic market, making them a source of aesthetic inspiration and a model of management (CORÁ, 2016: 87).⁴

Patten (2016) analyzed reports from three female entrepreneurs in the creative industry and, also, came to the same conclusion. Using a qualitative approach, based on in-depth interviews, the author pointed out that the interviewees' connection does not align with the traditional discourses of entrepreneurship, although they have to balance the expression of creativity in products, experiences and services, with the business demands that involve several strategies to generate income.

There are even those that consider difficult to distinguish cultural entrepreneurship from business entrepreneurial behavior. The trajectory of Damien Hirst, the controversial English artist who is at the root of the reurbanization of East London, was used by Enhuber (2014) to illustrate the difficulties in distinguishing between the concepts of cultural and economic entrepreneur.

One field where these interactions can be seen is the cinema industry. For instance, Alvarez et al (2005) used an institutionalist perspective to develop a micro-theory of Mavericks' creative action in the field of cinema. Analyzing the case of three

⁴ Our translation.



RELICI

138

European filmmakers – Pedro Almodóvar, Nanni Moretti and Lars von Trier – the authors proposed the notion of optimal distinctiveness as a concept associated with the idea of reconciling creative and industrial interests in the field of cinema. For them, this notion involves

Three domains - roles, partnerships and organizations - in which art and business are loosely coupled. We examined how the pattern of coupling in each of these domains was conducive to protecting the director's distinctiveness from isomorphic pressures. In the domain of roles, in all three cases, we found that control was regarded as important and that role combinations (i.e. writer-director, and director-producer) and role versatility were means for safeguarding control over both art and business. In the partnership domain, a stable long-term relationship between film director and film producer was a source of committed support that overcame any opportunism and mismatch of intentionality. The forming of tandems between a director and a producer who is committed to the director's trajectory is another mechanism for the loose coupling of art and business that benefits from art-business complementarity and appeases their inherent contradictions. Finally, in the organizational domain, film production companies owned by film directors are vehicles for binding art and business to a creativity-enhancing force. (ALVAREZ et al, 2005, p. 883).

Among the studies that focused entrepreneurship and cinema, Mezias and Kuperman (2000) analyzed the emergence of the film industry in the United States between 1895 and 1929 pointing out how entrepreneurship can be viewed at a community level of populations of new ventures and changes in organizations and products. They detail the emergence of different types of ventures in the value chain (production, distribution, and exhibition) associated with different technological and organizational innovations.

Adopting almost the same time period, Jones (2001) accomplished a longitudinal analysis of the initial 25 years of the film industry in the United States.



RELICI

139

The author, through his historical analysis, suggested the emergence of two types of entrepreneurs - technology-oriented and content-oriented. These types were dominant in different periods of this trajectory and used different legitimization strategies, resources and competences. Between 1895 and 1910, entrepreneurs who had a unique trajectory in the industry used patents to obtain superior performance. In the second period, between 1910 and 1920, entrepreneurs developed market competencies and exclusive contracts with movie stars, consistent with their earlier origins in commerce and services. In summary, the study by Jones (2001) showed that legitimization strategies can restrict or facilitate the entry of new competitors in an industry. In the technological era (1895-1910), a regulatory legitimacy through patents and patent infringement lawsuits inhibited the entry of new competitors. On the other hand, in the content era (1910-1920), the cultural legitimization strategy, by imitating other artistic areas such as theatre, and legitimizing the industry, lowered the barriers to entry for the nascent film industry. In both moments, the skills developed were different. In the first, the focus was on skills that reduced costs, while in the second, the skills involved the ability to attract and retain talents that attracted the public, together with the verticalization of activities, with companies operating in production, distribution, and exhibition.

Coe (2000) developed the idea that film industry organizations in Vancouver, Western Canada, develop their strategies based on networks that interconnect, but that are of different scales. At the international level, executives from local companies dealt with Hollywood companies in terms of offering services, but also as potential partners on projects. Co-productions were also being developed with the UK and France. At the national level, the networks involved relationships with major Canadian companies in the sector based in Toronto and Quebec. These companies, in general, competed for and gained the largest share of the official support bodies for the Canadian film industry. Finally, at the local level, there were networks that



RELICI

140

have been developed over twenty years, with different small companies in the sector, but also with union agents and service providers to the industry. Despite having strong ties at the local level, companies faced competition from US companies that use the Vancouver region as rental spaces for their productions, inflating the overall resource market.

The recent history of the development of the New Zealand film industry was used by Bruin (2005) to illustrate what the author called multilevel entrepreneurship. To do so, the analysis was based on the experience in the Auckland region, demonstrating how the growth of this industry in that country is the result of the efforts of entrepreneurs/artists, but also of public policies and actions developed at the country and regional level.

In a study on the British film industry, Davenport (2006) questioned the presence of innovation and entrepreneurial behavior in British producers from the adoption of the project-based organization, characteristic of this sector. Based on nine interviews, the author revealed that the risk-averse behavior of these producers and the adoption of project-based production led to a conservative organizational practice based on the temporary hiring of highly specialized workers, with little possibility of repeating contracts due to uncertainties of new productions. This entails a difficulty in forming teams and sharing knowledge. Furthermore, work organization and structuring practices were maintained for decades, which demonstrated low innovation in this sector and a constant search for the capacity to reproduce solutions instead of innovations were present. Finally, dependence on external financing led to a disadvantageous relationship between producers and the US majors that dominate the world distribution market.

Yamada and Yamashita (2006) analyzed three cases of successful Japanese companies in film production and argued that the intention to innovate is preceded by a search for partners. Thus, according to the cases analyzed, the realization of an



RELICI

141

innovative intention occurred after the establishment of partnerships. This allowed the three analyzed companies to develop a sustainable competitive position based on innovative business models.

Halle (2006) commented on the production of films in Germany from the 1990s onwards and its link to a trend of transnationalization of the industry. For the case of Germany, the author pointed out aspects related to co-production, especially stimulated by the location of major subsidiaries in the country. This led to a shift from “made for Germans” films to “made in Germany” films, making it difficult to characterize this production from the point of view of a German filmography. On the other hand, the author also commented on the internationalization of the distribution of this production, as well as its increased participation in local movie theaters, due to a program of support from the European Community for the construction of new theaters, with the commitment to show films produced in Europe. Finally, about film reception, the author commented on changes in the way film production made in Germany is received by critics from other countries, illustrating this change with the case of ritual reception in England. For the author, cultural prejudices are gradually being put aside and films made in Germany start to receive less culturally biased comments.

In Brazil, Guerra and Paiva Júnior (2014) investigated the aspects that make up the private dimension of the cultural entrepreneur's action in film production. They use the concept of cultural entrepreneur presented in Banks et al. (2000) who define it as that related to the production of cultural goods and services, i. e., products whose main value is symbolic, derived from their function as bearers of meanings in images, symbols, signs and sounds. For the authors, the private dimension of entrepreneurial action in cultural production includes structures of meaning that encompass subjective, sociocultural and political aspects responsible for the construction of common meanings through which the actors articulate themselves.



RELICI

They also pointed out that individual trajectories composed of aspects of the subjectivity of the producers related to the private dimension of their lives. Overall, the results indicated “a production effort anchored in the subjectivity of the entrepreneurs, in their individual trajectories and in the relationships established with their peers” (GUERRA & PAIVA JÚNIOR, 2014, p. 69)⁵.

Previously, in another study, the authors indicated that “the action of the cultural entrepreneur is related to an effort to emancipate professional groups, improve production conditions and the absorption of resources through networking” (GUERRA & PAIVA JÚNIOR, 2011: p. 84)⁶. The same context of film production was explored by Paiva Júnior, Guerra and Almeida (2012). For them, the articulation of entrepreneurs around the development of their films constitutes a space for negotiation and tension. In this space there is a growing demand for professionalization with the “cultural entrepreneur’s commitment to the projects he develops, as well as the exercise of the production activity beyond the economic aspect, expanding to the existential level” (PAIVA JÚNIOR, GUERRA, & ALMEIDA, 2012: 68)⁷.

Another Brazilian study (Gimenez & Rocha, 2017) investigated the trajectory of two young entrepreneurs and their motivations to starting the business, and difficulties faced during the startup process. Results showed that the main motivation to start the venture was the desire to develop projects independently and the opportunity to access government incentive policies that promote Brazilian film production. Most of the difficulties were of a financial nature. In this study, Gimenez and Rocha (2017) suggested that cultural entrepreneurship is marked by the competence development in artistic, entrepreneurial, and managerial arenas. Other

⁵ Our translation

⁶ Our translation

⁷ Our translation



RELICI

recent contributions in the cultural entrepreneurship literature have stressed the dual nature of cultural enterprise creation based on an entrepreneurial mindset and acquisition of artistic tools and mastery (ESSIG, 2012; NYTCH, 2012; ENHUBER, 2014; PREECE, 2014; POLLARD; WILSON, 2014).

On a general perspective, Rauen and Rauen (2013) commented on technological evolution in the field of information and communication and its impacts on the audiovisual content production and distribution sector. For them, it is not possible to prevent the advance of the creative destruction process initiated by this technical paradigm shift. Thus, they suggest that companies operating in these sectors should seek ways to use this technology in their business activities, either directly competing with new entrants or in partnerships. Thus, an entrepreneurial behavior, based on innovation at artistic and operational levels, is demanded for the development of sustainable activities in the audiovisual sector.

In summary, there are diverse approaches to the study of entrepreneurship in film production. This diversity is related to the awareness that beyond the artistic and symbolic nature of the film as a product, those involved in the setting up and managing of film production companies cannot put aside the economic aspects of their businesses, resulting in the assumption of entrepreneurial and managerial roles. Also, previous literature has stressed the importance of market connections and the building of partnerships for starting new ventures in the field as well for sustainable development of these enterprises.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research approach of this study was a qualitative one, based on the analysis of three interviews with actors within the cinema production sector in Curitiba. The interviews were based on a semi-structured set of topics that formed the base for a conversation with the interviewees. The starting point for conducting



RELICI

144

the interviews was the historical trajectory of each founder and company, its current operations, its sources of financing and how each one dealt with financial sustainability issues. Topics ranged from their motivation for starting a film production company to their portfolio of audiovisual products released to the market. The conversation also related to difficulties in starting and managing the company since its inception and day to day management.

The interviews' content was fully transcribed and analyzed in order to find possible points of convergence with studies on cultural entrepreneurship, both from an artistic point of view as well entrepreneurial and managerial ones. The organization of the analysis was freely guided with a focus on highlighting discourse parts that were relevant for understanding the assumption of an entrepreneurial identity as well for apprehending the business startup and development dynamics. No previous analytical categories were adopted and the categories that are presented in the next section are those that emerged from various readings of the transcript interviews.

All respondents were the founders and managers of their firms with more than 10 years of experience in the field. Two were male and the other a female. They were involved with both production and distribution functions for their products. In presenting and analyzing the results of this study, pseudonyms were adopted for the respondents and their enterprises.

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

In this section, the results of the study are described and analyzed. First, a brief description of each film production company and its founder is presented. Afterwards, the main findings related to the respondents' perception of their role in the business and identity are discussed.



RELICI

Zero films

Zero Films is a production company that emerged in 1990, founded by W., who graduated in journalism, but with a great passion for cinema. Together with a friend who owned a pharmaceutical company, they started one company for the production of educational videos related to the health area. The project, despite not having good results and being discontinued, was the starting point for W. to develop his trajectory by himself. He further pursued his career working for a production film company that also produced educational videos and institutional pieces for advertising purposes. In this company he performed the most diverse functions such as script writing, production, direction, and editing.

Based on this knowledge and experience, W. was able to shoot his first short film, in 1988. In his first endeavor with fictional film, he faced a great difficulty in terms of production:

It was in 1988 that I shot it and I only finished it in 1990. I shot it on 35 mm film. The money came from an action among friends, at the time there was no government financial support.

The relationship with funding, therefore, was a major concern at the beginning of his career. As W. commented, “at that time, Embrafilme's⁸ actions for film financing in Brazil were not enough due to the country's economic instability and high inflation. Thus, for covering post-production costs, he had to look for financing elsewhere in the market, as well as friends.

It can be seen, therefore, that there was a dependence on incentives and public programs for the realization of audiovisual in the country. However, the way that W. took his own risks and financed his short film could be seen as an entrepreneurial attitude, so much so that it ended up being the first film produced by Zero Films.

⁸ Embrafilme was a state company that operated from 1969 to 1990. During this period, it was the main source for financing and distributing Brazilian films.



RELICI

146

From then on, dedicating himself exclusively to Zero films, W. narrated how his journey within it took place through the production of institutional and corporate content, a panorama that remained until the emergence of laws such as the Audiovisual Law and the Rouanet Law⁹, which facilitated film production in parallel with other activities. However, W. understood how, in a way, the firm was still dependent on these contents for its survival. This condition was still prevalent at the time of his interview. Thus, when asked what type of audiovisual content the company produced, W. answered: “I do any business”. Nevertheless, as he also commented, he had a great concern with the creation of content linked to the cultural universe:

But for some years I have been dedicating myself a lot to content production, which is cinema, television, which are more artistic, cultural, authorial works, whatever it is, other than commission work, it can be commission work, but in the cultural area.

W., then, explained how the mechanisms for the realization of these productions in the “cultural area” occur, with the Audiovisual Law and public calls being paramount, in addition to the search for sponsors, which involves going “door to door” negotiating for funds. He also pointed out how, at the time of the interview, the Audiovisual Sectorial Fund¹⁰ was very much in vogue, but he added that “the fund has a process to be followed, a very complicated thing for those who are not in the field of administration and economics”.

There is then a clear management dimension in this search for resources for his productions, but W. still encountered difficulties, even within mechanisms of exclusive audiovisual resources. These difficulties were also present when asked about the firm's financial sustainability. W. categorically stated: “I am not a manager, I

⁹ Brazilian pieces of legislation, at federal government level, that created conditions for public and private led financing for audiovisual production in Brazil. This legislation emerged after the closing of Embrafilme in 1990.

¹⁰ A financial fund managed by ANCINE, the Brazilian Agency for Cinema, that is a source of funds for production and distribution of Brazilian audiovisual products.



RELICI

147

am a guy with ideas, my business is creation". He also mentioned how he had hired an accounting firm that helped him in these activities, however, at other times during the interview, W. showed clear signs of a concern with managing his company, even when not directly managing financial issues.

Right after stating that he was not a manager, for example, W. commented on a partnership with a person who helped him in the search for sponsorship and was a partner in several Zero Films productions. At other instances, other contributors were mentioned that helped him, for example, in a web-based project. This search for collaboration and collective work is an important point for several studies on cultural entrepreneurship, especially in the film sector, as pointed out by Guerra and Paiva Júnior (2011; 2014).

W., even if he did not see himself as a manager, sought partnerships and resources that helped him, both in production and in financial matters. This was also seen, when explaining the structure of the company, he pointed out that Zero Films has a very small permanent team, counting on freelancers according to the demand of the projects.

This way of organizing the company, a structure that was also cited by the other respondents, is strongly biased towards the company's financial sustainability, with a concern with its viability and the viability of each audiovisual production. In this direction, when commenting on the distribution of the films, W. demonstrated a great knowledge about DVD sales and their profit, and about the sale of rights for open and closed television.

Eight films

Eight Films was founded in 1998, after two attempts by M. to create companies in partnership with friends. M., who graduated in Mechanical Engineering, with a postgraduate degree in computer graphics, a master's degree in technology



RELICI

148

and, at the time of the interview, was in a doctorate in communication, commented that his interest in cinema came from a desire to combine technique with art and also to have each project as something new.

Before joining societies, M. worked in environments related to his graduation, having also spent 14 years at Caixa Econômica Federal (CEF)¹¹, where he tried, without success, to “create a television”. Self-styled workaholic, he only left CEF when he felt he could support himself within the audiovisual market.

As Eight Films is specialized in animation production, M. pointed out how his interest in animation was much more an opportunity and a result of his “taking advantage of the flows”. He took an animation course when he was still in mechanical engineering college, as well as a short one after graduation. With the production company operating, M. commented on distribution models for his products. About a specific product he said:

The TV series has 3 episodes, if I manage to have 52, I can sell to the world, that means I can sell to 100 or 200 televisions companies in the world, so from the moment I can sell to the world it becomes paid.

M. commented how for this sale to materialize, he did not even need to work on the various dubs, since the animation facilitates the dubbing process, which he saw as an advantage over live action. M. then commented on how the choice for animation was “strategic” and mentioned two other reasons: the vocation of the city of Curitiba for animation in terms of job offer and “graphic capacity” and the fact that in the city “it rains a lot”, a big problem for direct action productions, but it does not affect the animation work.

In this brief explanation by M. there are strong indications of a concern that goes beyond his and the company's artistic work. Animation appears almost as a Schumpeterian productive opportunity, a productive potential to explore. When

¹¹ A Brazilian state banking organization.



RELICI

149

considering Albinsson's (2017) central points, the concern with financial prosperity is clear. However, M. pointed out that, even with the great potential of the city of Curitiba, the possible animation hub that could arise still suffers from a lack of government incentives for its development.

At various times in the interview M. criticized the lack of interest and, in general, the existing culture at the most different levels of national cultural production, forming a "bad environment", when it comes to investment allocation and cultural production in general. With a strong "political side", M. was involved in various practical aspects of audiovisual production in the state and local spheres, participating and acting in the creation of laws, associations, unions, and other collective organizations and efforts.

During the interview, several anecdotes emerged from clashes between M. and various figures with different roles within this audiovisual political universe. These were about the way of acting and the possibility of changes within the market. In one of them, for example, it took place in the context of M. suggesting that short filmmakers from all over the country make 10minute films to be sold on television in packages. The idea was rejected by the other filmmakers, but he pointed out that it was a way for "creating the conditions for their artworks to reach a wider public".

A mentality clash occurred between M., who was highly focused on content distribution, with other artists, who denied any form of possible interference in the creative process. However, M. strongly emphasized that a proposal like the one he suggested "does not deny its artistic side". Among other points of disagreement between M. and others were also the need to include technology within academic film research, change of names and bureaucratic details that involved, for example, the Audiovisual Sector Fund. Gimenez (2018) places this kind of situation, in this case among M. and other market actors, but which can also occur within the artist himself, as a central tension point of cultural entrepreneurship, i.e., how to balance



RELICI

150

the search for financial viability with artistic making. M., many times, pointed out an effort by Eight Films to change the current mentality, to modify this environment criticized by him, i.e., a search for institutional change within the sector (Albinsson, 2017).

These criticisms go beyond the purely political scope and also enter the business model of various producers. M. criticized the high individuality that exists among audiovisual companies, denying partnerships or not cooperating at the level desired by M., who pointed out that collective work is very complicated among producers from the most diverse centers. However, in his view, cooperation brings numerous mutual benefits, mainly in the financial side of the business.

These benefits clearly arise from management concerns, such as the most diverse ones pointed out by M. There is an audiovisual product in the company's portfolio, that he called "seasonal", which the company expands according to the demand for productions, with freelancers. At another point, he mentioned how Eight Films had a differential in "delivery capacity" and "great efficiency": "our first feature film was made in one year, this is a record, no one could make a feature film in one year and we did it". There is, then, a very strong organizational management capacity combined with the company's artistic activity, from the choice for the seasonal structure within it, a purely financial and logistical choice for a production model, to this search for efficiency seen as the company's differential.

Commenting on his participation in the Rio Content Market event, a group that "thinks about the market", according to M., he also added:

The question is really business, and I am more part of this team, which I think, look, I am an artist, so for me art is everything, now the question is, I decided to be an artist as a professional, I want to make a living from it, for this I say, I must sell, I must make money.

This confirms the pragmatic approach, focused on realization in practical terms, which moves M. within the company, and which always follows the company's



RELICI

151

financial viability to the letter. At another time, however, M. stated that he concluded: “I think I am a terrible businessman, but a great entrepreneur”. This is so because what moves him would be the development of new things and the challenges associated with this endeavor.

However, as observed in the examples given here, M.'s performance within Eight Films strictly follows the precepts of good administration, such as, the constant search for financial viability, and efficiency, even in small details, such as purchases made for the company's functioning. Thus, in another moment, he placed himself as “the strategist, the manager, and the operations man”. On the other hand, regarding innovation, M. was also always directly active. When commenting on the revolution brought by cell phone in the production and distribution model, he spoke about searching for “the next unimaginable thing”. His mental model, which criticizes the current way of doing business in the audiovisual sector, constantly seeking for “changing the market”, is, in itself, a way of innovating within it. This behavior and mind set is consistent with changes that were mentioned by Rauen and Rauen (2013).

Thirteen films

Thirteen Films is based on L.'s previous experience in the audiovisual market, a middle-aged woman that worked since a teenager in television, graduated in the field abroad and returned to Brazil to work at an American production company specializing in video training. While working for this company, she had the idea of starting her own business. As Brazil advanced in terms of cultural production at the beginning of the 2000s, the company emerged to work with the editing and completion of this foreign company's products, always based on video training. L. pointed out that it was only between 2008 and 2009 that there was a reformulation to bring Thirteen Films closer to productions outside institutional materials.



RELICI

152

According to L., the reformulation went through an approach with a person from the financial market, who became a partner of the company:

She joined the company, taught me how to do all the administrative part because I started very early, so I didn't have an entrepreneurial profile, I don't think I had a managerial profile.

From this financial reorganization, L. pointed out that Thirteen Films began to look for Brazilian audiovisual production. The first fruit of this work took place in 2010, in the form of a partnership with a horror film director, who had made a feature film via the incentive law but had not distributed it. L. commented as, at the time, she worked with television, she had direct contact with distributors and was interested in the area, which gave rise to the opportunity to “face distribution”, becoming the company's first commercial film in a movie theater.

Thus, Thirteen Films' career as a distributor began. In 2012, the company began negotiating with television broadcasters, providing content, as well as entering the Video on Demand market, iTunes, Google Play and, finally, Netflix. Thus, distribution has become a large part of the company's operations, arising from the recognition of the opportunity that emerged for distribution in 2010, in addition to L.'s personal trajectory.

Thirteen Films, however, led by L., aimed to increasingly participate in all production processes, including knowledge acquired from experiences within distribution, such as the partnership created in the production of horror features that, according to L., gave life to an “executive production manual for horror films”. Other projects included production of series and other feature films, aggregating the entire production chain since its inception. L. stated, however, that everything was being done calmly, and that they were in negotiation phases. As she put it, “it is working more or less like this, there is a series of productions, which we are linking together various lines of financing, various forms of financing”.

These various forms are divided between sectorial fund, private investment



RELICI

153

and television contracts, creating a financing plan for several productions in a period of about 10 years. Thirteen Films, therefore, sought high organization and long-term planning in this search for investment, which was highlighted in the interview as not involving state resources.

Still on how this production process takes place within the company, L. said: “our focus today is to take good care of development so that the distribution chain can absorb this production that we are organizing here”. It is observed, therefore, that the know-how obtained within the previous distribution activities was being used by L. She was concerned with how each production would be distributed. L. also mentioned how each of her productions was relatively cheap. Specifically talking about horror films, she pointed out that if the film’s production budget exceeds 300 or 400 thousand reais, it ceases to be profitable.

In L’s discourse, one can find a clear notion of economic prosperity (Albinsson, 2017). Each step taken by L. arose from a planning of economic viability and security within this viability, as well as issues such as the search for investments arose as her initiative, taking an active role. In another moment, when commenting on negotiations for a partnership with an American producer, she talked about how important it is to “understand the Americans’ time”, in addition to citing their actions before closing the deal, demonstrating how, even within the cultural market, an experience of negotiation and bargain was created.

In addition, L. commented on how the company sought to enter the world of games and works on innovation, associating itself with a great local brand, that has international market operation in IT businesses. But she was also working with a start-up that developed 3D glasses and related technologies that are not restricted to world of games:

we are working within game technology in two series for us, in this case the technology within the series and then here we start to marry the two things, innovation and financial result.



RELICI

L. also mentioned how there are "text innovations" that are of great importance to the company, that is, changes that are not technological but that are new practices, whether in terms of marketing or even within distribution. Mentioning the names of some well-known audiovisual professionals, she commented "that theater, literature, the basis of cinema, are innovative in themselves and we are hoping to recover a little of that".

In L.'s discourse, as well, there is a recognition of the line that links artistic innovation with entrepreneurial innovation within a company in the cultural sector with one influencing the other, and having the financial results, seen in the success cases mentioned, as paramount. L. also at every moment of the interview presented a vocabulary like that of the entrepreneurial world: cases, buyers, players, business-to-businesses, etc. As already pointed out by Martins, Tavares and Rodrigues (2016) this is a practice that brings together actors in the audiovisual market and entrepreneurship practiced in other sectors.

Analysis

The panorama created by the interviews provided a broad view of the way in which three companies focused on different markets within the audiovisual sector: productions in general, animations, series and distribution. They also provide a good overview of the way each producer does business and, especially, the way they see themselves in the market, either as artists, or as cultural entrepreneurs.

W., from Zero Films and M., from Eight Films, openly commented on not considering themselves managers or administrators, but what is found in their speech is just the opposite, a strong knowledge not only of the functionality of their companies, so much in practical terms for everyday life, as well as in terms of organization for a production, but also on the market as a whole. In W.'s speech



RELICI

155

there is knowledge about the profit obtained from the production of DVDs (and how they are distributed), the way in which funding is sought in the context of television and much specific business-related knowledge, arising from experience and dear to financial management.

M., on the other hand, demonstrates this knowledge at the most diverse levels, both in terms of politics, production, finance or content and content propagation. His discourse passes a complete mastery of the mechanisms for the realization and dissemination of products, and even takes this knowledge to other areas, constantly debating with other actors in the sector. Although, during the interview, he saw himself as having a “practical look”, practicality can very well be seen as a tool in the search for the company's financial viability and sustainability.

In turn, L., who did not comment on what her role would be within the inherent contradiction of the artist and the entrepreneur, is also constantly evoking a side more linked to management – which she believes she has learned from her partner. In the interview, for example, she presented a financing plan drawn up for 10 productions. Although L. did not present any details about the productions, she talked in detail about how the development and financing of this plan would take place. At other times, a clear vocabulary of people within the entrepreneurial environment was used by her.

Overall, the results of this study help in understanding how different dimensions of an entrepreneurial identity are amalgamated into a specific configuration. In this configuration, the cultural entrepreneurs revealed concerns with artistic innovation that is incorporated into their audiovisual productions, revealing both entrepreneurial and artistic motivations. Besides that, in this configuration, is also present a high concern with economic and financial sustainability of the business based on assuring the acquisition of needed financial resources from different sources and its productive application.



RELICI

CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to describe how the dynamics of cultural entrepreneurship operates in the context of audiovisual production companies located in the city of Curitiba. Based on three interviews with cultural entrepreneurs that have started audiovisual businesses in this city, it was possible to give evidence of the interplay among artistic, entrepreneurial and managerial concerns in the day-to-day operation of these businesses.

During the interviews, the three actors in the sector discussed points related to the structure of their companies, the search for funding and concerns about innovation and change within social scenarios and related to the artistic universe. Therefore, in the respondents' discourse, four dimensions previously discussed in the cultural entrepreneurship literature were present: artistic innovation, economic prosperity, social change and institutional development. Besides, the discourses also showed other relevant dimensions that have to be considered in cultural entrepreneurship: the possible influence of the entrepreneur's personal trajectory before starting up the business and the role of partnerships in its growth, development and success.

The study contributed to extant literature by highlighting that identity is a construct that can be paramount to better explanations of the cultural entrepreneurship processes, dynamics and success. Two of the respondents acknowledged the relevance of entrepreneurial and managerial competences to be added to artistic ones. By studying interviews like this, it is possible to analyze how this identity is recognized and to what extent management and innovation outside the artistic sphere is included within the discourse of the audiovisual sector actor. Additionally, further studies should investigate how it is possible to have direct intersections between the act of creating products related to the cultural universe and



RELICI

these elements of entrepreneurship and management.

REFERENCES

- Albinsson, S. (2017). What is so “cultural” about cultural entrepreneurship. *The Journal of the Economic & Business History Society*, 35(1), 366-390.
- Alvarez, J. L. et al (2005). Shielding idiosyncrasy from isomorphic pressures: towards optimal distinctiveness in European filmmaking. *Organization*, 12(6), 863-888.
- Banks, M. et al. (2000). Risk and trust in the cultural industries. *Geoforum*, 31(4), 453-464.
- Bruin, A. de (2005). Multi-level entrepreneurship in the creative industries. New Zealand’s screen production industry. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 6(3), 143-150.
- Coe, N. M. (2000) The view from out West: embeddedness, inter-personal relations and the development of an indigenous film industry in Vancouver. *Geoforum*, 31(4), 391-407.
- Corá, M. A. J. (2016). Empreendedores criativos: uma análise sobre o trabalho na cultura. *Revista Interdisciplinar de Gestão Social*, 5(2), 71-89.
- Davenport, J. (2006). UK film companies: project-based organizations lacking entrepreneurship and innovativeness? *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15(3), 250-256.
- Dimaggio, P. (1982a). Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: the creation of an organizational base for high culture in America. *Media, Culture and Society*, 4(1), 33-50.
- Dimaggio, P. (1982b). Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston, part II: the classification and framing of American art. *Media, Culture and Society*, 4(4), 303-322.
- Ellmeier, A. (2003). Cultural entrepreneurialism: on the changing relationship between the arts, culture and employment. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 9(1), 3-16.



RELICI

Enhuber, M. (2014). How is Damien Hirst a cultural entrepreneur? *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(2), 3-20.

Essig, L. (2012). Frameworks for educating the artist of the future: teaching habits of mind for arts entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(2), 65-77.

Gimenez, F. A. P. (2018) Empreendedor cultural: uma identidade rejeitada? *Políticas Culturais em Revista*, 11(1), 369-392.

Gimenez, F. A. P., & Rocha, D. T. da (2017). Imagística: a case of youth entrepreneurship in a small film production firm. *International Journal of Innovation*, 5(3), 349-360.

Guerra, J. R. F.; Paiva Júnior, F. G. (2011). Empreendedorismo cultural na produção cinematográfica: a ação empreendedora de realizadores de filmes pernambucanos. *Revista de Administração e Inovação*, 8(3), 78-99.

Guerra, J. R. F.; Paiva Júnior, F. G. (2014). O empreendedorismo no campo da produção cultural: analisando a dimensão privada da ação empreendedora audiovisual, *Revista Livre de Cinema*, 1(2), 55-73.

Halle, R. (2006). German film, European film: transnational production, distribution and reception. *Screen*, 47(2), 251-259.

Hausmann, A., Heinze, A. (2016). Entrepreneurship in the cultural and creative industries: insights from an emergent field. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 5(2), 7-22.

Jones, C. (2001). Co-evolution of entrepreneurial careers, institutional rules and competitive dynamics in American film, 1895-1920. *Organization Studies*, 22(6), 911-944.

Klamer, A. (2011). Cultural Entrepreneurship. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 24(2), 141-156.

Kolsteeg, J. (2013). Situated cultural entrepreneurship. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 2(1), 3-13.



RELICI

159

Lounsbury, M., Glynn, M. A. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6-7), 545-564.

Martins, M. I., Tavares, L. F., & Rodrigues, M. S. (2016). O discurso do empreendedor cultural e seus reflexos na cena alternativa da cidade de Pelotas (RS). *Políticas Culturais em Revista*, 9(1): 210-243.

Mezias, S. J., & Kuperman, J. C. (2001). The community dynamics of entrepreneurship: the birth of the American Film Industry 1895, 1929. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(3), 209-223.

Nytch, J. (2012). The case of the Pittsburgh New Music Ensemble: an illustration of entrepreneurial theory in an artistic setting. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 1(1), 25-34.

Paiva Júnior, F. G., Guerra, J. R. F., & Almeida, S. L. de (2012). A dimensão pública da ação do empreendedor cultural na produção de cinema. *Cadernos de Estudos Sociais*, 27(1), 155-170.

Patten, T. (2006). "Creative?"... "entrepreneur?" – understanding the creative industries entrepreneur. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 5(2), 23-42.

Pollard, V., & Wilson, E. (2014). The "entrepreneurial mindset" in creative and performing arts higher education in Australia. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(1), p. 3-22.

Preece, S. (2014). Social bricolage in arts entrepreneurship: building a jazz society from scratch. *Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 3(1), 23-34.

Rauen, A. T., & Rauen, C. V. (2013). Pirata ou empreendedor? – A destruição criativa na indústria de conteúdo audiovisual. *Revista Espaço Acadêmico*, 12(143), 52-59, 2013.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1957). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, Harvard University.

Yamada, J.-I., & Yamashita, M. (2006). Entrepreneurs' intentions and partnership towards innovation: evidence from the Japanese film industry. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 15(3), 2006.