

Shielding Idiosyncrasy from Isomorphic Pressures: Towards Optimal Distinctiveness in European Filmmaking

José Luis Álvarez
Instituto de Empresa

Carmelo Mazza
Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”

Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen
Copenhagen Business School

Silviya Svejnova
Department of Business Policy
ESADE. Universitat Ramon Llull

Received: June, 2005

Abstract

This paper advances a micro theory of creative action by examining how distinctive artists shield their idiosyncratic styles from the isomorphic pressures of a field. It draws on the cases of three internationally recognized, distinctive European film directors –Pedro Almodóvar (Spain), Nanni Moretti (Italy) and Lars von Trier (Denmark). We argue that in a cinema field, managing artistic pressures for distinctiveness versus business pressures for profits drive filmmakers’ quest for optimal distinctiveness. This quest seeks both exclusive (unique style) and inclusive (audience-appealing) artwork with legitimacy in the field. Our theory of creative action for optimal distinctiveness suggests that film directors increase their control by personally consolidating artistic and production roles, by forming close partnership with a committed producer, and by establishing their own production company. Ironically, to escape the iron cage of local cinema fields, film directors increasingly control the coupling of art and business.

Forthcoming in *Organization*, 2005, vol. 12, #6

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Mary Ann Glynn and Kjell Tryggestad for their helpful comments for improving the paper. We appreciate the comments of the anonymous reviewers of “Organization”, as well as of Candy Jones, Joe Lampel and the rest of the participants in the 2002 EGOS Colloquium’s sub-theme on Creative Industries in Barcelona, Spain. We also thank Christopher Mathieu for his editorial assistance.

José Luis Alvarez. <jlalvarez@profesor.ie.edu>

Carmelo Mazza. <cm.ioa@cbs.dk>

Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen. <js.ioa@cbs.dk>

Silviya Svejenova. <silviya.svejenova@esade.edu>

“[T]he unusual and paradoxical place that Pedro [Almodóvar] has been able to find: we are within the industry but we preserve our peculiarity.” (Agustín Almodóvar, 2001)

Optimal distinctiveness: “Social identity is viewed as reconciliation of opposing needs for assimilation and differentiation from others.” (Marilynn Brewer, 1991)

Introduction

New institutional theory has sought to explain why organizational actors show compliance and similarities (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991). It has argued that the establishment penalizes deviant actors making their access to resources and opportunities difficult (Becker, 1982; Baker and Faulkner, 1991; Zuckerman, 1999). Despite penalties for deviance and costs for illegitimacy, distinctive actors persist and increase the heterogeneity of a field. This paper contributes to new institutional analysis by proposing a micro theory of creative action to shield singularity from isomorphic pressures. It draws on the cases of three internationally recognized European film directors – Pedro Almodóvar (Spain), Nanni Moretti (Italy) and Lars von Trier (Denmark) – who have overcome restrictions of the status quo and penalties for not fitting into pre-established niches. Unlike classical accounts of maverick artists losing their exceptional status once the conventional field has accepted their work (Becker, 1982), the three directors sustain both idiosyncrasy and audience appeal by incessant experimentation and self-renewal, at times rebelling even against their self-imposed conventions.

This paper advances milestones of action theory for exclusivity and inclusion in creative domains. For this purpose, we bring in the social psychological notion “optimal distinctiveness” that views social identity as a reconciliation of opposing needs for assimilation and differentiation from others (Brewer, 1991). We suggest that optimal

distinctiveness is especially relevant for creative industries where artists need both inclusion to obtain resources and differentiation to attain recognition for their talents. In the quest for optimal distinctiveness, we argue, film directors not only break away from the iron cage of a field's conventions. As our study revealed, they also tend to control the coupling of art and business through an own production hub, close partnership with a committed producer, and/or personally consolidating creative and production roles.

The paper proceeds as follows. *First*, it reviews core concepts of isomorphism and maverickness to ground theoretically the need for creative action in shielding idiosyncrasy from isomorphic pressures. *Second*, it positions the idiosyncrasy-isomorphism duality in the context of a creative industry – i.e. cinema - that is particular for the need to appease art and business. *Third*, it outlines the research design, data sources and methods for data analysis and provides brief introductions to the cases. *Fourth*, it compares the three cases to advance a micro theory of creative action. *Finally*, we make some concluding remarks on the importance of creative action in isomorphic fields.

Isomorphism and Idiosyncrasy in a Field

Film projects are complex temporary systems that pull together cultural, financial and material inputs (Faulkner and Anderson, 1987; DeFillippi and Arthur, 1998). Compliant, legitimate actors are more likely to gain access to these resources. Hence, “[o]ne of the filmmaker’s critical problems is to find ways to gain legitimacy” (Baker and Faulkner, 1991: 28).

The legitimization of filmmakers, and hence their access to resources and opportunities, takes place in the cinema field. Within the Institutional Theory of organizations the term field is defined as “those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product

consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services and products” (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991:143). DiMaggio and Powell’s field definition makes a reference to a range of significant actors and their relations. To a large extent, it is “coterminous with the application of a distinctive complex of institutional rules” (Scott, 1995:135), which constitute ‘coercive’, ‘normative’ and ‘mimetic’ isomorphic pressures (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991). To gain acceptance and inclusion, organisations tend to abide by those rules and conventions leading to standardisation of practices and isomorphism (Strandgaard Pedersen and Dobbin, 1997). Other institutional researchers, for example Andrew Hoffman, have pointed out that the field concept does not account for interest, power and influence. To overcome this, Hoffman proposed the following: “... The notion that an organizational field forms around a central issue – such as the protection of the natural environment – rather than a central technology or market introduces the idea that fields become centres of debates in which competing interests negotiate over issue interpretations” (Hoffman, 1999:351). Despite of these different definitions of the field concept, there is a consensus that the notion of a field is more encompassing than traditional concepts of economics, such as industry, for example. Furthermore, using a field-based model puts more emphasis on sociological variables and processes and in that way explains the rise and modus operandi of institutions.

Some of the central actors in a national cinema field would be the national Film Institute and its consultants, film schools, film producers, distributors, cinema theatre owners, film critics and so forth. A film project is one of the most important events in the field as it brings together most of the various players in a field. A cinema field experiences a range of isomorphic forces. Film making conventions, endorsed throughout formal schooling and/or with award giving, provide a normative ground for standardisation (Becker, 1982). Industry regulators and organisations in control of financial resources align producers’ practices by tying financing for creative production up with certain artistic topics and budgetary routines, leaving the

quality of artwork to the discretion of “expert” committees (Corsi, 2001). Production companies, as gatekeepers that decide whether creative innovations are “in” or “out”, have a say on the “blueprint” of what gets to the market (Hirsch, 1972). To reproduce success creative professionals then imitate the blueprint (Baker and Faulkner, 1991).

Macro-structural insights on isomorphism, however, are not necessarily sensitive to micro-explanations of institutional creation and change. Interests and agency are generative forces of change (DiMaggio, 1988; Lounsbury, 1997; Hirsch and Lounsbury, 1997; Alvarez, 2000). At least some institutions “result from successful attempts of extraordinarily creative, innovative, and productive individual actors who have the vision and genius not to accept or fine-tune existing ways of doing things but rather to consciously change the boundaries of what is possible” (Zucker and Darby, 1997: 503). Extraordinary individuals created the New York’s Museum of Modern Art (DiMaggio, 1992). Content and technology entrepreneurs at the dawn of the Hollywood cinema initiated the field “*de nouveau*” and then contributed to its change (Jones, 2001). Hence, for fields to develop, actors have to balance legitimacy needs with efforts at creating unique identities (Lounsbury and Glynn, 2001).

Extreme cases of uniqueness in a creative industry are mavericks who disobey established conventions (Becker, 1982). Maverick film directors are articulate filmmakers with an idiosyncratic approach to filmmaking, deviating from ordinary practice. Becker’s seminal work on art worlds defines maverickness in relational terms, i.e. how the person stands in relation to an organized art world (Becker, 1982: 228). Unlike work by integrated professionals whose collaborators have clear cues and expectations for action, maverick art is innovative and outside the limits of existing art worlds’ production. Hence, up-front understandings are difficult and task co-ordination is improved with long-term collaboration.

Creativity, both for mavericks and integrated professionals, is a social activity where the gifted person needs collaborative support to produce and diffuse works of art (Becker, 1982; Brass, 1995). It requires reconciliation of the expression of artistic values with the economics of mass entertainment (Lampel, Lant, and Shamsie, 2000). Academic inquiries have emphasised the critical role of a range of business activities and players (e.g., dealers, agents, production companies, distributors) as complementary to the artistic endeavour in producing and getting artwork to public (White and White, 1993; Becker, 1982; Hirsch, 1972; Caves, 2000). They have also accounted for the inherent contradiction between creative work and humdrum commerce (Caves, 2000). The creative and the business sub-systems have different interests and priorities. The former sub-system aims at expressing creative vision in a consistent way, “providing an inner standard to which reference is made” (Storr, 1985). The latter sub-system looks for delivering a box office film on time and within a budget (Baker and Faulkner, 1991: 286) and calls for legitimacy for subsequent access to finding project support.

Filmmaking as a creative undertaking needs integration (*coupling*) of business and artistic inputs embodied in entrepreneurs-administrators from the management sub-system and professionals-artists from the technical sub-system (Hirsch, 1972; Baker and Faulkner, 1991). Coupling refers to the ways entities in a system relate to each other along the dimensions of distinctiveness and responsiveness (Orton and Weick, 1990). Due to their nature, art and business call for loose coupling solutions where artistic and business sub-systems are distinctive yet responsive. Loose coupling as a pattern allows behavioural discretion and enhances experimentation and innovation (Orton and Weick, 1990), which are essential for creativity.

Research Design

Aiming at making a contribution to a micro theory of creative action we undertook a multiple case study of renowned European film

directors who are both idiosyncratic and profitable. Europe is dominated by the so-called *auteur* system originated in the late 1940's developments in Italy and further consolidated by the *Nouvelle Vague* in France and the journal *Cahiers du Cinema's* circles. Unlike producer-centred Hollywood cinema field where it is the producer who "peoples" the projects (Baker and Faulkner, 1991), the European *auteur* system pronounces the director as the core (and most powerful) figure in filmmaking.

The three cases – Pedro Almodóvar, Nanni Moretti and Lars von Trier – were approached with a preliminary theoretical framework derived from the extant literature (Yin, 1994; Brown and Eisenhardt, 1998). Theory building had affinities with grounded-theory approaches and came out of numerous iterations between the "deep cases" and the extant theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1998; Dyer and Wilkins, 1991).

Data and Methods

The study triangulated sources of evidence and methods for data collection (Yin, 1994). Data sources included interviews, company documents and visits (for the cases of Almodóvar and von Trier), press clippings and books on, and TV interviews and round tables with, the three directors, and their movies (see Table 1). Data gathering was based on established common guidelines along issues of interest related to the research question on how maverick filmmakers shield their idiosyncrasy from isomorphic pressures. Following the guidelines, the researchers conducted separate, in-depth, historical case studies for each of the three filmmakers, with the case study on Almodóvar preceding that on Moretti and von Trier.

Table 1
Data Sources

Pedro Almodóvar	Nanni Moretti	Lars von Trier
9 interviews: with his brother and producer Agustín Almodóvar and 2 other members of the production company	-	11 interviews: with his long-term business partner and producer Aalbaek Jensen and 10 other members of the production company
Company visits	-	Company visits
Company press archive	Company press archive	Company press archive
Book with interviews with Almodóvar (Strauss, 2001)	Book with interviews with Moretti (De Berardinis, 2001; Ranucci and Ughi, 2001)	Book with interviews with Von Trier and other Danish directors (Hjort and Bondebjerg, 2000)
TV programmes, colloquiums, round tables with Pedro Almodóvar's participation	TV programmes, colloquiums, round tables with Nanni Moretti's participation	TV programme, interview with Lars von Trier's partner Peter Aalbaek Jensen
Local and international press clippings, books on the film director	Local and international press clippings, books on the film director	Local and international press clippings, books on the film director

As is typical of inductive research, to advance theory out of “staggering volume of data” (Eisenhardt, 1989), the rich information gathered was integrated into detailed write-ups for each case. Then, within-case and across-case analyses were performed, following design indications for comparative qualitative research by Miles and Huberman (1994). Comparative displays were used for clarifying main points of convergence and divergence. In addition to initially specified issues of interest, we also allowed for new themes to emerge from the data.

Cases and frameworks were first independently analysed by the researchers and then discussed among them at several “interpretative meetings”. Each time a new round of iterations was initiated between theory (to enlighten and to substantiate conceptually an empirically observed pattern) and data sources (to provide missing information for further induction). Secondary information, including books and

articles from the business and film press on other film directors, artists, and gifted professionals alike, were used to refine our thinking and improve the soundness of our inferences. Theory building from cases was based on analytic generalisation, “in which previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study” (Yin, 1994: 38).

The Cases

In a recent article in *Variety*, Moretti, von Trier and Almodóvar are compared as three masters of melodrama (Rooney, 2001). The article not only calls Moretti an “idiosyncratic *auteur*” but also labels him “a maverick” who is closer to Woody Allen than to “his Italian cronies”. Furthermore, it refers to him as “the darling of *Cahiers du Cinema* critics and regular on the French art-house network”. Almodóvar is also considered a maverick filmmaker (Dale, 1997) and an *enfant terrible* of the European cinema (Smith, 1999). A *Washington Post*’s article calls von Trier the “maturing maverick of the Danish cinema”, arguing that “[i]n a Scandinavian film tradition that has lacked vivid personalities since the heyday of Ingmar Bergman, von Trier is certainly larger than life” (Winters, 1996).

Both local and international cinema communities and professional organizations find the three directors creative and innovative. For more than twenty years they have been producing movies of their liking despite homogenizing pressures of the cinema field. Such sustainable idiosyncrasy is rare and does not necessarily lead to success or acceptance in the field, or to a meaningful and coherent career path (White and White, 1993; Becker, 1982). In this sense, the three cases are critical instances (Yin, 1994) of maverick film directors who have managed to shield their idiosyncratic identities from isomorphic pressures. Table 2 provides detail on their most prestigious European and Hollywood film awards and general information on their style, projects and affiliations.

Table 2
The Three Film Directors: General information

	Pedro Almodóvar (1949-) Spain	Nanni Moretti (1953-) Italy	Lars von Trier (1956-) Denmark
Selected awards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1999 Oscar Award, Best Foreign Language Film • 1999 Cannes, Best Director • 1999 Honorary César, French Film Academy • 1999 Goya Award, Spanish Film Academy, Best Director 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2001 Cannes, Palme d’Or, Best Film • 1994 Cannes, Best Director • 1986 Berlin Golden Bear, Best Film 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2000 Cannes Palme d’Or • 1996 Cannes, Grand Jury Citation, Second Place • 1991 Cannes, Special Jury Prize, Third Place • 1984 Cannes, Prize for Technical Achievement
Affiliations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • politically sympathetic with people with progressive convictions • belongs to a social world of fashion and interior designers, artists, singers, etc. • with <i>Cahiers du Cinéma</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • politically sympathetic with the former PCI • party and currently with the centre-left coalition “L’Ulivo” • with <i>Cahiers du Cinéma</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in his earlier days, member of the Danish Youth Communist Party • initiates and sustains for a while the film movement Dogma 95 that aims to establish alternative movie making conventions
Film projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pace: 13 feature films (1980-2001) • mainly counts on own financing and on a financial co-producer • persistent relationship with a sales agent and with a distribution company for the USA – Sony Classic (previously Orion) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pace: 8 feature films (1978-2001) • moderate use of subsidies (in Italy State subsidies are widespread to sustain Italian movies) • money from TV networks (RAI and also Canal plus) • until 1986 produced by big Italian production companies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pace: 6 feature films (1984-2001) • uses local (Danish), regional (Scandinavian) and EU subsidies to finance his projects, in addition to own resources • recent distribution agreement with Nordisk Film (Denmark) and Fine Line (US)
Creative style	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short movies in the 1970s • First feature: 1980 • Narrow range of genres: mostly comedy-drama • Genre deviance • Characteristic topics and colours • Towards higher universality of issues in his last films • Films in Spanish and in Spain 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short movies in the 1970s • First feature: 1978 • Broad range of genres: comedy, drama, documentaries for TV • Genre-deviance • Characteristic topics and characters • Towards higher universality of issues in his last film • Films in Italian and in Italy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 commercials before 1984 • First feature: 1984 • Broad range of genres: dramas, musicals, TV series • Genre-deviance • Obsession with the technical aspects of film • Films in English and Danish; in Scandinavia and abroad

Almodóvar is a self-taught film director who claims “sole ownership” of his career. Critics have recognised that “with the clout to make any film he wants, he may yield more artistic freedom than any other

European director” (Gritten, 1999). His line producer since the mid-1980s affirms that “[h]e controls everything in his movies” (Fernández, 2000). Almodóvar’s films cut across genres, blending and redefining them (Thomas, 1991; Strauss, 2001). His creative style combines preparation and improvisation. A renowned Spanish cinematographer comments that “though sometimes the filming is very well prepared and the details have been worked out with almost manic precision, [Almodóvar] also improvises a lot and always incorporates new ideas” (Herdero, 1994). Furthermore, unlike the majority of film directors who film without following the script sequence to economize on resources, Almodóvar films sequentially, which gives him more control and additional freedom for changes and improvisations.

Moretti is another self-made director who started his career by using very simple technology and small budgets to become successful when still in his late twenties. He has never relied upon a single genre; he interweaves his characteristic autobiographical references in thrillers and documentaries, comedies and dramas. Though French film critics considered him an innovator within the “*commedia all’italiana*” genre, Moretti has constantly set himself apart from authors and directors in that genre tradition. He tends to present himself as an outsider, a film director who is against everything “mainstream” in the Italian cinema. His inner drive, rather than some purposefully sought audience appeal, shapes his films:

[...] I do not think of the audience when making a movie. To me, directors and producers have done most damage when they have spoken for the audience. When reading of a press conference where the director and the producers claim, “We are not interested in intellectual arguments; we just want to make movies for the people”, I am convinced it is a false statement. They are unable to make good movies and hence hide behind the argument “this is what people like”. I do not know what people like (Ranucci and Ughi, 2001: 11).

Von Trier is the Scandinavian *enfant terrible*. Unlike Almodóvar and Moretti, he has been through formal training in film directing. He is capable of continuously changing his style. As commented by his long-term partner and producer Aalbaek Jensen, “If there is a common element uniting von Trier’s different faces..., it is his genuine embracing of all points of view, his interest in expanding the boundaries of perception” (Winters, 1996). Von Trier’s maverickness is both in making alternative rules and in breaking those self-imposed rules. Initially fond of technical sophistication, in 1984 he received the Cannes Award for technical achievement. A decade later, with the *Dogma 95* manifesto,¹ he returned to technical simplicity and purity as norms, only to disobey them again not before long. Von Trier affirms, “I always do something that I’ve never done before” (Kaufman, 2000). When asked whether he likes to disrupt the system, he replies: “If you like something, you want it to develop. I’m very fond of films, and I think all the films that I really like have pushed the medium a bit. It’s as if you were in love with a woman or a man, or whatever, you want this person to develop... I would like to think I am doing this with film.” (Kaufman, 2000)

In summary, the three directors consider themselves and are perceived as *mavericks* in their local cinema fields and also in the international movie arena. They have succeeded in making a steady string of feature films with both critical and public acclaim, demonstrating rare career resilience for an industry in flux and under strong standardization pressures. Below we discuss how they paved their way towards exclusivity and inclusion.

¹ The DOGMA 95 manifesto, developed by Lars von Trier and Thomas Vinterberg, and endorsed also with the help of Kristian Levring and Søren Kragh Jacobsen, is a ‘Vow of Chastity’ of ten rules that film directors have to obey to have their films certified as ‘DOGMA’ movies. A Dogma film rejects artifice, telling a contemporary story that is shot on location with a hand-handled camera, in natural light and with location sound. The manifesto pleads for refraining from personal taste and from being an artist, and forbids optical work or genre movies.

Discussion

Scholars have argued for the need of bridging old and new institutionalism, calling for a more complex theory of action that incorporates phenomenological approaches with those that focus on socially legitimated agency (Hirsch and Lounsbury, 1997). Our analysis of the three cases in interplay with the theory revealed that optimal distinctiveness – at the boundary of agency-driven exclusivity and institutionally guaranteed inclusion – could inform possible old-new institutional bridges. Optimal distinctiveness is constantly redefined and changing – over time and with each new artwork – both with the actions of the film directors and institutional change, originating in other sources. Below we suggest some building blocks for a micro theory of action that is also sensitive to isomorphic pressures, and hence could possibly be incorporated into and push forward new institutional theory.

Art and business as two complementary forces forge the iron cage of the cinema field. Art puts pressures for exclusivity and idiosyncratic style and movies. Business lends its support to film directors who are capable of attracting audiences and generating profits. Optimally distinctive film directors are those who reconcile the need for artistic differentiation and audience appeal. Mavericks, as an extreme case of differentiation, are usually unable to get audience appeal, or if they manage to achieve that, they tend to lose their unique status (Becker, 1982). Integrated professionals, as an extreme case of assimilation, tend to give up idiosyncrasy for inclusion and legitimacy in the field, and yield rather conventional artwork. Optimal distinctiveness provides a more balanced approach to action in an isomorphic field that reconciles the need for idiosyncrasy with the need to obtain resources from the field in order to keep producing artwork.

To shield idiosyncrasy while gaining inclusion, film directors have to couple successfully art and business. Our study revealed that getting away from the iron cage of isomorphism leads, ironically, to the forging of own iron cage. Artistic freedom calls for tighter control,

with new levels of social structure emerging “from and only from efforts at control” (White, 1992: 234).

To increase control, film directors couple art and business in several domains (see Table 3). They personally consolidate artistic and production roles in filmmaking (Baker and Faulkner, 1991; Menger, 1999), becoming writer-director-producer hyphenates. They also form long-term partnerships with trusted and committed producers and establish their own production companies. Finally, within their own artistic worlds, they nurture a cultural belief system based upon artistic freedom, integrity and experimentation.

Table 3
Domains of Coupling of Art and Business

	Pedro Almodóvar	Nanni Moretti	Lars Von Trier
Consolidation of roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer-director hyphenate • Involved in other style-related aspects of movies • Initial role-versatility. Later on focused on movie making role-set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer-director-producer multi-hyphenate • Versatile role-set (production, distribution, exhibition, own film festivals, director of Venice film festival) • Cameo/his films (alter ego Michele Apicella) • Acts in friends' films 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writer-director hyphenate • Cinematographer and producer at times • Versatile role-set (TV directing and production, commercials, Dogma 95 movement)
Committed producer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agustín Almodóvar Partner in their company • Executive producer • Brother 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Angelo Barbagallo • Partner in their company • Co-producer of his movies • Friend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Aalbaek Jensen • Partner in their company • Executive producer • Friend
Own production company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • El Deseo (1985-) • Film development and production • size: about 10 people • offices, and a film studio in construction • “product mix” – mainly films of Almodóvar, rarely complemented by films of novel directors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sacher Film (1986-) • production company Sacher Film • distribution company Tandem (1997-) • cinema theatre in Rome-Trastevere Nuovo Sacher (1991-) • has his own distribution company (Tandem 1997) • short films' festival Sacher Film Festival in July (1992) • “product mix” - producing own features and many short films by young directors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zentropa (1992-) • the largest film production company in Scandinavia (76 employees permanent staff) • a multiplicity of enterprises • integrated from development to post-production • film city with studio space and equipment (rental) • training programmes for film makers and other professionals • consulting companies on creativity • more than 50 feature films produced • “product mix” low-budget Danish feature films (e.g., The Dogma Series), larger international art films of von Trier, etc.

Consolidating Artistic and Business Roles

Film directors may consolidate the role of the writer and the producer in the set of roles they perform (Baker and Faulkner, 1991). Alternatively, they may decide to focus only on the creative side, leaving the production function to an alter ego, a very committed work partner, as we will suggest below. This “resource perspective on roles” views roles as vehicles for actors who look for creative independence (Callero, 1994). The role is a resource in two ways: as a means to claim, bargain for, and gain membership and acceptance in a social community, and also as granting access to social, cultural, and material resources necessary for the pursuit of the artist’s interest (Baker and Faulkner, 1991). The essential roles in a film project are director, writer, and producer (Morley and Silver, 1977). One way of using role as a resource to protect an idiosyncratic style in film is by combining these roles (e.g., a writer-director, a director-producer). Such role combinations could be elements of an imitation strategy by film professionals in the *blockbuster era* of Hollywood (Baker and Faulkner, 1991).² Alternatively, as our study revealed, they could be instrumental to shielding maverickness by increasing the film director’s control over the process and over the final output.

In addition to *role consolidation*, film directors could enlarge control and involvement through *role-versatility* (Menger, 1999). According to Menger, the creative person’s working time and earnings are divided among the creative activity itself (film directing in our case), art-related work (e.g., management tasks in artistic organisations), and non-art work (any occupation, not related directly or indirectly with film making, mainly as a source of income). Below is an account of the role consolidation and the role versatility of the three mavericks and how it is conducive to endured artistic idiosyncrasy.

² Baker and Faulkner (1991: 288, in footnote) consider *The Godfather* (1972) the first blockbuster film and delineate a *pre-blockbuster* period (1962-1972) and a *blockbuster* period (1973-1980).

Almodóvar is an “artistic hyphenate” (a phrase to denote enactment of screenwriter-director roles by a single professional) with involvement in a range of other creative aspects in his films – from set design and costumes to posters and press books. According to the press director of the Almodóvar brothers’ production company *El Deseo*, “Pedro is definitely not a businessman. He does not perform any kind of business tasks, neither is he interested in such issues.” He relies on his younger brother Agustín for the management of the company and the executive production of his films (such close director-producer partnerships are discussed below).

Almodóvar used to be a role-versatile film director at the time he had neither reputation, nor resources to arrange financing for his movies. Thus, in the 1970’s and early 1980’s he took a range of casual jobs followed by 12 years as a clerk for the Spanish telephone company, using the income to help realize his creative ideas. In this early stage, he was also involved in art-related activities, such as acting and singing in a spoof punk-rock band and writing for underground magazines. With the success of his movies, Almodóvar narrowed down his role versatility to focus on script writing and directing in search of professionalism and control in filmmaking.

Moretti (unlike Almodóvar) consolidates the production role in his role-set justifying it with the need to make high quality movies, as revealed in the quote below:

I wanted to be a producer... to react to the crisis situation of the Italian movie industry. The producer exists as an entrepreneur who wants above all to earn money. On the contrary, I am a producer who is first of all a director, that is to say a producer who likes nice movies. This is already counter-intuitive; I am producing neither to earn money, nor to make my movies earn money. Today in Italy – and I suppose in France too – the producer makes the deal before the movie is done. They get the money from money providers and at the same time, part of the

money goes in their pockets: the deal is made! The more the film is apparently international, the more the money they get, so, paradoxically, producers are not interested in the quality, the success, the future of the film (De Berardinis, 2001).

In addition to being a “multi-hyphenate” for encompassing writer-director-producer-actor in his movies, Moretti also maintains broad role versatility. Since 1988, he has given the *Golden Sacher Awards* to the best Italian movies, as a caricature to the traditional Italian movie awards and yet another manifestation of his own positioning as an outsider to the Italian cinema (De Berardinis, 2001). However, in 2001 he accepted the role as director of the prestigious mainstream and highly institutionalised *Venice Film Festival*, an involvement at odds with his attempts to set himself apart from mainstream filmmaking. On the non-art side of the role versatility set, he is currently involved in political manifestations and anti-corruption protests, overcoming his shyness and reluctance to speak in public. A distance to mass media is also expressed by Moretti (through his alter ego ‘Michele Apicella’), who, in the movie *Palombella Rossa* states ‘that the reputation of a person is definitely damaged if his name appears on a newspaper’s page’. In his first movies, he openly portrayed the rhetorical shallowness of expressions that were commonly used in the discourse of the political movements in the 1970’s. The multi-hyphenate and role-versatility is reflected in Moretti’s dream for independence and control, for example made explicit with his first movie “*Io sono un autarchico*” (“I am autarchic”).

Von Trier is a middle case between the mavericks Almodóvar and Moretti. Like them, he consolidates the roles of writer and director in his film projects. He also appears as actor (e.g., *Element of Crime*) and exercises production and cinematographer roles at times, the latter role reflecting his interest in pushing the technological frontiers of filmmaking. On the role versatility side, he directs and produces TV series and commercials. Defying the conventions of existing film

worlds, with the *Dogma 95* Manifesto he became involved in the development and endorsement of an alternative standard. In an interview, von Trier emphasises the philosophy behind the *Dogma 95* Manifesto and its rules:

“... [B]y limiting freedom in this way [by enforcing these rules], we can acquire greater freedom within the set limits.” (Hjort and Bondebjerg, 2000:229)

The success of some Dogma-based productions (e.g. Palme d’Or to *Celebration* by Vinterberg, Golden Bear to *Last Song by Mifune* by Kragh-Jacobsen and to *Italian for Beginners* by Scherfig) reveals another paradox in creative fields. In some cases strict rules and limitations rather than complete freedom or huge budgets can trigger distinctive and acclaimed artistic creations (Hjort and Bondebjerg, 2000).

The three directors use role enactment to increase control over their film projects and to obtain degrees of freedom in the pursuit of exclusivity and inclusion. Exercising and getting credit for the role of writer, director and/or producer is a way to attain inclusion in professional circles and to get the right to claim and manage certain resources. The coupling of two artistic roles (writer-director) and the addition of a production role to them (in the extreme case) bind roles that release distinctiveness.

Forming a Tandem with Committed Producer

Another mechanism for shielding idiosyncrasy is engaging in on-going collaboration with a trusted partner (Álvarez and Svejenova, 2002a; 2002b). A stable, affect- and trust-based dyad of film director and producer reconciles classical principal-agent tensions between producers and film directors (e.g., Baker and Faulkner 1991; Fama 1980) allowing the pursuit of idiosyncrasy without opportunism or futile opposition. The trusted partner gets professional (an exciting

occupation) and personal (contribution to the accomplishment of a talented artist) satisfaction.

The three directors work in intimate collaboration with a trusted partner that complements their role-set by specialising in or sharing activities more related to the business side of filmmaking. Almodóvar develops his trajectory in a symbiotic way with his brother, partner in their company, and executive producer of his movies Agustín Almodóvar (Álvarez and Svejenova, 2002a). Pedro Almodóvar wanted to start his production company “with somebody who was going to understand him intimately, from the essence, from the first idea of a film”. Agustín took “a vital decision – to abandon my career... for love of Pedro... [and] to see the happiness and coherence of the career of a gifted person.” Indispensable for his complete dedication, Agustín added, was his relationship with Pedro based on fidelity, affection, and fraternity, and ultimately his “love for Pedro.” On a more instrumental level, Pedro needed Agustín’s support to increase control over his artwork and to avoid the typical tension between art and business, exhibited in sterile opposition, mismatches of intentionality, or formal disagreement (Felipe, 1999).

The two sides of the relationship, as perceived by each sibling, are depicted in the following quotes:

“My relationship... with Pedro as a director commenced in 1972, when I arrived in Madrid. I was 16 and coming from the deep province...and I discovered a different world... Pedro knew the key people to access to the most interesting ambiances. My brother was both my guard and initiator. At that time... I was accompanying him in every place where he was showing them [his shorts on Super 8], and I have the impression that until now I keep doing the same: ... simply the friends and the places have changed, now they are much more distinguished; our appearance has also changed, we wear tuxedos, but our motivation and our

relationship is unchanged” (Agustín Almodóvar, in Strauss, 2001: 63).

“Agustín has always been my first spectator. When an idea occurs to me, the first thing I do before I develop it is to tell him about it. He is always there. Agustín... is the person who understands me best and who has always comprehended in a very profound way everything I have done.” (Pedro Almodóvar, in Strauss, 2001: 65).

Such a strong affective relationship between the two siblings not only buffers Pedro Almodóvar from the field’s isomorphic pressures. It also provides the committed support necessary for the forming and maintaining of his distinct art world.

The main partnership between Nanni Moretti and Angelo Barbagallo is based on a long-term friendship, which has remained largely unacknowledged by the press. From a legal viewpoint, Barbagallo is the sole administrator of the company, while Moretti has the general right to operate on behalf of it. Barbagallo appears in *Caro diario* in the last episode of Moretti’s tumour therapy. Asked about how he works on preparing a film and how important the collaboration with the same team is for him, Moretti responds:

“Rather than a team, we are two people – Angelo Barbagallo and me. [I]t’s a choice that, on the one hand, has enabled me to work with other directors, with whom I worked well, producing their features. On the other hand, having our own production company, and such a good partner, enabled me decide to make films unexpectedly, as happened with a film called *La Cosa*, about the end of the Communist Party in Italy. I was able to make documentaries or shorts, whatever we felt like.” (Wootten, 2001)

Distinguishing between conventional relationship with producer and relationship based on close partnership, such as the one he has with Barbagallo, Moretti explains:

“... [W]hen you have typical relationship with film producer, the film will have very clear and distinct stages – scriptwriting, pre-production, filming, post-production, editing and all the rest. Whereas in some films I have made in recent years, these stages have become much more blurred.” (Wooten, 2001)

As Moretti further acknowledges, this is only possible when one has one’s own production company (one’s own production hub as a milestone in the theory of action in creative domains is discussed below).

Lars von Trier and his partner Peter Aalbaek Jensen met at the National Film School of Denmark in the mid 1980’s, von Trier having just graduated as a director and Aalbaek Jensen near graduation as a producer (Hjort and Bondebjerg, 2000). They both were members of the Danish Communist Party’s youth section and are proud of their rebellious attitude and identity. Aalbaek Jensen described the timing of their teaming up in the following way:

“We were a good team. Lars had just ‘flopped’ with *Epidemic* and I had gone bankrupt with my first company, which had produced *Perfect World*.” (Wilhelmsen, 2000)

Von Trier and Aalbaek Jensen perform two different roles in the company. Lars von Trier is the artistic force behind the most significant movies and television shows of Zentropa, such as *The Kingdom* (1994 and 1997), *Breaking the Waves* (1996), *The Idiots* (1998) and *Dancer in the Dark* (2000). Aalbaek Jensen, unlike Agustín Almodóvar, is an equally popular and public figure in the Danish cinema, known for his outgoing style (usually pictured in Armani suits and with a huge Cohiba cigar) and provocative

comments on the film industry establishment. As producer and managing director, he provides organisational and financial support for the films. Von Trier stays away from the daily management of the company and from the board of directors, yet he benefits from Aalbaek Jensen's commitment (Darmer, Strandgaard Pedersen and Brorsen, 2003).

A stable director-producer partnership enhances the director's control over the artwork. Though ubiquitous in artistic domains, such pairings are not necessarily stable (e.g., the failed tandem of Woody Allen and Jean Doumanian, his friend and business partner for almost four decades) and require constant nurturing and mutual commitment.

Establishing One's Own Production Company

Independent producers operate as archetypal entrepreneurs, finding scripts, assembling commitments from teams of actors and production personnel, and convincing studios and investors to fund the projects (Robins, 1993). The establishment of one's own hub by principals with creative vision reveals such entrepreneurial impulses (DeFillippi and Arthur, 1999) and a need to buffer peculiar creative styles from restrictions on creativity by traditional production organizations (Álvarez and Svejenova, 2002a).

In the case of Almodóvar, it was his need to work with complete freedom that pushed him to undertake the production venture with his brother. For his first movie Almodóvar had to establish a co-operative with the support of a theatre director as his unusual style precluded support from conventional art worlds. Almodóvar registered his own hub in 1985, after five films produced by different production companies, which not only intervened in the business aspects of his movies but also in their creative conception (Strauss, 2001). As his brother and producer Agustín summarized, “[i]f from the very beginning Pedro had had a producer who had said ‘we have to favour... creativity because it is a treasure, *El Deseo* would never have

existed.” Pedro Almodóvar commented that “*El Deseo* is an idea of the two of us [Pedro and Agustín] and, as a film maker; I enjoy the freedom I give myself as a producer” (Strauss, 2001).

The company is named after the first independently produced film of Almodóvar *La ley del deseo* (“The law of desire”) and has a few cultural peculiarities. First, as Agustín Almodóvar revealed in an interview, the staffing strategy goes under the motto of finding the right job for the persons with whom the two brothers like collaborating. Hence, first the siblings are convinced of somebody’s professionalism and develop a quality relation with him or her, and next, when the financial situation of the company allows it, they bring that person onto the company’s payroll and find a job appropriate for what he or she is good at. In addition, the company operates with a “key man clause” when dealing with distributors, sales agents or financial co-producers. Such repeated personified exchange enhances the creative freedom to Pedro Almodóvar, providing better understanding of his idiosyncratic style and vision and tailor-made service and support for his movies.

Moretti has operated his own production company since 1986. It is named *Sacher Film* after the Viennese chocolate cake eulogized in his movie *Bianca*. It has produced eight movies by or with Moretti, as well as various short movies by young film directors. Moretti is not a fast filmmaker. There is always a time lag between his movies. The same is true for his production efforts –Sacher Film does not produce many movies, less than one per year. This could in part be explained by the quality sought by Moretti in film production and his inner drive in initiating new projects. Like Almodóvar, famous for reconvening and cherishing a troop of actors as his “second family” (Corliss, 1999), Moretti tends to work with the same people. The use of the same troop (including relatives like his father and old friends, similarly to Almodóvar giving roles to his late mother and to his brother-producer) is also due to Moretti’s obsession in avoiding press anticipation of the content of his movies.

Moretti and Barbagallo have also founded a distribution company, *Tandem*, a joint venture of *Sacher* (Moretti and Barbagallo) and *Mikado*, a company well known in the Italian movie industry. Moretti's strategy to vertically integrate business leads to increased control over financing, sales and distribution. His movies are events that always create high expectations among both the public and critics. As a consequence Moretti has never had problems in finding the financial resources for making his movies (it has to be acknowledged his movies remain low budget). Now, because of their high visibility and reputation, *Sacher* and *Tandem* are in such a position so as to easily secure film financing.

Lars von Trier and Peter Aalbaek Jensen founded their film company *Zentropa* in 1992. According to Aalbaek Jensen, the goal of *Zentropa* is to create an alternative to the established Danish film society (Darmer, Strandgaard Pedersen and Brorsen 2003). It produces mainly "artistic" films outside of the mainstream categories that no other production firm in the Danish film industry would undertake due to financial risks. Its distinctiveness lies also in its organisation as an umbrella for a constellation of more than forty companies encompassing a range of activities in the cinema value chain (from sales and distribution companies to post-production and animation studios). For risk diversification, a separate company is added to the constellation each time a new project is triggered. Such an approach to organising is more conducive to experimentation and innovation than integration within a single large company.

While distinctive in its approach to projects and organization, *Zentropa* has managed to develop good relationships with organizations and institutions that provide financial resources to film projects. It relies on subsidies as well as on independent investors. Between 1992 to 1997, *Zentropa* received more than 13 million euro in subsidies from the *Danish Film Institute* (DFI), and still continues to receive support from it though, paradoxically, it openly sets itself apart from DFI. *Zentropa* has also attracted direct subsidies or interest

free loans from Scandinavian and EU media supporting programmes. Another source of financing is the production of commercials and TV series. Furthermore, *Zentropa* has just concluded an agreement with the competitor *Nordisk Film* on distribution and partial financing of a number of films (Dabelsteen, 2001).

Zentropa Productions has a permanent staff of 76 employees of which some are interns. The internship system is a 3-year programme where students start as receptionists and are then allowed to work, for example, in Peter Aalbaek Jensen's office, or in the many different departments, such as sales or post-production. They are urged to leave *Zentropa* after the third year to try something different, but they are welcome to return.

While both staff and management at *Zentropa* argue they are an unorganized company, there is a clear project-based integration of the functional departments (e.g., finance, law, production, post-production, sales and marketing). Usually, a person from each department has overall responsibility for a film project. Finance, sales and law can also work for external parties as well as have a more strategic, coordinating role for the *Zentropa* group. This means that *Zentropa* is not only able to produce and sell films. It could also offer services from ideas to market to other film companies.

Having one's own production company means being able to bundle and manage artistic and business inputs from within, thus accentuating the director's idiosyncrasy. It is also an inclusion mechanism because production companies as formally registered entities are recognized as legitimate players in the field and are entitled to get bank loans or subsidies, and to negotiate and sign binding contracts with other players in the field. Hence, production companies become a vehicle for both exclusivity and inclusion of the creative players.

The cases we examined illustrate only one possible strategy for creating and protecting a creative space, that of the maverick directors

who achieve the necessary coupling of art and business through roles, own company and trusted alter. These coupling mechanisms are necessary but insufficient conditions for optimal distinctiveness in a creative field. What is also necessary is unique talent. It is only when talent and coupling mechanisms are bound together that distinctiveness in a creative field becomes difficult to be imitated and easier to sustain. Here we are interested in identifying and defining this niche distinctiveness strategy, rather than trying to estimate its size and the inclusion/exclusion criteria in operation.

Shielding Idiosyncrasy

Our study revealed that shielding differentiation requires not only uncoupling from established systems. It calls for establishing own structures and conventions on how artwork is made and who gets included in one's art world. Role, relational and structural control mechanisms are needed to compensate for the decoupling and to maintain inclusion in the field despite of differentiation. They allow distinctive artists to get away from the iron cage of the field. Below we discuss briefly three particular manifestations of the film directors' attempts at shielding idiosyncrasy: Almodóvar's "families" and "key men", Moretti's festivals and Lars von Trier's Dogma 95 manifesto.

Pedro Almodóvar: "Families" and "Key men"

Pedro Almodóvar has succeeded in building an audience-appealing coherent body of work with distinctive features – colours, topics, and characters. According to Agustín, their own hub reveals "the unusual and paradoxical place that Pedro has been able to find: we are within the industry but we preserve our peculiarity" (Strauss, 2001: 66). He has consolidated an enduring niche position, which sets itself apart from the rest of the cinema field, yet it has been acknowledged legitimate.

Pedro works through “family” groups, his nuclei of trust and affection (Álvarez and Svejenova, 2002a). The collaboration of his biological family (most significantly his brother) is extended to accommodate his “second family” – the team of El Deseo (Francia, 2000: 33). He also nurtures his “family” of actors with nearly a dozen actors who have appeared in three or more films (Corliss, 1999). The Almodóvar brothers further forge the “iron cage” by choosing main partners through a “key-man clause.” As Agustín explains it, whenever they have to deal with a particular company, be it for distribution or promotion, they do so through a specific person, whose departure from that company means the end of the contractual relation between El Deseo and that company. This is a very strong restriction that may lead to a loss of a client. However, it not only guarantees a differential service beyond what an ordinary firm would get. It also provides enforcement of “Pedro’s way”. Through this enforcement it secures sustainability and perpetuation of his distinctiveness. A reason for Almodóvar’s reluctance to film in Hollywood is precisely the need to abandon his own controlled and committed environment and to abide by alien norms and rules that would inevitably restrict his creative freedom.

Almodóvar does not deliberately aim at establishing a parallel standard to be followed by others. However, by attaining a peculiar creative style that becomes identifiable as a label, he becomes a role model, followed in a mimetic way by new generations of filmmakers. This mimetic isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell, 1991) enlarges the influence of his creative style in the field.

Nanni Moretti: Film Festivals

Moretti’s approach to defining a niche and own standard resembles a normative influence exercised by a professional community on its members. Moretti’s “normative” influence is revealed in the awards and the festival as myths and rituals of conformity (Meyer and Rowan,

1977). The film festivals he organises and runs can be seen as occasions of niche by selecting participants and awarding output with certain features. Moretti's short film festival is a very peculiar forum as its jury consists of only two people – Moretti and his producer and friend, Barbagallo.

The same originality regards the “Golden Sacher,” awarded by the same jury under the same premises. As it is stated in the award's ironic rules, a “Golden Sacher” will not be given to directors whom Moretti dislikes. Young directors, sometimes after a fair commercial success, have won the “Golden Sacher”. The awards given by Moretti and Barbagallo seem to be an attempt at setting a kind of “parallel cinema field”, or a fully-fledged maverick niche within the establishment. It would be interesting to further trace how Nanni Moretti's chairing the 2001 Jury of the Venice Film Festival, the most important and mainstream festival in Italy, reconciles with his drive for endorsing an alternative standard to the Italian cinema establishment.

Lars von Trier: Dogma 95 Filmmaking Conventions

From the three directors, von Trier is the one who most explicitly attempts to consolidate own conventions through the *Dogma 95* manifesto, which he developed together with his three ‘Dogma-brothers’ (See Note 1). *Dogma 95* breaks with filmmaking conventions, advancing stringent rules against artificial inputs in shooting, lighting, sound, plot, and prohibiting any aesthetic claim to the film director, who in addition must not be credited for his work (Hjort and Bondebjerg, 2000; Darmer, Strandgaard Pedersen and Brorsen, 2003). Twenty-five films from more than ten countries (USA, Denmark, Norway, Spain, France, Italy, Korea, Sweden, Belgium, Switzerland, etc.) have been certified and are credited in the official Dogma 95 website. Von Trier attempt at setting a standard

with *Dogma 95* could be seen as rather coercive and normative effort to standardise part of the cinema field.

In all three cases, the directors form a shield – i.e. forge an iron cage – for their idiosyncrasy. In the case of Almodóvar, it is a tightly knit art world of collaborators that perpetuate his style and artistic identity. In the case of Moretti, it is the attempt to “institutionalise” his vision of the cinema by award giving. Finally, von Trier gets normative in the artistic space, explicitly defining rules by which other filmmakers should abide.

Concluding Remarks

In this paper we addressed a less studied yet increasingly important duality between idiosyncrasy and isomorphism. We showed how creative action is intended to rebel against isomorphic pressure by building uniqueness through strong ties and local practice.

Coming from the field periphery mavericks initiate and promote institutional changes (Powell, 1991; Scott et al., 2000). These changes can become influential, as creative fields are relatively open to cross-fertilization of ideas, techniques and styles coming from different artist. For example, painters, photographers, musicians or engineers influence the style and work of film directors. Over time, style innovations coming from the periphery tend to become institutionalized (Jones, 2001). Unlike the institutionalization of creative styles, the institutionalization of distinctive business practices in creative industries is more controversial. It can be argued that business models are not necessarily moving from the field periphery to the centre. While artistic mavericks can be an example for other (potential) mavericks in shaping and sustaining their idiosyncrasy – as shown in the history of the movie industry (see, for instance, the *Nouvelle Vague* in France and independent movie making in US during the nineties), it is less evident there is spill-over of idiosyncratic business practices from the periphery to the field centre.

In examining cases of film directors who have achieved recognition for their creative individuality, we also outline how uniqueness is perpetuated over time and the obstacles that such path dependency may have for creativity. In this sense, it can be argued that creativity could become trapped in its own success. To avoid the re-emergence of self-produced isomorphic pressures, creative actors have to be able to pursue their own renewal and to promote further heterogeneity in the field itself.

Regarding *the shielding and sustaining of optimal distinctiveness*, we add to the literature on creative industries by sketching out 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. the writer-director, and the director-producer hyphenates) and role versatility were means to 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 of a director and a producer committed to the director's trajectory is another mechanism for 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. These three domains, taken together, appear to be instrumental to the shielding of idiosyncratic identities from the isomorphic pressures of the field. A wider insight from our study is that it could be argued that continued commercial success is as important to film directors' ability to maintain a condition of relative autonomy as it is to any other institutional configuration. What makes the case of maverick directors unique is that in addition to commercial success, a series of mechanisms of

coupling of art and business need to be set up to further guarantee this autonomy.

A related contribution is our aim to advance sociological accounts of maverickness. Our paper aims at enriching Becker's (1982) original description of maverickness with the case of European maverick filmmakers. We argue that maverickness does not necessarily arise in professionals who have been trained in the field's conventions and have found them restrictive (two of our distinctive cases were self-trained). It may also arise in cases of self-learned creative professionals, who unaware of the field's conventions are capable of coming up with novel creative output that increases the field's heterogeneity. Furthermore, our cases question Becker's assertion that mavericks lose their uniqueness once accepted by the conventional field. Finally, artistic maverickness (idiosyncratic style) may have to be complemented by organisational maverickness (distinctive organisational solutions to serve the idiosyncratic style).

An additional contribution that was not initially intended, but emerged from the study, is related to the *pushing forward of the frontiers of the cinema field*. It addressed the issue of institutional entrepreneurship by casting light on how maverick film directors as active agents can bring change to their respective cinema fields by establishing parallel standard and defining a niche.

Our micro theory of creative action was built on the assumption that to succeed in a creative domain, such as filmmaking, film directors have to look for optimal distinctiveness. Optimal distinctiveness bridges the artistic concerns for exclusivity with the business rationale for profitability that guarantees legitimacy, and hence inclusion in a field. The actions that directors undertake in building their optimal distinctiveness have to do with the establishment and operation of mechanisms that bind art and business together. The directors free themselves from the iron cage of the field by enacting the isomorphic mechanisms only to commence by forging their own iron cages of

personally imposed (isomorphic) pressures and normative standards. Scholarly work in the New institutional tradition, we argue, would benefit from further attention not only to instances of optimal deviance and assessment of their functional and dysfunctional aspects as driving forces for a field's perpetuation and renewal, but also from paying attention to the dynamics of the interactions between deviant cases and more institutional processes and actors that have become the norm.

References

Álvarez, J. L. (2000) “Theories of Managerial Action and Their Impact on the Conceptualisation of Executive Careers”. In: Peiperl, M.; Arthur, M. (ed.) *Conversations in Career Theory: Insights and Trends*: 127-137. Oxford, UK.

Álvarez, J. L.; Svejenova, S. (2002a) “Symbiotic Careers in Movie Making: Pedro and Agustín Almodóvar”. In: Peiperl, M.; Arthur, M.; Goffee, R.; Anand, N. (ed.) *Career Creativity: Explorations in the Remaking of Work*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Alvarez, J. L.; Svejenova, S. (2002b) “Pairs at The Top: From Tandems to Coupled Careers”. Conference on Careers. London: Harvard Business School, June.

Baker, W. E.; Faulkner, R. R. (1991) “Role as Resource in the Hollywood Film Industry”, *American Journal of Sociology*, 97(2): 279-309.

Becker, H. (1982) *Art Worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brass, D. J. (1995) “Creativity: It’s All in Your Social Network”. In: Ford, C. M.; Gioia, D. A (ed.) *Creative Action in Organizations: Ivory Tower Visions and Real World Voices*, pp. 94-99. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Brewer, M. B. (1991) “The Social Self: On Being the Same and Different at the Same Time”, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5): 475-482.

Brown, S. L.; Eisenhardt, K. M. (1998) *Competing on the Edge: Strategy as Structured Chaos*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Callero, P. L. (1994) "From Role-Playing to Role-Using: Understanding Role as a Resource", *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 57(3): 228-243.

Caves, R. (2000) *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Corliss, R. (1999) "Loving Pedro", *Time*, 29th November, pp. 59-60.

Corsi, B. (2001) *Per Qualche Dollaro In Più*. Milan: Baldini and Castoldi.

Dabelsteen, P. (2001) *Zentropa Bliver Voksen*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Politiken.

Dale, M. (1997) *The Movie Game*. London, UK: Cassell.

Darmer, P.; Strandgaard Pedersen, J.; Brorsen, J. P. (2003) "Zentropa – det går ufatteligt godt". In: Ole Steen Andersen (ed.) *Organisationer i forandring*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.

De Berardinis, F. (2001) *Nanni Moretti*. Milano: Il Castoro.

DeFillippi, R. J.; Arthur, M. B. (1998) "Paradox in Project-Based Enterprise: The Case of Filmmaking", *California Management Review*, 40(2): 125-139.

DeFillippi, R. J.; Arthur, M. B. (1999) "Paradox Revisited: A Reply to Phelan and Lewin", *California Management Review*, 40(2): 186-191.

DiMaggio, P. (1988) "Interest and Agency in Institutional Theory". In: Zucker, L. G. (ed.) *Institutional Patterns and Organizations; Culture and Environment*, pp. 3-21. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

DiMaggio, P. (1992) "Nadel's Paradox Revisited: Relational and Cultural Aspects of Organizational Structure". In: Nohria, N.; Eccles, R. (ed.) *Networks and Organizations: Structure, Form, and Action*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

DiMaggio, P. J.; Powell, W. W. (1991) "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields". In: Powell, W. W.; DiMaggio, P. J. (ed.) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*: 63-82. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Dyer jr., W. G.; Wilkins, A. L. (1991) "Better Stories, Not Better Constructs, to Generate Better Theory: A Rejoinder to Eisenhardt", *Academy of Management Review*, 16(3): 613-619.

Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989) "Building Theories from Case Study Research", *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 532-550.

Fama, E. F. (1980) "Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm", *Journal of Political Economy*, 88: 288-307.

Faulkner, R. R.; Anderson, A. B. (1987) "Short-Term Projects and Emergent Careers: Evidence from Hollywood", *American Journal of Sociology*, 92: 879-909.

Felipe, F. de (1999) *Joel y Ethan Coen: El Cine Siamés*. Barcelona: Glénat.

Fernández, J. (2000) "Ciudadano Pedro, Retrato Amable de Familia". *Dominical, El Periódico*, 19th March.

Francia, J. J. (2000) "Pedro Almodóvar", *Magazine, La Vanguardia*, 30th January, pp. 26-33.

Gritten, D. (1999) "One for the Girls. Interview with Pedro Almodóvar", *The Telegraph Magazine*, 14th August.

Herederó, C. F. (1994) *El Lenguaje de la Luz: Entrevistas con Directores de Fotografía del Cine Español*. Festival de Cine de Alcalá de Henares.

Hirsch, P. (1972) "Processing Fads and Fashions: An Organization-Set Analysis of Cultural Industry Systems", *American Journal of Sociology*, 77: 36-48.

Hirsch, P. M.; Lounsbury, M. (1997) "Ending the Family Quarrel: Toward a Reconciliation of [Old] and [New] Institutionalisms", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4): 406-418.

Hjort, M.; Bondebjerg, I. (2000) *Instruktørens Blik*. Copenhagen: Rosinante Publisher.

Hoffman, A. J. (1999) "Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the US Chemical Industry", *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(4): 351-370.

Jones, C. (2001) "Co-Evolution of Entrepreneurial Careers, Institutional Rules and Competitive Dynamics in American Film", *Organization Studies*, 6: 1895-1920.

Kaufman, A. (2000) "Interview: Lars von Trier Comes Out of the Dark". <www.indiewire.com>.

Lampel, J.; Lant, T.; Shamsie, J. (2000) "Balancing Act: Learning from Organizing Practices in Cultural Industries", *Organization Science*, 11(3): 263-269.

Lounsbury, M.; Glynn, M. A. (2001) "Cultural Entrepreneurship: Stories, Legitimacy and the Acquisition of Resources", *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 545-564.

Lounsbury, M. (1997) "Exploring the Institutional Tool Kit: The Rise of Recycling in the U.S. Solid Waste Field", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4): 465-477.

Menger, P. M. (1999) "Artistic Labor Markets and Careers", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 541-574.

Meyer, J.; Rowan, B. (1977) "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony", *American Journal of Sociology*, 83: 340-363.

Miles, M. B.; Huberman, A. M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Morley, E.; Silver, A. (1977) "A Film Director's Approach to Managing Creativity", *Harvard Business Review*, March-April: 59-70.

Orton, J. D.; Weick, K. E. (1990) "A Reconceptualization: Loosely Coupled Systems", *Academy of Management Review*, 15(2): 203-233.

Powell, W. (1991) "Expanding the Scope of Institutional Analysis". In: Powell, W. W.; DiMaggio, P. J. (ed.) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, pp. 183-203. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Ranucci, G.; Ughi, S. (2001) *Nanni Moretti*. Roma: Dino Audino Editore.

Robins, J. A. (1993) "Organization as Strategy: Restructuring Production in the Film Industry", *Strategic Management Journal*, 14: 103-118.

Rooney, D. (2001) “Helmer Savors [Room] for Growth”, *Variety*, 4th-10th June.

Scott, W. R. (1995) *Institutions and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Scott, W. R.; Ruef, M.; Mendel, P. J.; Caronna, C. A. (2000) *Institutional Change and Health Care Organizations. From Professional Dominance to Managed Care*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Storr, A. (1985) *The Dynamics of Creation*. New York: Atheneum.

Strandgaard Pedersen, J.; Dobbin, F. (1997) “The Social Invention of Collective Actors – On the Rise of the Organization”, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4): 431-443.

Strauss, A.; Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, F. (2001) *Conversaciones con Pedro Almodóvar*. Madrid: Ediciones Akal.

Thomas, N. (1991) *International Dictionary of Films and Filmmakers-2. Directors*. Chicago, IL: St. James Press.

White, H. C.; White, C. A. [1965](1993) *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

White, H. (1992) *Identity and Control. A Structural Theory of Social Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Winters, L. (1996) "Lars von Trier: Hot Danish Director", *The Washington Post*, 24th November.

Wooten, A. (2001) "Nanni Moretti", *Regus London Film Festival Interviews 2001*, 17th November. <Film.guardian.co.uk/rlff2001>.

Yin, R. K. (1994) *Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Zucker, L. G.; Darby, M. R. (1997) "Individual Action and the Demand for Institutions: Star Scientists and Institutional Transformation", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(4): 502-513.

Zuckerman, E. W. (1999) "The Categorical Imperative: Securities Analysts and the Illegitimacy Discount", *American Journal of Sociology*, 104(5): 1398-1438.