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Abstract

This thesis aims at understanding the social aspects of postmerger integration processes by taking an interpretive point of departure in the case of a merger between four Copenhagen film festivals.

The case offhand holds a paradox: how can synergies be pursued across the festivals while maintaining the distinctiveness - which is needed for cultural products - for each of these? Research has shown that management in the cultural-creative industries demands balancing of opposing imperatives and handling of dilemmas which generally informs and provides management practices for other industries. Given this aspect of learning from the cultural-creative industries and the paradox of the case, the study has set out to understand the balance between these two opposing elements of organising; distinctiveness and synergies.

Through an overall narrative approach organisational identity within the merged organisation is analysed from a cultural as well as a process perspective. The main findings are that the organisational members – through identity work of unmanaged storytelling and sensemaking as well as managed physical artifacts - construct a hybrid and holographic identity based upon both a utilitarian - as well as an artistic logic. By flexibly claiming these logics of the hybrid organisational identity the paradox is balanced by the organisational members.

However, the balance of synergies and distinctiveness is in flux as organisational members - by drawing on the utilitarian - and artistic logic - continuously negotiate, narrate, and make sense of how this balance needs to be managed. Moreover, a grey area of differing interpretations of what needs to be distinct and what can be pursued synergies upon exists in the case.

The thesis contributes to understanding the social mechanisms of postmerger integration processes within the creative-cultural industries. It points to managers’ advantages of paying attention to the social constructions of identity – both managed and unmanaged - as they hold valuable implications for the balancing of distinctiveness and pursuit of synergies.
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Foreword

This thesis is the final project in my two year master study Management of Creative Business Processes. The thesis draws primarily on organisation theory. By choosing a case within the creative industries and furthermore applying theories relevant for management of creative production the requirements of a CBP thesis are met. I would like to thank the informants for letting me in on their thoughts, experiences, and premises.
**Chapter 1. Introduction**

1.1. Motivation

In 2008 the two biggest feature film festivals in Denmark, Natfilmfestivalen (abbr. NFF) and Copenhagen International Film Festival (abbr. CIFF), merged into one new feature film festival: CPH PIX. When merging their foundations Natsværmerfonden and The Foundation Copenhagen International Film Festival, the foundation Copenhagen Film Festivals (abbr. CFF) was created. Two other festivals, Copenhagen International Documentary Festival CPH:DOX* (abbr. DOX) (as a part of Natsværmerfonden) and Copenhagen International Film Festival for Children and Youth (Buster) (as a part of The Foundation Copenhagen International Film Festival) became a part of the new constellation as well. *(See appendix I for a graphical overview).*

Forming a horizontal merger of organisations within the same businesses (as the one of CFF) is often grounded in pursuit of synergies and advantages of large-scale operations and is therefore bound to cause substantial integration [Gertsen et al. 1998]. Organisation is generally thought of as a balance between coordination and control on one hand and on the other specialisation and decentralisation [Mintzberg et al. 1998], that is, the balance of integration in organisations. Substantial integration, however, can pose a particular threat to both the artistic purpose and the quest of the film festivals of providing cultural value, since cultural production and its core competencies basically requires distinctiveness, experimentation, creativity, and innovation [Lampel et al. 2000]. This artistic logic tends to get suppressed by a more utilitarian logic [Eikhof and Haunschild 2007] such as for instance pursuit of synergies through large-scale operations. My basic motivation for studying CFF is thus the paradox between keeping the festivals distinct and forming an umbrella organisation with the aim of pursuing synergies. Hence with a point of departure in the case of CFF and the paradox of balancing distinctiveness and synergies as my overall theme I will in the following paragraph further narrow down the scope of the thesis.

---

1 Merger is in this thesis legally understood as when ‘two or more previously independent undertakings amalgamate into one undertaking’ [Danish Competition Authority 2007].
1.2. Presenting the problem area

The merger between the two foundations finally became a reality April 1st 2008 [Møller 2008]. The process had been initiated several years before and had been characterised by great agitation and turmoil with mudslinging in the press and fighting between both the festivals and between them and the governmental bodies involved [e.g. Jensen 2006; ‘Ledende artikel’ 2007]. This battle ended up with an ultimatum given by the festivals’ primary sources of subsidy, The Municipality of Copenhagen, The Ministry of Culture, and The Danish Film Institute (DFI): either merge or subsidies will cease [KFU 2007;Bo 2008;Finnedal and Møller 2007]. On October 4th 2007 the members of The Culture and Leisure Committee\(^2\) stated:

‘A unanimous Culture and Leisure Committee applauds the efforts taken in preparation for unifying the film festivals of Copenhagen (CIFF, [NFF], DOX and Buster) on a joint platform. The total donation, from the Municipality of Copenhagen in 2008 and the years to come, make up 2.811.000 DKK. (…) The Culture and Leisure Committee will at the same time stress that the public funding is contingent on the co-ordination of the film festivals’ [KFU 2007].

The argument for putting up this ultimatum of co-ordination was a wish for turning the unfruitful competition that had developed between the two feature film festivals into synergies by merging them and forming a more professionalised, administratively strong collaboration [Bo 2008;CEO]\(^3\). Therefore Buster and DOX were also incorporated in CFF [Finnedal and Møller 2007]. Yet the festivals were to be maintained as autonomous events [ibid.]. Two other festivals; Salaam.dk and Copenhagen Gay and Lesbian Film Festival were also invited to join the new organisation but turned down the offer [CEO].

Research on mergers has primarily been focusing on financial and strategic aspects [Molin and Strandgaard Pedersen 1996;Klepeostø 1998;Vaara 2000]. These strategic aspects of creating synergies through economies of scale, of reducing competition, broadening and extending markets, and fast growth are furthermore often the decisive elements in merger decisions [Nahavandi and Malekzadeh 1993]. The most important motives for mergers are often the expected synergies but

---

2 The committee judging grant applications within the Municipality of Copenhagen
3 Interviews in this anonymised version of the thesis are referred to in square brackets with the designation of occupation of the informant; e.g. [XX]. An overview of the different designation of occupations can be found in appendix III.
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these are far from always obtained [Gertsen et al. 1998]. However, it is further pointed out by several theorists and researchers that the cause of merger failures is to be found in the lack of focus on the management of the postmerger integration process [e.g. Shrivastava 1986;Gertsen et al. 1998;Vaara 2000], thus not realising the great importance of socio-cultural integration [Shrivastava 1986; Kleppestø 1998;Vaara 2000].

Research on mergers within cultural-creative industries is scarce; however, it seems as if this is because these types of organisations rarely merge in the first place. Rather there is ‘substantial evidence to argue that creative industries tend to cluster geographically’ and that ‘creative outputs are conceived within networks (of individuals or firms), environments and communities that act as accumulation points’ [Chapain and De Propris 2009:13]. Further this ‘geographical agglomeration (...) generates external and agglomeration economies (...) [which] generate dynamic processes of knowledge creation (learning and innovation) and knowledge transfer (diffusion and synergies)’ [ibid:14]. Thus it seems that the stability and synergies normally obtained through mergers are mainly reached through clustering and network formation within these industries.

Cultural industry organisations need to ‘reconcile the demands of artistic production with those of the market place’ [Lampel et al. 2000:265] and cultural production needs artistic as well as commercial inputs [Throsby 2001;Caves 2000;Hesmondhalgh 2007]. Thus, ‘humdrum commerce’ and ‘art for art’s sake’ inevitably clash within cultural-creative organisations [Caves 2000]. ‘If culture in general and the arts in particular are to be seen as important, especially in policy terms in a world where economists are kings, they need to establish their economic credentials’ [Throsby 2001:111]. Following this, it might be beneficial for cultural organisations to be able to engage in more professional organisations or networks facilitating synergies on non-content issues. Therefore knowledge on such constellations is needed. By choosing CFF as my case I support the view that cultural industries need more looking into given ‘the volume, value, and range of output’ they generate [Power 2002:103].

4 Cultural industry organisations are producers of cultural goods as ‘movies, television, music, theatre, and visual arts’ [Lampel et al. 2000:263] or as Hesmondhalgh suggests; broadcasting, internet, music, print and electronic industries, video and computer games, advertising/marketing and film [2007:12-14ff.]. Creative industries are defined broader as ‘supplying goods and services that we broadly associate with cultural, artistic, or simply entertainment value [Caves 2000:1]. In this thesis I will - realising that it may simplify matters - use the term cultural-creative industries/organisations [Reff Pedersen and Strandgaard Pedersen] comprising both definitions, thus taking a rather broad approach to the concept. However, film festivals – with their focus on both artistic content and commercial film markets [De Valck 2007;Rülin and Strandgaard Pedersen 2010] while providing cultural goods to the public via cultural events – are both creative, cultural, and an industry. I will elaborate on film festivals in chapter 3.
Researchers point out that much can be learned from the management practices of these industries [e.g. Lampel et al. 2000;Reff Pedersen and Strandgaard Pedersen 2008] and that these practices are ever more needed on a general level in order to maintain competitive advantage in a world of increasingly fast-changing demand and uncertain environment [Lampel et al. 2000]. By focusing on the management of the postmerger integration process within cultural-creative organisations this thesis aims to contribute to understanding these practices. Research on film festivals is a rather new endeavour; however, it has recently become an area of interest for several researchers [e.g. Harbord 2002;Mezias et al. 2008;Mazza and Strandgaard Pedersen 2010]. Film festivals make an interesting case given their aesthetic and market driven nature and they ‘provide a fascinating setting for organizational research’ [Rüling and Strandgaard Pedersen 2010:2].

The fact that many mergers do not generate the results wished for [Borum and Reff Pedersen 2008;Gertsen et al. 1998] and the tumultuous history of the premerger process of CFF briefly displayed above (see chapter 3 for a more detailed description of the process) make it obvious that the new organisation, CFF, had tough odds and that believers in the new constellation were hard to find. How would the festivals be able to collaborate and take common decisions, and how would they react upon the joint secretariat (being used to, for the part of most of them, running the festivals rather autonomously)? And how would the pursuit of synergies meet with the cultural production? For instance, critics pointed to the danger of standardising the festivals and the suffocation of the creative spirit of especially NFF - a grassroots festival running for 19 years driven by entrepreneurial and enthusiastic forces - and its off-spring DOX; ‘[NFF] started 17 years ago and it has remained the grassroots among the festivals’ [Finnedal and Møller 2007] and ‘one can be afraid that, DOX not the least, which over a few years has become an important festival for documentaries (...) will suffer from the new top management. Like at NFF the focal point has been the joy, the good off-beat ideas and the latitude an informal and horizontal structure yields’ [Monggaard 2008] (‘grassroots’ will be further examined in chapter 4). Borum and Reff Pedersen point out that mergers are complicated change processes happening in social systems and that they cause change in the relationship between ‘us’ and ‘them’ leading to changes in identities [2008]. They also point to that the management of the postmerger process, and not the decision of merging, is what determines the outcome of the merger [ibid.].

CFF has - at the time of writing - existed for over two years. A period of severe economical problems took place during the first year [CFF 2008;CEO] and employee turnover was rather high
due to both voluntary and involuntary departures [FD;EMP;Enggard 2009b]. However, the first festivals carried out within the new constellation have been rather successful on the following measures; firstly, the audience numbers are significantly higher than expected with the numbers reached in 2009 being the ones set for 2012 [CFF 2009;CEO], secondly, the reviews\(^5\) of the festivals have been mainly positive [e.g. Vandrup 2010;Hegnsvid 2009], thirdly, CFF is ‘based on satisfactory annual results, significantly stronger than by the turn of 2009’ [CFF 2009], and fourthly, the media storm of critique and mud-slinging has ceased\(^6\), leaving room for focus on the contents of the three festivals. CFF is offhand - paradoxically given its turbulent genesis - starting to resemble a ‘success’.

It is therefore of interest to study how the postmerger integration process in CFF is made sense of and how identity is negotiated. What are the social and qualitative consequences of pushing the balance of integration towards synergies and away from distinctiveness? How does it affect management of the balance between art and business, and how do the collective actors make sense of the changes in processes and collective status?

Therefore, the overall research question guiding this study is:

**Research question**

How is identity constructed - and synergies and distinctiveness balanced - in postmerger integration processes of cultural-creative organisations?

To guide my process of answering this question I will answer the following sub questions

1. *How is identity constructed through cultural manifestations?*
2. *How do the organisational members make sense of processes of collaboration and competition?*

---

\(^5\) Reviews are a significant measure of success for the festivals [FD;CEO].

\(^6\) A search on www.infomedia.dk covering the last six months of 2009 on different search terms as ‘Copenhagen Film Festivals’, ‘CPH:PIX’, ‘CPH:DOX’, and ‘Buster’ solely entails articles on the festivals’ content and profile.
Synergies are for the purpose of this thesis understood as extra value gained from both economies of scale and combination of energy and ideas. Distinctiveness is understood as ‘having a special quality, character, or appearance that is different and easy to recognize’ [Distinctive 1995].

1.3. Purpose and overall delimitations

As mentioned in the introduction research on mergers has primarily focused on financial and strategic aspects and has only recently started paying attention to the importance of sociocultural integration processes. This thesis aims at understanding these processes by looking at a case of merger within the cultural-creative industries. These industries, as mentioned, form an emerging area of research which generally informs management practices. To study postmerger sociocultural integration processes within the cultural-creative industries with an aim to understand the processes and inform management practices is thus the purpose of this thesis.

This thesis is based upon an interpretive research study carried out in Copenhagen over six months in 2009/2010 by the author. The overall focus of the research study is on management in creative industries and organisational identity (abbr. OI) in change processes. The focus on OI is delimited from individual identity. Furthermore it is delimited to internal dimensions of the organisation and thus delimited from external notions such as organisational image and new institutional theory. Therefore organisational identity will in this study not be directly concerned with marketing, external communication, and strategy. These and further delimitations will be clarified in chapter 2 on Methods, theoretical perspectives, and analytical tools.

1.4. Reading guide

Firstly, in chapter 2, I will state my epistemological and ontological standpoint, my unit of analysis, my overall approach, and explain my methods in collecting and analysing my empirical material and other data. Secondly, I present the theoretical perspectives and analytical tools applied in the analysis. Chapter 3 provides an introduction to film festivals and their place within the cultural-creative industries and subsequently the festivals and the secretariat are presented as cases. Chapter 4 through interpretation and analysis by use of the extant theory presents my findings and in chapter 5 I compare and discuss these. Chapter 6 sums up the conclusions and in chapter 7 I put my findings, conclusions and case into retrospect and forward perspective.
Definitions and understanding of terms and concepts will be incorporated in text and foot notes when relevant.
Chapter 2. Methods, theoretical perspectives, and analytical tools

This chapter starts out by stating my philosophical position that further guides my ontological claims and epistemological reflexions. Then the unit of analysis and the narrative approach taken to the study is presented. Subsequently the research design is described comprising of sections on case study, empirical data collection, and analysis. Finally, I will present my theoretical perspectives and analytical tools.

2.1. Philosophical position

In the purpose of this thesis to gain an understanding of the sociocultural aspects in postmerger integration processes (abbr. PmIP) I base my study on a social constructionist view. I regard organisational change and OI as social phenomena which are constructed in processes and open to change.

The social world consists of multiple realities and interpretations and knowledge ‘is context specific by being created in a situation and of that situation’ [Hatch and Yanow 2003:69]. According to Hatch and Yanow these interpretations take place at more levels; on the situational (the actor and/or the researcher) where a setting/an event is interpreted; on the level where the researcher interprets artifacts (interviews, documents, observations); and on the presentational where the reader interprets the report [2003:70-71ff.]. Hence the process of interpretation is ongoing and multilayered; all knowledge is interpretive and we can only gain access to the social world by interpreting it [ibid.] and ‘recognition equals interpretation: an action where reality is constructed’ [Jordansen and Madsen 2010:58, MT]. I as a researcher construct the social world I am investigating; ‘the object of analysis is per definition a fluid, unstable, and ambiguous phenomenon which is created in the encounter with the researcher’ [Mik-Meyer and Järvinen 2005:9, MT] (I will return to this in 2.4.). Consequently no analyses within this paradigm will be identical.

---

7 Sociocultural processes is in this thesis understood as processes of socially constructed/constructing relations among actors
2.2. Level and unit of analysis

In order to understand the processes of a merger one can choose from a number of perspectives and levels of analysis. I have chosen to focus on a structural level [Scott 1998:16] and apply a combined organisational and managerial perspective across the management group within CFF; this way taking a collective approach with the festivals and the secretariat as the collective actors.

These choices are grounded in a wish for understanding the collective meaning construction across CFF. Being aware that the employees within the festivals more than likely hold differing opinions on and make different sense of the merger processes I however restrict my focus to the management group in order not to cause an unfruitful amount of complexity in the thesis. Hence the premise is that the festivals and the secretariat respectively are considered homogenous, collective actors and that they form the organisation CFF which is then the phenomenon to be explained.

Guiding the study is an overall narrative approach which will be presented in the following section. The analysis (chapter 4) is bipartite. Analysis 1 will look at how identity is constructed within CFF through cultural manifestations by firstly looking at storytelling and secondly at physical artifacts. Analysis 2 will look at how members make sense of processes of collaboration and competition within CFF. For a graphical overview of the approach, theoretical perspectives, and analyses see appendix II.

2.3. A narrative approach

Processes of meaning creation in the PmIP can be assessed by taking a narrative approach which ‘[gives] voice to a wide range of organizational actors, showing in which ways their interpretations of organizational reality may correspond and differ’ [Söderberg 2003:5] thus honouring the polyphonic nature of mergers [Borum and Reff Pedersen 2008].

I apply the narrative approach with a triple aim. Firstly, as an interview method where I encourage storytelling (cf. 2.5.1), second- and thirdly as a way of ‘narrating the organization’ [Czarniawska 1997;Gabriel 2000] where I as a researcher on one hand analytically organise ‘the
raw material of everyday organizational life (...)’ [Czarniawska and Gagliardi 2003:VII], and then on the other hand present my case. The reason for making a distinction between the analytical aspect and the presentation aspect within ‘narrating the organization’ is that CFF is not only consisting of stories. As I will return to other artifacts and sensemakings will also be a part of the narrative on CFF I create since ‘[n]arrating is organizing, and although organizing is more than narrating, even that part of it that is non-narrative can become a topic of a narration [Czarniawska 2004:651].

A narrative approach is well-suited for the purpose of this thesis with its aim to interpretively understand OI construction. The approach allows to get ‘quite close to the actors in the merger’ [Borum and Reff Pedersen 2008:79] who engage in ‘the work involved in the creation of identity’ [Reff Pedersen and Strandgaard Pedersen 2008:92] through storytelling and sensemaking. When focusing on identity as a relative phenomenon, an advantage of the narrative approach is its focus on time and space [Czarniawska 2004], this way providing a means for me as a researcher to understand how the actors link context, action, and artifacts which then informs their meaning constructions. I will elaborate on identity in 2.6.1. in this chapter.

Within narrative research the logic is usually vertical polyphony [e.g. Søderberg 2003;Borum and Reff Pedersen 2008] where voice is given to organisational members across more hierarchical layers. However, since the scope of the thesis is to understand how CFF broadly construct identity and make sense of the PmIP I - by interviewing the management group as representatives of their festivals and the secretariat - take a horizontal polyphonic narrative approach (cf. 2.2. for unit of analysis) seeking to give voice to the collectives within CFF.

2.4. Research design

This thesis is designed as an interpretive case study of CFF with the three festivals and the secretariat as ‘embedded case studies’ [Maaløe 2002]. A case study ‘often is about understanding how the phenomenon investigated is ascribed meaning and makes sense for the parties involved, but it can also be about the mapping of a given process as for instance an organisational change’ [Georg 2010:151, MT]. I use the case for both purposes; as a mapping describing a merger within the cultural-creative industries in depth by providing a rather comprehensive context for the analysis as well as an understanding of how meaning is ascribed to the merger integration process and this way understanding how identity is constructed.
Regarding the research designs’ impact on the applicability and quality of this study, the socioeconomic approach through qualitative methods is not aiming at generalizing (universally) but on setting up ideal types [Olsen and Pedersen 1999]. The aim of the case is to describe and understand the unique phenomenon; ‘to bring forward the complexity and develop more sophisticated understandings of the problem’ [Georg 2010:152, MT] and to ‘provide in-depth knowledge’ [Maaløe 2002:24, MT] thus seeing the world ‘in a grain of sand’[Martin 2002:29]. This knowledge, despite its context-specific origin, is useful. Flyvbjerg explains how true expertise is only achieved through context-dependant research, whereas if you stick with content-independent research (rule based) you will stay at beginners’ level [2006]. ‘Concrete experiences can be achieved via continued proximity to the studied reality and via feedback from those under study’ [Flyvbjerg 2006:223].

A case study consequently has its limitations. For instance, it can be hard to convey results from one case to another given its context-specific nature. Insights and experiences gained from specific mergers are not easily applied to other cases, but need to be taken into consideration concerning the specific time and place [Borum and Reff Pedersen 2008]. Scientific quality, within the case study and qualitative methods, is according to Jordansen and Madsen achieved by ensuring transparency and consistency in the process and making sure that all premises, aim, and approach are accounted for [2010].

The case was chosen on several grounds; because of its nature as a creative industry organisation meeting the requirements of a CBP thesis, because of the film festival being an emerging and interesting area of research, and because of the uniqueness of the merger within the cultural-creative industries. The case was furthermore chosen because of the extensive media coverage providing information on the process and thus yielding an overview which I reckoned advantageous considering the rather short time frame for the study. Moreover, I was granted access to the festivals and had the opportunity of conducting interviews and observing as well as gaining partial access to documents and other material. Data will be presented in the following section.

* In the following sections I will present my approach and methods for data collection and analysis as well as reflexions on the methods and my role as a researcher in the study.
2.5. Research instruments and research process

Primary empirical material is collected through seven semi-structured interviews and direct observation. Secondary data collected are research interviews, documents, annual reports, web sites, books, articles, reports, news paper articles, written interviews, radio interviews, and festival programmes and posters. Data collection was stretched over a period of six months from December 2009 to May 2010. By applying a range of qualitative research instruments I have sought to gain a broad and rich understanding of the case in order to carry out the interpretive case study [Georg 2010].

2.5.1. Interviews

Interviewees were in accordance with the unit of analysis the management group of CFF; the CEO, the three head of festivals, the head of production and the head of sponsorship and marketing. However, one employee who had over time worked within all of the festivals and in the secretariat was interviewed. She this way represents an overall view and functions as an informant with broad knowledge and insights on the processes in the organisation. The festival directors represent their festivals, respectively and the artistic production of CFF. The CEO, the head of sponsorship and marketing, and the head of production are all representatives of the secretariat and the central administration, however assuming different roles. The CEO as top manager being the link to the board and with an overall responsibility for the operations and personnel, the head of sponsorship and marketing as a creative-commercial role, and the head of production in a creative-technical role. The two latter have no personnel responsibility. (See appendix III for List of informants; anonymised in this version).

The interviews have been qualitative and I have used elements both from the narrative interview [Jordansen 2010] and the semi-structured interview [Kvale and Brinkmann 2009] in order to, firstly, attain knowledge on more formal structures and daily life within CFF. Secondly, my aim was to get a view into the ‘life world’ [Kvale and Brinkmann 2009;Madsen and Darmer 2010;Hatch and Yanow 2003] and social world of the respondents, that is, their view on the PmIP, through stories and sensemaking. Thus, the interviews have both functioned as informant interviews and narrative accounts and I have used them both for the background for the case and for the analysis.

Initially, an interview guide with a number of basic questions was developed based on overall theoretical insight and the knowledge I had collected on the case through secondary data. (See
The interview guide was used at each interview in order to be able to compare answers, yet the questions were all open-ended allowing for freedom in answering them. This is in accordance with the interactionistic approach to interviewing which is reflective, narrative, and seeks to embrace complexity through sensitively conducting the interviews [Staunæs and Søndergaard 2005]. The interviews were, after an initial collection of secondary data, carried out in the period from January to April 2010, lasted between 45 minutes to three hours and were recorded with a digital recorder. They have been conducted over this period of four months with the iterative purpose of allowing time for reflection on and comparison between the interview methods, findings and relevant theoretical perspectives; this way further development of the problem took place in between interviews. The interviews took place in the offices of the informants and have all but one been conducted in Danish, have been transcribed, and the quotations translated into English for the purpose of coherence in the thesis. The single interview in English was conducted in this manner because the respondent felt more comfortable in this language having a third language as mother tongue. Transcription has taken place immediately after the interviews in order for the transcription to be as precise as possible with the gestures etc. in clear mind. (See appendix V for transcribed interviews, not in this anonymised version). The transcripts contain all words spoken and I have further noted pauses and sounds in order for me to work with the interviews as sensibly as possible; however when quotes are used throughout the thesis these words and notes are removed in order to provide a more coherent reading.

2.5.2. Documents and observation

I have in the analysis used fewer internal, physical documents from CFF than planned. This is firstly because I was not allowed access to for instance board minutes and other internal documents but also because CFF is a rather ‘undocumented’ organisation and procedures are rarely written down. However, I obtained a few documents as for instance the annual reports and a guide to the

---

8 Except for the one interview with an employee not part of the management group. This interview took place at an office at CBS.
joint economy handed out and gone through over at a joint meeting in the kitchen. Along with electronic documents, as the press releases and information on web sites, these have been taken into consideration and analysed as part of the analysis of identity. I have reflected on them and critically selected them as well as not considered them being ‘neutral windows’ to reality [Mik-Meyer and Justesen 2010:285, MT]. In the analysis I have in accordance with my constructionist approach considered them as co-constructing meaning in CFF [ibid.].

A wide range of newspaper articles and diverse report from for instance DFI and The Ministry of Culture have provided background knowledge on the historic course of events described in the introduction and case (chapter 1 and 3). As these are not a part of the analysis they have not been subject to an actual ‘document analysis’, however, I have, as with the documents used in the analysis reflected critically on them. Furthermore, after having written the historic and factual account I sent it to my informants who were then able to comment on it. A few factual errors were corrected in this process of feedback and external validation.

Further I have used observation as a method of data collection. Besides the six interviews taking place at CFF’s premises (three at Farimagsgade before the move, three at Tagensvej after) I have visited the organisation on three occasions. I have, firstly, participated in a joint meeting on economy where 15 employees, the festival directors, and the secretariat participated, secondly, I have participated in two joint meetings at DOX and PIX, respectively. Lastly, I have visited PIX on location under the festival in April 2010. These observations were used as a supplementary technique for the primary generation of empiric material (interviews and documents) in order to experience and see with own eyes what actions are carried out within the organisation thus ‘getting a view into the context which surrounds and is embedded in the social interaction’ [Mik-Meyer 2010:332, MT]. Besides this the visits provided a more informal relation with the interviewees and several interview appointments were entered into during the visits. Detailed notes on talk and action were taken during the observations and I have re-read these throughout the iteration of theory and empirical findings. Observation notes are in the thesis referred to in square brackets including place, event, and time, e.g. [observation notes, place, event, and time].

2.5.3. Reflexions on my role as a researcher

As a fundamental term within the social constructionist view I as a researcher co-construct the phenomenon that I am investigating [Mik-Meyer and Järvinen 2005]. This subjectivity should, however, not be seen as a source of error but instead be accounted for by explicating that subjectivity [Jordansen and Madsen 2010].

[18]
I had no personal commitment to, prior experiences of, or knowledge about CFF; neither the case actors nor the organisation. On the positive side this made me see things from an outer perspective resisting the blind spots that an insider might have; however it also caused some disadvantages. Firstly, of negotiating access and also getting a limited access (to for instance documents and meetings), secondly, the process of gaining trust from the informants, the confusing process of gaining an overview over the organisation, and how their work processes are carried out. Thirdly, the disadvantage of not understanding ‘tacit knowledge’, rhetoric patterns, and ways of speech.

* 

I approach merger and identity as phenomena whose meanings are defined through social processes. Through an interpretive case study of a merger within the cultural-creative industries I outline and describe the context of a concrete example of a PmIP and analyse what and how meaning is created concerning collective identity. The study is carried out from a combined organisational and managerial perspective and applies an overall narrative approach to identity.

* 

In the following section I will present the theoretical perspectives and analytical tools relevant to my case and applied in the analysis. (See appendix II for a graphical overview).

2.6. Theoretical perspectives and analytical tools

The following contains an introduction to the concept Organisational Identity which is at the core of this thesis. This will be followed by a presentation of three perspectives on the concept as well as the theories applied in the analysis and discussion in chapter 4 and 5 in my quest for answering the research question.

The thesis draws on different bodies of literature within organisational studies; on organisational and corporate identity and culture, on narrative, and on sensemaking.

It should be noted, cf. 2.5.1., that my research process has been iterative and that the choice of including the theories I present in the following hence have emerged in the process.
2.6.1. Organisational identity

The concept of identity is a broad concept allowing for multilevel analysis and can beneficially be applied in the quest for understanding organisational processes [Roos and Oliver 2007]. An obvious question is; why is identity important in organisations? Recalling my approach to identity as a socially constructed phenomenon; ‘identification’ as ‘a sense of continuous formulation and preservation of the self through interaction is essential’ for individuals [Gioia et al. 2000:65]. Identity is thus a necessity for coping with the world and identification a basic human action.

The concept of organisational identity was initially empirically developed by Albert and Whetten who define it as what is by organisational members claimed to be central, distinctive, and enduring about the organisation [1985]. This is often referred to as answering the self-reflective question: 'Who are we as an organization?' [e.g. Pratt and Foreman 2000; Reff Pedersen and Strandgaard Pedersen 2008] and an answer to the question of ‘what we stand for’ as an organization’ [Hatch and Schultz 2000:15]. Other ‘organizational researchers have expanded on the notion in recognition that some organizational identities are more flexible, less central, and even less distinctive than originally defined’ [Gioia et al. 2000; Hatch and Schultz 2002; Pratt and Foreman 2000 in Corley 2004:1147]. In accordance with my social constructionist approach, I concur with Gioia et al. when they suggest that organizational identity ‘is better viewed as a relatively fluid and unstable concept’ [Gioia et al. 2000:63]. ‘[I]dentity is not, and indeed cannot be, enduring in any strict sense, even though it apparently retains continuity in its essential features’ [Gioia et al. 2000:65]. As a consequence of this view identity becomes a phenomenon which needs repetitive ‘identity work’ [Reff Pedersen and Strandgaard Pedersen 2008] and which does not automatically maintain itself but requires ‘maintenance’ [Corley 2004:1146].

Why do organisations then need identity? It is suggested that the self-reflexion and identification is as important for organisations as it is for individuals [Gioia et al. 2000]. Moreover ‘concern with ‘the identity’ of the organization is not unrelated to that of identification, for the identity of the organization is believed to create a basis for member identification with the organization’ [Schultz et al. 2000:16]. According to Albert et al. as organisations face increasingly changing environments and as organising becomes more fragmented, temporary, and outsourced, identification is too of increasing importance since ‘identity serves as a rudder for navigating difficult waters’ [2000:13]. Moreover, as ‘conventional organizational forms are dismantled, so too are many of the institutionalized history and methods, and the institutionalized means by which the
organizations perpetuate themselves’ [ibid.]. When understanding mergers OI is a relevant concept [Baruch 2006] since ‘organizational identity is an important component of any organizations’ strategic attempts at survival and prosperity, as well as an important variable in understanding employees’ commitment to the organization’ [Corley 2004:1168]. With the focus of OI on ‘the experience and expectations of a wide array of people who view the organization from a multiplicity of perspectives and approach it with a variety of motives’ [Hatch and Schultz 2004:1] I see the concept as a suitable means for studying PmIP.

I will in this thesis approach ‘organisational identities as properties of a collective’ [Pratt and Foreman 2000:19] and thus something which is ‘akin to a distributed consciousness that lies within the group of individuals whose activities comprise the organization’ [Hatch and Schultz 2004:4]. I set out to study ‘how organisational members see themselves as an organization’ and thus ‘the perspective lies internal to the organization and is rooted in organizational members’ perceptions and understandings’ [Hatch and Schultz 2000:16].

Albert and Whetten suggested that organisations often consists of dual or multiple identities; one type being *holographic* where multiple identities exist in all parts of the organisation and another being ideographic where multiple identities exist in different parts [1985]. Since mergers bring more organisations together the concept of multiple identities is particularly relevant for my study. A multiple OI construction explored which is of particular relevance for this thesis is the hybrid based on artistic/business ideologies [Glynn 2000] which builds upon the dual identity of normative/utilitarian ideologies suggested by Albert and Whetten [1985]. The former is a study of a symphony orchestra and suggests that: ‘in cultural organizations, whose participants are split between concerns with normative artistry and utilitarian economics, hybrid identities may often be a source of creative tension and debate’ [Brown 2006:740]. The study shows how musicians and administrators claim identity through core ideologies [Glynn 2000]. The study by focusing on ‘[h]ybridization of identity in complex organizations like a symphony, shows how a single organization may have a multiplicity of claims on its central character’ [ibid.]. Hence, in this view there can be more claims to what is *central*. These identities do not *have* to conflict [Pratt and Foreman 2000] and, as I have already mentioned, they can be shared by all members (holographic) or be held by distinct groups (ideographic) [Albert and Whetten 1985]. The core ideologies I will be referring to throughout the thesis are those of utilitarian and artistic respectively [Glynn 2000; Eikhof and Haunschild 2007]. Utilitarian logic refers to ‘an explicit market orientation’ and

[21]
the artistic logic refers to ‘the desire to produce’ [Eikhof and Haunschild 2007:526] or what is known as ‘l’art pour art’ [Caves 2000:4].

I am in the analysis inspired by the conceptualization of managerial responses to multiple identities by Pratt and Foreman [2000] in order to understand how multiple identities are dealt with in CFF and what managerial actions mean for the multiple identities. While taking inspiration from this conceptualization I, in line with my interpretive approach, assume that identities can be partly managed by managerial action; however not that it is a strictly controlled product. As Pratt and Foreman state: ‘From an interpretive or constructionist perspective, the dynamic, subjective, and reflexive nature of identity makes it difficult for managers to either reduce plurality or attain synergy’[2000:37]. In line with the approach to identity as fluid and unstable the management however, involves the aforementioned identity work since the existence of multiple identities can create ‘potential costs and benefits to managers’ [ibid:38]. The advantages of multiple identities are e.g. flexibility and disadvantages are e.g. ‘intraorganizational conflict’ and use of valuable resources in negotiating among identities [ibid:23]. Pratt and Foreman list four ways of managers to manage multiple identities; compartmentalization, aggregation, integration, and deletion [ibid:38].

As described in the method I see objects as co-constructing the social world and, as I will present in the following, my approach also contains managerial decision such as moving to new premises and layout of web site(s) and how this affect meaning construction and identity.

Thus another concept of relevance to my research is that of corporate identity which is closely related to organisational identity [Schultz et al. 2000]. The specific theories of corporate identity applied will be presented shortly. However, it should be stated that I approach corporate identity as an internal concept (cf. 1.3.). Corporate identity is a managerial perspective focusing on decisions and choices of the management of CFF [ibid.] and is applied in order to understand how artifacts, as outcomes of managerial decisions, ‘become part of organizational identity’ [ibid:18]. I thus apply both an organisational perspective (OI) and a managerial perspective (corporate identity) with the view that these in turn affect each other [ibid.].

* 

Thus, I have provided a brief introduction to the concept of OI and presented my focus within the area of research. I have - through the iterative research process - chosen to focus on OI as a fluid and unstable phenomenon requiring identity work; on OI as a collective phenomenon and how
organisations construct multiple identities; especially the hybrid identity has proven relevant for my case. Further I will apply the concept of corporate identity in order to look at how managerial decisions affect OI. In the following I will present the perspectives on identity and the analytical tools.

2.6.2. Perspectives and tools

In the study of identity the thesis draws on several overlapping areas of research within interpretive organisational studies; ‘(1) studies of organisational culture, symbolism, and aesthetics, (2) process-based theorising about interpretation, and (3) analyses of writing and storytelling in ‘narrating’ organizational realities’ [Hatch and Yanow 2003:71]. The first two I will refer to as the culture perspective and the process perspective. The narrative perspective I have already presented as my overall approach and it will further be presented as analytical tools.

2.6.2.1 The culture perspective on identity

The culture perspective is applied for several purposes; firstly in order to (analysis 1) understand the collective identity in CFF by what is shared by taking an integration perspective to culture [Martin and Meyerson 1987]9, secondly in order to (analysis 2) understand how different sensemakings construct collective identities in CIFF by taking a differentiation perspective on culture [ibid.] and thirdly in order to generally inform identity by use of cultural manifestations. This way culture is not either shared or differentiated [ibid.]; it is instead a perception of and a construction by the researcher [Hatch and Yanow 2003] and a way to see organisations through two lenses.

The culture perspective explores how organisational culture influences meaning creation and the interpretive approach to culture stresses the unmanageable and ambiguous nature of culture [ibid.]. Culture operationalizes identity through linguistic artifacts, acts, and objects [ibid.]. A cultural perspective is about ‘the willingness to look beneath the surface, to gain an in-depth understanding of how people interpret the meanings of (...) [cultural] manifestations and how these interpretations form patterns of clarity, inconsistencies, and ambiguities that can be used to characterize understandings of working lives’ [Martin 2002:4-5]. Applying the lenses is a way for me as a researcher to construct culture [Hatch and Yanow 2003] and is thus corresponding to my role as co-

---

9 Martin and Meyerson [1987] set up three paradigms (‘lenses’); integration, differentiation, and ambiguity (fragmentation), for understanding cultural change in organisations. They each provide ‘the criteria and content of what we attend to, and (…) they determine what we notice and enact as cultural change’ [ibid: 624]. I am inspired by the two first perspectives.
constructing the social world I am investigating. According to Joanne Martin ‘manifestations of culture include rituals, stories, humor, jargon, physical arrangements, and formal structure and policies, as well as informal norms and practices’ [2002:55]. The cultural perspective is thus especially relevant when I in analysis 1 discuss how collective identity is constructed through shared storytelling and other manifestations.

In the first part of my analysis of cultural manifestations I will focus on storytelling and in the second part I will focus on physical artifacts and objects. However, the latter will be presented first for the purpose of coherence in this chapter.

**Artifacts and objects**

As written above culture operationalizes identity through artifacts and objects [Hatch and Yanow 2003]. When focusing on these cultural manifestations in analysis 1b I draw on ‘the study of artifacts and space’ [Gagliardi 2007:701] and on the work of Gagliardi [1990], Berg and Kreiner [1990], and Baruch [2006] on artifacts in corporate culture. By artifacts I in analysis 1b mean a more concrete definition than usually taken within cultural studies and focus on them as ‘products’ which are ‘intentional’ and ‘perceived by the senses’ [Gagliardi 1990:3]. Artifacts are ‘the most evident, concrete, and tangible manifestations of the culture of an organization [ibid:8] and paradoxically they are often overlooked by researchers of culture rejecting them as being ‘common sense’ [ibid:9]. This is despite their ability to ‘provide a key giving privileged access to the sensory and aesthetic dimension of corporate life’ [ibid:13]. Gagliardi describes two dimensions of artifacts; firstly, the pragmatic which is ‘the relationship between artifacts and organizational action’ where ‘artifacts make materially possible, help, hinder, or even prescribe organizational action’ and secondly, the hermeneutic which is ‘what and how artifacts may speak to us when we are seeking to interpret the culture of an organization’ hence how artifacts ‘influence our perception of reality, to the point of subtly shaping beliefs, norms, and cultural values’ [Gagliardi 2007:706, italics in original]. I apply these two dimensions in order to understand how the physical setting (the moving to new premises with a new distribution of offices), posters, and websites may affect sensemaking processes, and how they symbolically inform the identity within CFF.

**Physical settings**

Berg and Kreiner look into how corporate architecture as ‘the exterior and interior design of corporate buildings’ is more than a physical setting; how it is also a symbolic resource [1990:42, italics in original]. They argue that ‘buildings may be seen as symbolic artifacts that reflect (and as
such inform us about) some basic traits of the organization inhabiting them’ [ibid.]. Further they see corporate buildings as ‘symbols of (...) managerial intentions’ and suggest that ‘the intended symbolism in corporate buildings is commonly known by organizational members’ [ibid:43]. This is used as a point in my analysis of how these physical settings as an outcome of managerial action co-construct identity.

**Website, poster, and logo**

For the purpose of looking at how identity is co-constructed by the website, posters, and logo of CFF and the festivals, I have found the work of Baruch relevant [2006]. She focuses on the logo; ‘a symbolic, graphic artifact aiming to produce a certain image of an organization, to convey a message’ and how ‘it also serves as a vehicle to help build both a self-image and group identity of the group members’ conveying distinctiveness to these [ibid:182]. This way ‘the logo is part of a collective of symbols and artifacts that help to generate an organizational identity’ [ibid.] and further it ‘helps to link present with past and provides a compelling image that maintains a sense of identity [Baruch 2006:185]. I will apply her work broadly on logo, website, and posters looking at how they ‘[help] enact a shared reality and sensemaking of the organization to internal members’ [ibid:186].

I will use the theory of Berg and Kreiner, Gagliardi, and Baruch in *analysis 1b*.

* 

I will now present the theory on storytelling which is both relevant for the cultural - and the process perspective. Subsequently I will present the process perspective.

### 2.6.2.2. Storytelling as an analytical tool

Storytelling in organisations is approached in various ways [Boje 2001;Chreim 2007] and can, as mentioned in the introduction, be both a matter of ‘narrating the organisation’, of taking a narrative approach to collecting data, and as an analytical tool. Elaborating on the latter this thesis will use two main definitions thus two analytical tools; one is termed *narrative* and the other termed *story*. This is not a clear distinction within the narrative literature but I will use it for the purpose of distinguishing between a more structured story, the *narrative*, and a more unstructured story, the
story. This is in accordance with my two ‘lenses’ on identity. I will start out by elaborating on the narrative definition.

**Narratives**

Stories are ‘narratives with plots and characters, generating emotion in narrator and audience, through a poetic elaboration of symbolic material. This material may be a product of fantasy or experience, including an experience of earlier narratives. Story plots entail conflicts, predicaments, trials and crises which call for choices, decisions, actions and interactions, whose actual outcomes are often at odds with the characters’ intentions and purposes’ [Gabriel 2000:239].

This structural definition focusing on plot, motive, and characters has proven to be useful in my analysis of OI through storytelling since it allows for looking at the stories my informants share when they ‘organize [their] experience and [their] memory of what have happened (...) in the form of narrative’ [Søderberg 2003:8] and thus infuse these with collective meaning.

I have used narrative analysis in order to gain access to accounts of identity as these were displayed in the interviews, thus ‘seeking to unmask the hidden symbolism of stories, reading them as depositories of meanings and expressions of (...) social realities’ [Gabriel 2000:15-16] and seen the interviews as ‘spaces within organizations that are sheltered from direct controls and from mainstream values of rationality (…); the unmanaged organization’ [ibid:131]. Again, these narratives as expressions of shared storytelling which I have detected in my interview material, I have firstly co-constructed and then analysed.

A model used for this purpose is the *Actantial Model* originally developed by Algirdas J. Greimas in 1966 and applied by for instance by Søderberg [2003]. I will use her presentation of the model to guide my structural analysis of the *narratives*. The model is structural in the sense that it focuses on the structures of - and actants in - the *narrative* thus unfolding the underlying plot [Søderberg 2003]. Six actants assume the roles of: power, object, receiver, helper, subject, and opponent [ibid.] that are all playing a part in the narrative either by action or inaction, opposition or helping. Basically Søderberg’s model is built up
like a fairytale; ‘a prince who combats an evil dragon to free a princess, after which he receives her hand in marriage from her father, the king’.

The actants can be both human beings, abstraction, and institutions, for instance when I apply it, the object-actant takes shape of ‘reaching a certain state’ that is; becoming part of a forced merger [ibid.]. By applying the model one ‘can elucidate how employees and managers understand organizational change processes after an acquisition, throwing light on changing interpretations of the role of various actors as well as of challenges facing the organization’ [ibid:12]. I apply the model in order to focus at the members’ interpretation of the merger process.

The analysis on the narratives further draws on the work of Gabriel on epic and tragic stories [2000]. Gabriel sees the narrative as a folkloric element part of organisational culture [ibid.]. He takes a structuralist approach focusing on how the stories are plotted and draws on a folkloric universe of - among others - heroes, victims, and villains [ibid.]. Building upon an extensive study of 404 narratives in organisations he presents different types of stories which each have a ‘poetic mode’, that is, different ways of ‘infusing meaning into events’ [ibid:60]. The epic story with either a hero as protagonist of or leading act in the story focuses ‘on agency and in particular on noble or heroic achievements, such as missions accomplished, contests won, challenges met, or crisis resolved’. It may ‘spring from dramas and crisis, but (...) highlights the resolution of the crisis’ [ibid:74]. The epic story further attributes guilt to the villain however it may be undermined by ‘finding a way of presenting the victim as (...) a victim of his or her own actions [ibid:83]. The application of this epic story model is applied for the purpose of focusing the analysis on the members’ interpretation of the management of CFF.

I will use the specified narrative models of Søderberg (the actantial model) and Gabriel (epic and tragic story) in analysis 1a.

Stories

The other definition of story that I will present here in order to apply it in my analysis is a more fragmented type than the narrative.

‘Story resists narrative. (...) The folk of organizations inhabit storytelling spaces outside plot, not tidy and rationalized spaces. (...) [A] sensemaking to lived experience before the narrative requirements of beginnings, middles or endings’ [Boje 2001:2,4].

[27]
This definition has proven useful in addition to the narrative definition in *analysis 1* and when analysing how my informants make sense of different processes within the PmIP (*analysis 2*). In this definition I further assume that CFF is a ‘collective storytelling system in which the performance of stories is a key part of members’ sense-making and a means to allow them to supplement individual memories with institutional memory’ [Boje 1991:106]. Stories are then narratives coming into existence – a sensemaking process – and ‘storytelling organisations are antenarrative, existing to tell their collective stories, to live out their collective stories, to be in constant struggle over getting stories of insiders and outsiders straight. It is a sensemaking that is coming into being, but not finished or concluded, in narrative retrospection’ [Boje 2001:4].

This definition allows me to understand how identity is being constructed in negotiation among the members of CFF.

I will further supplement the definition of story with the tool ‘linguistic labels and metaphors’ which are ‘verbal inventions (…) [or] verbal tools used to build shared meaning’ by classifying and telling ‘what things are’ and ‘how things are’ [Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges 1990:339-340, *italics in original*]. I will use the term ‘linguistic artifact’ for this tool. Moreover, it is a part of the differentiation perspective I take on culture [Martin 2002] and is a more dynamic definition which lends itself more to the process perspective which I will present shortly.

I use stories as an analytical tool in both analyses.

* 

Throughout the thesis I will distinguish between the two definitions by terming them *narrative, story (and linguistic artifact)*. When considering them collectively I will use the term *storytelling*.

**2.6.2.3. The process perspective on identity**

As written in the introduction the process perspective is applied broadly in the analysis. The perspective is focusing on identity as a process and not as a stable phenomenon [Hatch and Yanow 2003]. The process perspective is particularly relevant for *analysis 2* where I look at how members make sense of the processes of collaboration and competition. However, in both analyses I apply sensemaking as an analytical tool.

Weick has been a major influence on the process perspective with his focus on ‘lived experience and socially constructed reality’ [ibid:75] and his verb ‘organizing’ over the noun ‘organization’
Balancing distinctiveness and synergies

[Weick 1995:72]. He stresses action and dynamics as constructing meaning. Identity in this view is thus a product these interactions infer.

Sensemaking

Sensemaking is stressed as ‘a developing set of ideas rather than a body of knowledge’ [Weick 1995:1] and has (at least) seven properties, it is; ‘grounded in identity construction, retrospective, enactive of sensible environments, social, ongoing, focused and extracted by cues, and driven by plausibility rather than accuracy’ [ibid:17]. It is a way of explaining surprises and the unknown by putting it into the frameworks formed by previous experience and through this creating meaning [Weick 1995]. Further ‘sensemaking is about people generating what they interpret’ [ibid:10] and it is thus an active process where reality is constructed and it is different from interpretation because it demands action and ‘focus on process’ [Weick 1995:13]. However, sensemaking is a collective action of meaning construction because it happens through ‘enactment’ where people through joint actions create shared interpretations, ‘selection’ where some of these interpretations are maintained, and ‘retention’ where these interpretations become frames for action [ibid]. ‘Frames tend to be past moments of socialization and cues tend to be present moments of experience’ [Weick 1995:111].

Sensemaking is an access for me as a researcher to understand how members in CFF ascribe meaning to the PmIP and construct OI.

* * *

In this chapter I have presented the concepts and theories relevant for - and applied to - my case. By drawing on several approaches to OI I look at how CFF engage in ‘identity work’ [Reff Pedersen and Strandgaard Pedersen 2008] and how this work is both a mechanism of the unmanaged organisation and the managed organisation [ibid.; Gabriel 2000]. Furthermore the process perspective is linked to the cultural perspective since ‘interpretation and symbolization, along with manifestation and realization, describe a continuous dynamic state within which members forge their cultural influences and respond to them’ [Hatch and Yanow 2003:75]. Hence, by using both I aim to provide an in-depth understanding of the PmIP in CFF and the question of collective identity.
Chapter 3. Background and cases

Based on information from my interviews, literature, documents, and newspaper articles I will in this chapter provide background for the cases and further present them. Firstly, I will describe the film festival as a phenomenon and discuss its presence within the cultural-creative industries. Secondly, I will provide a brief presentation of DFI and the Danish film festivals. Thirdly, I will introduce the film festivals and the secretariat within CFF and finally I will describe different work processes as well as structural and financial processes relevant for the analysis in chapter 4.

3.1. Film festivals and the cultural-creative industries

There are roughly estimated around 3500 film festivals in the world [Mazza and Strandgaard Pedersen 2010]. A film festival is typically an annual event running for 2-10 days screening films in one or more venues, most often cinemas. The film festival is belonging to a genre; feature film, documentary, short film, gay and lesbian etc. and can include several series and programmes with focus points and themes changing from year to year. The large international film festivals are accredited by FIAPF10 [‘50 international... ’ n.d.]. 50 international film festivals are, at the time of writing, accredited [ibid.]. These, and a great deal of non-accredited festivals as well, will typically along with their public screenings and other events, include a film market which brings together industry players for financing, buying and selling films as well as networking, developing talent, and diffusing knowledge. The accredited festivals furthermore often contain more festivals; besides the main programme which is often feature film they have a children’s programme, a documentary programme etc. The three film festivals under CFF are not accredited by FIAPF.

One of the drivers for film festivals is their function as a distribution channel to the public. The gatekeepers [Caves 2000] deciding which films to screen in cinemas are often huge corporations like Sony. There exist other rules for screening during festivals which makes it possible to screen otherwise inaccessible productions. A screening during a festival might thus be the only chance for the audience to see a film and for the producers to sell it. The film in question might not even be released on DVD [FD]. Another important feature of film festivals which has come into focus during the recent years is the element of awards. ‘Film festivals are seen as a specific type of events

10 International Federation of Film Producers Association
and award ceremonies, operating as a meeting place for art and business and identity building [Ooi and Strandgaard Pedersen 2010:8]. Film festivals ‘accommodate culture and commerce, experimentation and entertainment, geopolitical interest and global funding [De Valck 2007:16]. Organising festivals include a complex set of tasks; organising for risk, financing, creative work in programming, settling the graphic layout, professional marketing and PR etc. At the same time festivals need to manage multiple stakeholders [Rüling and Strandgaard Pedersen 2010].

Film festivals are a part of the experience economy within the sub category ‘events’ [Christensen 2009] and ‘unlike cultural institutions as museums the event is a single phenomenon or a periodic recurrent event’ [ibid:138, MT]. The experience economy is the generic term for the industries selling experience products [Christensen 2009]. Experience products and thus events are increasingly being addressed as drivers for growth under the term ‘experience economy’ [see e.g. Bille and Lorenzen 2008; Christensen 2009]. The planning and production of film festivals is organised around projects. This is to a large extent an outcome of the financing of festivals through public and private funding and sponsorships since these rarely support operations but instead support projects. Furthermore, the great amount of temporary employees involved (both paid and voluntary) characterizes the film festival as temporary yet the core organisation is rather stationary [Modig 2007]. As a cultural product a festival is non-utilitarian [Lampel et al. 2000] implying that the quality of it is subjective and thus not objectively measurable. Furthermore, being a part of the cultural-creative industries the film festivals are operating within an uncertain environment with uncertain demand [Caves 2000]. Another characteristic is the value chain of a film festival; the festival as such is a unique product of a complex process of coordinating various skills and activities. This complex input of skills in the value chain has been termed by Caves the motley crew [ibid.].

* 

The film festival is a complex phenomenon consisting of various elements, approaching various and diversified audience, and is created and carried out by a motley crew team. It combines artistic values and business processes and in this way carries economic and artistic interest at the same time. It can be placed within the creative industries and has features of both a temporary and a stationary organisation.
3.2. The Danish festivals

The Danish film industry is characterised by being highly subsidised [DFI 2009]. The Danish Film Institute (DFI) is the central actor within the Danish film industry [Eskjær 2009]. DFI - as a governmental body under The Danish Ministry for Culture - administers the significant amount of subsidy granted to the film industry each year. In 2009 the amount granted for short –, documentary -, and feature film festivals was 5,3M DKK [DFI 2009].

There are 10 film festivals in Denmark [Visit Denmark 2009] and, apart from my three cases, the rest are based entirely on volunteerism or are collaborations between a municipality and the local business community. Five of the festivals are based in Copenhagen and the rest located across the country from Bornholm to Frederikshavn. They cover feature, documentary, and shorts (including music videos and commercials) within film genres as for instance children & youth, Nordic film culture, and gay & lesbian.

3.3. Presentation of CFF

The remainder of this chapter describes the establishment and structure of CFF. Moreover the film festivals are presented with focus on their history, structure, and profile. Then a brief description of the process of the merger is given and finally an overview over relevant organisational processes within CFF is presented.

3.3.1. Copenhagen Film Festivals

The foundation Copenhagen Film Festivals (CFF) was established April 1st 2008 [Møller 2008] and is the legal body of the three festivals CPH:DOX, Buster, and CPH PIX [CFF 2008]. (See appendix I for an overview).

The present festival director of CFF took over May 1st 2009 from the first CEO of the foundation [Benner 2009]. The latter was given a vote of no confidence from the employees, handed in to the board in December 2008 [Enggard 2009a;Ditlevsen 2009]. According to the media he resigned June 1st 2009 due to a wish to engage himself in more creative tasks stating that his current position was too administrative and that he had realised he had not found his niche there [Ditlevsen 2009]. However, the board was already given notice on his wish to resign at the turn of the year 2008 [CFF 2008]. The present CEO has previously been employed at DFI where he was actively involved in the merger process between the festivals [CEO].
The foundation consists of the secretariat; the CEO, the head of marketing, the head of production (former Head of Secretariat of Natfilmfestivalen), the financial manager, and the board. The three festivals are legally organised under CFF as projects and are each headed by a festival director. The joint marketing -, accountant, and producer positions were created with the establishment of CFF.

3.3.2. CPH PIX

The feature film festival was established in autumn 2008 as an outcome of the merger of Natfilmfestivalen and CIFF. CPH PIX (abbr. PIX) was held April 16-26 2009 for the first time ['Ny Filmfestival ... ’ 2008]. PIX draws on the experience of its predecessors Natfilmfestivalen and Copenhagen International Film Festival, however, it has a new profile focusing on ‘new talents and artistic bravery’ [CPH PIX n.d.]. During the festival PIX screens 180 films [Jensen 2010]. A significant award, the New Talent Grand PIX, of 50.000 Euro is awarded each year. The festival has three permanent employees and is headed by the Festival Director, who is former programme director of CIFF. The budget of PIX is 6-7M DKK and half is subsidy [CEO;FD]. In the first year of PIX’s existence 1 million DKK were spent on marketing and numerous strategic partnerships were joined. The value of the marketing expenses is assessed to 8 million DKK and 20% more tickets than expected were sold [Ingemann 2009].

PIX is as mentioned a merger between two former Copenhagen based feature film festivals. These are briefly presented in the following sections.

Natfilmfestivalen

Being carried out in 1990 for the first time and running until 2008 makes Natfilmfestivalen (NFF) the longest running feature film festival in Denmark with 19 festivals held. It was a highly popular festival among the audience with on average 35.000 tickets sold annually with an average budget on 3-4M DKK [HP]. The name was taken because of the sponsorship by Carlsberg and their slogan ‘The night is black as gold’ referring to the strong beer ‘Black Gold’ [HP]. Realising that the cinemas were empty at night made them a perfect (and inexpensive) time for screening the films [HP]. It was however only in the first years that the films were shown in the middle of the night [FD]. NFF is described as a grass roots festival [Møller 2005; ‘Towards the... ’ 2006; Monggaard 2008]. The profile of the festival was off-beat and focused on underground films from all over the world. Films of ‘sex, violence, and midnight roar’ [FD] as an informant puts it, however stressing that NFF also presented films of other niches. NFF had no industry platform and solely addressed
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the audience. The festival had, besides in Copenhagen, minor screenings in Odense, Ålborg, and Århus. The festival was from 1994 run by Andreas Steinmann and Kim Foss who worked as respectively a graphic and a reviewer. They were paid three months salary per festival but worked on their passion of making NFF throughout the year [HP].

_Copenhagen International Film Festival_

As an addition to the feature film festival scene in Denmark, Copenhagen International Film Festival (CIFF) was established in 2002 with the first festival taking place in August 2003 and the last in 2007. The audience number peaked at 25,000 in 2007 [Pedersen 2009]. The budget of the festival was 8M DKK. The aim of festival and the legitimising element was to create a Danish International Film Festival that could embrace and attract the international industry and audience. The artistic profile aimed from 2005 to 2007 primarily at European film [Hansen 2005]. The Capital Committee of Development[^11^] donated the money and the start-up was led by Janne Giese. The festival had troubles getting started and through its 5-year long existence battles were fought in media and on industry – as well as political level on its legitimacy on the film festival scene. Mishaps, blown up by the media, on for instance false report on ticket sales worsened the tension [e.g. Enggard 2008]. CIFF - albeit challenged on audience numbers - was perceived as administratively strong [FD;FD;HP]. Buster was in 2007 placed under and moved in with the CIFF foundation [Eising 2005].

3.3.3. CPH:DOX*

The documentary festival (abbr. DOX) was founded as a project under NFF in 2003 by initiative of NFF and the festival director. The latter was working at DFI at that time and they agreed on her spending three months a year to work on the festival from her office in Gothersgade. The festival had an expected audience number of 1200 the first year but succeeded in getting a surprising 14,000 audience [CPH:DOXa]. The number has been growing ever since peaking at 37,000 last year [ibid.]. DOX has not been physically placed with NFF but has had its own office space. DOX has eight permanent employees. The festival takes place in November, screens 180 documentary films from around the world, and has a budget of 6-7M. Their programme goes _‘beyond traditional boundaries between disciplines and media, offering perspectives on creative crossovers between cinema, television and media art and seeks to bridge the documentary approach to reality (...) to a wide range of related art forms on the music scene and in the visual_

arts [CPH:DOXb]. A key characteristic of the festival is the abundance of events arranged around the documentaries during the festival as well as the year passing between the festivals. For instance DOX:BIO which screens documentaries in cinemas nationwide and they also collaborate with various events and venues\(^\text{12}\). The aim is to attract a younger and bigger audience [DR P1, November 5, 2009]. DOX is considered as one of the most important documentary festivals in Scandinavia [CEO;FD].

3.3.4. Buster

Buster was founded in 2000 by The Danish Film Institute in collaboration with a number of private and public organisations\(^\text{13}\). In 2007 the festival became independent but due to economical problems it was placed under CIFF by The Danish Film Institute; they moved in together and shared their marketing - and sponsor division [Eising 2005] and the festival was now run and administrated by the foundation of CIFF [Enggard 2007] in Gothersgade in central Copenhagen. The festival director is the third director in the history of Buster. The festival has four permanent employees. Buster is, with their programme, targeting the children and youth up until the age of 17, however their competition Oregon is for film creators up until the age of 20. Regarding the profile: ‘Buster’s films are funny, unique, thought-provoking, sad, dramatic, lively and captivating. To put it briefly: quality film in all genres. The films range far and wide: from minor productions to great entertainment, from serious documentaries to incisive shorts’ [Buster 2009]. Buster screens 120 films and has a budget of 5-6M DKK. The festival is among the top five international festivals for children and youth [Schiøt 2008].

3.3.5. The process of the merger

As described in the introduction (1.1. and 1.2.) the process of merging the two foundations was long and hard. The press covered the situation starting with the establishment of CIFF back in 2003 heavily stressing the tension and political pressure for consolidation of the two festivals; CIFF and NFF [e.g. Eising 2004b; Møller 2005; Dahlgaard 2006; Dubgaard 2007; Jensen 2006; Møller 2007; Finnedal and Møller 2007; Bo 2008; Benner 2009]. The Chairman of the Board of NFF commented on the process after the merger and stressed that the fight presented in the media did not correspond to the reality of the boards of the respective festivals [Bo 2008].

\(^{12}\) For instance DOX collaborates with CopenHell, a metal music festival held in June 2010, on DOX:HELL; a cinema opening in closed down factory shop next to the festival area showing metal music documentaries.

\(^{13}\) The Danish Film School, Denmark’s Radio’s Children - and Youth Department, Danish Children – and Youth Film Clubs, Nordisk Film Cinemas, Nordisk Film Junior, Dagbladet Politiken, Byens Børn, and Tinderbox A/S.
Several critical incidents affected the process of merging the festivals. For instance, the Municipality of Copenhagen addressed NFF and asked them to draw up a proposal for how to merge the festivals [Eising 2004a; Jensen 2006; HP]. CIFF was not informed of this and it caused a period of turbulence [HP; FD]. As mentioned the Culture - and Leisure Committee made the subsidies dependent on a consolidation of the four festivals [KFU 2007] and the process of forming further collaboration between the festivals was initiated [HP; FD]. The two boards initiated a series of meetings lasting one and a half years discussing the strategic aspects of a merger [Bo 2008; HP]. In these meetings two members from each board negotiated, discussing which elements from respectively CIFF and NFF should be represented in the new PIX. According to an informant they were very on guards with each other in order to not either be cheated or give away valuable secrets on their festivals and cautious about not letting the merged festival be either too Natfilm- or too CIFF-ish [HP]. A mediator finally was hired for six months [Bo 2008] and in February 2008 a press release announced the agreement: The two foundations were to merge and form an umbrella organisation, one feature film festival would replace the two feature film festivals, and Buster and DOX would enter into the consolidation along with the new festival. The festivals could not agree on an administrative head of CFF, thus the board ended up deciding on the former CEO [FD] who had not previously been involved in the festivals.

3.3.6. Organising within CFF

In the following I present a brief overview of how CFF is organised in order to provide a background for the themes, structures, processes, and events featuring in the analysis.

Structure and processes

The management group in CFF consists of the CEO, the marketing and sponsor director, the head of production, and the three festival directors.

Besides the core staff as described in the previous section each festival takes in interns and volunteers and moreover hire freelancers and other project workers to work on the festivals each year [FD; FD]. The interns are typically involved for three months [FD]. Funding and employment of temporary staff are closely connected; since the festivals’ budgets change from year to year employment is different from year to year [FD].

Regular meetings take place across the festivals. Once a week the management group have a meeting. The festivals hold separate meetings every week and a programme committee consisting
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of the programming staff of each festival meet up approximately once every two weeks and coordinate films in order to keep the programmes distinct.

Within CFF a marketing division is functioning across the festivals with the marketing and sponsor director in charge collaborating with the three marketing assistants from Buster, PIX, and DOX. Initially, all marketing staff would engage in a meeting every once a month however these joint meetings were postponed indefinitely in 2008 [HSM;HP]. A bipartite marketing strategy of dividing CFFs interface into two was initiated in spring 2009 [CEO;FD]. From that moment on audience, specific industry players, and private sponsors would be approached by the three festivals respectively. Concurrently the political scene and thus the major funders would be approached by the joint representation of CFF, with the aim of appearing as a strong, more professional cultural organization [CEO].

The festivals generally have their own employees, interns, freelancers, and volunteers; however, in 2009 a joint volunteer recruitment was launched [CEO;FD]. Some permanent staff has over time moved between the festivals. The head of production produces for all three festivals. Initiatives have been taken to develop technology which can be used across the festivals for screening etc. under the festivals [HP;FD]. A data base exists for each of the festivals; however it is built up almost the same way [HP].

In Farimagsgade where CFF had offices from summer 2008 the offices were scattered across a larger complex and every festival had its own, secluded office space. CFF moved to new premises in spring 2010 which entailed a different allocation of offices between the festivals and secretariat. Instead of having their own, separate office space within a larger complex the festivals and the secretariat are now with their permanent employees assembled in one corridor at 2nd floor. On 1st floor there are offices for temporary employees and production facilities where the festivals move into when their festival is approaching [FD].

The festivals take place in April (PIX), September (Buster), and November (DOX). According to informants this solution is not optimal since Buster and DOX are very close [CEO;FD]. However they maintain the dates due to the dates of competitors, other international film festivals, and the dependence on cinemas [CEO].
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Finances, funding, sponsorship, and contracts

A general issue of concern for CFF is the uncertainty concerning future funding which distorts the strategic planning [CEO]. The yearly budget of the foundation is on average 20M DKK; half is public subsidy, the rest is private funds [CEO;CFF 2008;CFF 2009]. Publicly CFF is subsidised primarily by The Municipality of Copenhagen, The Ministry of Culture, and DFI [ibid.].

These major public subsidies are granted to CFF who then distributes them to the three festivals according to, inter alia, their income from tickets sales and possibilities of attracting sponsors and private funds [CEO;FD;FD]. These latter sponsors and private funds collaborate with and fund the festivals directly; for instance The Foundation of Marketing which in 2008 supported PIX by 4,5M DKK and also Nordea Fonden that has entered into a partnership with Buster involving a support of approx 5,9M DKK in the period 2009-2011 [CFF 2008]. Regarding ticket sales these vary among the festivals. Being a substantial income for PIX; ticket sales in 2009 amounting 37.000 equalled an income of 2M DKK covering one third of their budget [FD].This is important for PIX since it is harder for them to achieve funding [FD]. DOX has an attendance number almost as big as PIX (36.000 in 2009) but has a smaller income (1M DKK in 2009) on the ticket sales due to complementary tickets and free admission to some events [FD]. Buster’s ticket sales on approximately 31.000 in 2009 yielded a lower income due to low ticket prices. These prices are adapted to the audience which is mainly (77% in 2009, 85% in 2008) pupils and teachers from public schools having tight budgets [FD].

The three festivals have three different funding and sponsorship schemes. According to the CEO of CFF the festivals seek joint sponsors but experience that ‘the sponsors choose one festival over another just like that, that is, they are very picky in saying “what kind of festival goes with our profile’” [CEO]. DOX is because of its political focus, funded mainly by political institutions and does not attract many sponsors. In 2010 the partnership between PIX and the liquor company Jameson has, however, been negotiated to involve DOX as well [FD]. For Buster, with its focus on children and youth, opportunities for sponsorships are limited because there are ethics at play: ‘we have to be educational, we have to be approved by the teachers, we have to be good quality, we cannot be very commercial’ [FD].

On a general level the festivals have been affected by the financial crisis given its impact on sponsors, especially cash sponsors [CFF 2008].

So while the festivals aim at consolidating processes of fundraising and sponsoring they have to act upon the fact that the festivals have different possibilities and patterns in their quest for raising
money for the festivals. There is thus a limit to how centralised the application for funds, grants, and sponsorships can become given the festivals’ different audience and profiles.

Another level where synergies are sought is on the deals with suppliers. This is for instance hotels, taxis, and restaurant deals comprising all three festivals’ guests [HSM;FD;FD]. Some deals are however harder to enter into jointly. For instance the different size of screens used by the festivals and the differences in income from ticket sales limit the pursuit of synergies on cinema deals [FD].

*Working in the festivals*

When creating the programme the film festivals’ directors and head of programmes travel to festivals abroad where they watch 5-6 films a day [FD;FD;FD]. Besides this films are often handed out to all employees and the films are discussed informally as well as on planned meetings in (internal) programme committees [FD]. When a festival is coming up it is normal that people work extremely long hours. Another characteristic is that the employees ‘wear many caps’ [FD] and thus perform many different tasks in organising the film festivals.

When a festival is approaching, the festival team concerned move into the production facilities. These are basically offices with more room for the expanded festival staff and for the increased amount of posters, films and the like brought in and out up until and after a festival. It thus also matters whether there is easy access to the offices [FD;FD].

Setting the team for the festivals; size and configuration, is each year a puzzle: ‘every year we don’t know how much money we can get in and we can spend so we have to estimate... and then we estimate including the employees and stuff and later - three-four months before our festivals - we have to find out if we can afford it or not... then we cut down either the budgets from the festival or from the employees’ [FD]. Furthermore, because people are often temporarily employed the festival directors cannot be certain that they can hire the same freelancers again. Freelancers who had otherwise gained valuable knowledge and whose qualifications were maybe fitting perfectly with the festival team [FD].

* 

In this chapter I have provided the empirical background for the analysis. Firstly, my case was contextualised by describing the film festival as a phenomenon and its place within the cultural-creative industries and further within the Danish film festival scene. The chapter was completed by
a case description of CFF, an overview of the process of the merger, and the way CFF is organised for the purpose of the analysis.
Chapter 4. Analysis

The previous chapter provided a contextual background on the festivals. I have thus set the scene for a context-specific case study and will in this chapter perform the interpretive analysis by presenting, interpreting, and analysing the findings of my interviews and other empirical data.

The analysis consists of two sub analyses structured by the sub questions of my research question. Firstly, how identity is constructed through cultural manifestations within CFF and secondly; how members\textsuperscript{14} are making sense of the processes of collaboration and competition. Despite their division - for purposes of a clear perspective - the analyses form a coherent answer to my research question. Furthermore, the analysis contains discussion elements; however, an overall discussion based on the two analyses will be taken in the subsequent chapter.

4.0. Prologue

Narrating is a fundamental human activity, a mode of thinking and being [Søderberg 2003:8]. When organisations experience change in their collective status there is need for new identification [Albert and Whetten 1985] and a new interpretive scheme; hence a need for sensemaking [Weick 1995]. What is needed then is ‘a good story’ [ibid:60-61] since storytelling is a process of making sense of actions, events and objects, or of explaining the relationships between them [ibid:7]. The PmIP in the case of CFF is full of narratives and stories which in interaction with other manifestations inform identity. How these different identity negotiations, sensemakings, stories, cues, and narratives unfold is the overall focal point of this analysis.

4.1. Analysis 1. Identity and cultural manifestations

\textit{Guided by sub question 1: How is identity constructed through cultural manifestations?}

\textsuperscript{14} It should be noted that when I write ‘members’ I refer to the secretariat, PIX, DOX, and Buster (cf. 2.2 for elaboration of level and unit of analysis).
In this section I will argue that CFF - by means of cultural manifestations such as stories, artifacts, and physical arrangements – construct a hybrid, holographic identity as well as fragmented collective identities. Firstly, I will focus on storytelling (1a) and secondly, physical arrangements and artifacts (1b).

4.1.1. Collective storytelling (1a)

My informants presented to me at the same time very different and very similar accounts of the merger processes. Different in the way that they were told from various perspectives (e.g. professions), in divergent styles (e.g. emotional or factual) and often differed in their interpretation; however they were similar in the sense that a pattern of ‘shared storytelling’ [Boyce 1995] and ‘collective storytelling’ [Borum and Reff Pedersen 2008] appeared. This collective discursive construction I see as representing shared values thus representing shared culture and shared features of identity. The stories I found were ‘representations of reality in their becoming’ [Søderberg 2003:14] and were both narratives and stories (cf. 2.6.2.2. for definitions of story). Stories are cultural manifestations [Martin 2002:55] and the interview material is not only ‘reflexions of individual experience but also (...) manifestations of cultural discourses already existing’ [Järvinen 2005:37]. Cultural manifestations operationalize culture [Martin 2002] and culture when shaping ‘answers to ‘who are we’’ informs and ‘contextualizes identity’ [Schultz et al. 2002:25]. By taking a structural approach and ‘focusing on the inherent structural foundation of the plots practitioners express orally’ [Søderberg 2003:14] I will attempt ‘narrating’ the post-merger process ‘by organizing this raw and fragmented material with the help of such devices as plot and characters’ [Czarniawska and Gagliardi 2003:VII]. There is thus a double narrative - and interpretive process; the informants telling their stories and ascribing meaning to events and I continuing the narrative and interpretive process through ‘narrating the organisation’ [Czarniawska 1997;Gabriel 2000].

Inspired by the stories and discourse of my informants as well as in the media on the merger I have constructed and structured this first part of my analysis as a family narrative\(^{15}\) of CFF and its ancestors. Through three narratives the identity of the ‘family’ as constructed by collective storytelling will be presented; 1) The forced marriage, 2) Parenting, and 3) The ancestors. Each narrative is consisting of several stories. In my search after how OI is collectively constructed these

\(^{15}\) By terming my presentation a family identity narrative and not a family identity chronicle I allow myself to decide on the order of events and interpretations as I present these in themes hence narrating the identity. However, the temporal aspect of narrative (which chronicle refers to) is inherent in the family identity narrative in the way I have analysed and interpreted the stories of my informants as well as how I construct narratives within the themes.
narratives reflect the collective, shared storytelling performed by the members in CFF since:

‘[o]rganizations’ identities are constituted by the identity-relevant narratives that their participants author about them. Identity-relevant narratives are stories about organizations that actors author in their efforts to understand, or make sense of, the collective entities with which they identify. From this perspective, collective identity is a discursive (rather than, for example, psychological) construct, and ‘resides’ in the collective identity stories that, for example, people tell to each other in their conversations, write into corporate histories, and encode on websites [Brown 2006:734].

In concert the stories of identity thus form the OI. Emphasis is – as explained earlier - on what is collective and shared; however, the analysis will also make use of more ambiguous stories with a perspective on ambiguity and nuances in the storytelling since OI resembles:

“a fabric that is in a constant state of becoming, unravelling in some areas, embroidered over in others. At times much of the fabric may appear relatively coherent and consistent, as consensus on the meaning of important actions and events dominates, while at other times the fabric may take on a knotted or frayed character as different individuals and groups contest narratively what is truly distinctive or really enduring about their organization” [Brown 2006:735].

Thus I start each narrative by looking at what is shared within CFF (consensus on an organisational level) and then I look at how interpretations of these narratives might differ between the (collective) members. After the themes have been presented I will further analyse and interpret the stories. Several narrative analytical tools will be applied when analysing and interpreting the storytelling and the context in which they are embedded. This way I will attempt understanding how the OI is constructed through storytelling.

The forced marriage

The process of merging the two foundations and establishing CFF can be presented as one overall narrative; ‘The forced marriage’, which in its basic form goes like this:

After an unfruitful competition between the two feature film festivals had been going on for several years The Municipality of Copenhagen backed up by DFI and The Ministry of Culture encouraged the festivals to
form some kind of collaboration in order to put a stop to the unfruitful competition going on and in order to pursue synergies and large-scale operation by forming a more professional organisation. Several incidents of e.g. breakdown in communications occurred that worsened the already tense relation between both the festivals and between the festivals' boards. The period was characterised by a lot of fighting between these and an unpleasant uncertainty. At one point The Municipality along with the other major funding bodies made their subsidies dependent on a merger; thus a process of forced marriage was initiated. The process dragged on since the boards in charge of working out the strategic plan for the new feature film festival and structure of the joint administration were very different in their approach to the negotiations and had difficulties in finding common ground. As a part of merging the festivals a joint and extended secretariat was established.

Hence a consensual interpretation on the merger exists where the festivals are seen as being forced into marriage. If they did not join forces subsidies would be withdrawn. The decision was out of their hands; e.g. ‘the history was also that it wasn’t a voluntary merger (...) because we were forced to do it... [it was] a political decision, so there was nothing to do really’ [FD] and ‘I was kind of, well, those political decisions; I can be in total disagreement but hey if I can’t really have an influence on them then I can manage to keep my mouth shut, you see, and keep my opinion to myself” [FD]. The festivals describe the process as very uncertain, e.g.; ‘people [were] at the NFF office and not least at the DOX office very nervous about what would happen and what it would mean for the festivals, for employment, for economy’ [HP] and on the future prospects of CFF it is added: ‘some say that it (stabilising the merger) takes five-ten [years]... I don’t know... then they separate us again maybe, I don’t know. Because the thing is that it is a political decision, it’s not a decision from the festival’ [FD].

Having presented the shared interpretation of ‘The forced marriage’ there are smaller stories as for instance ‘Becoming family’ which is in line with the family discourse; e.g. ‘(W)e are not really free any longer because we are one big family (...) one big culture we are supposed to be but when we are three different festivals with three different identities and three different audience groups then (...) it takes time, it’s not easy’ [FD].

Some variances across the members’ stories are worth mentioning. On e.g. whether possibilities could be seen in the new constellation; ‘off-hand we were not especially interested in becoming part of this new construction’ [FD] and in contrast CFF is described as ‘obvious (...) [and] it’s a giant advantage that we in a small city like Copenhagen (...) aren’t placed three different places throughout the city fighting for the same’ [FD] and ‘the idea was good on paper. I believed it
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actually also at the start that we could do it. We can probably still do it but it’s not easy’ [FD].

Another nuance is that the first CEO was hired ‘since we [the festivals] could not agree who should represent us (...)’ [FD], this way ascribing some sort of co-responsibility of the festivals. (I will conduct further interpretation shortly).

Parenting – symbolic leadership

The management of the post-merger process can be presented as one overall narrative ‘parenting’ on the basis of all my informants’ accounts, which in its basic form goes like this:

After the forced merger an administration was added on top of the festivals. The first CEO was hired by the Chairman of the Board. He was from the theatre world and did not know enough about film. He was wrongly promised an artistic responsibility and he tried to form a corporate organisation by ascribing CFF a central role and streamlining the names of the festivals. The festivals were highly against it. The CEO had difficulties in raising the money for the joint administration of the festivals. The organisation ended up in severe financial difficulties. He resigned. A new CEO was hired. He is respected and understands the dynamics of the film festivals better, has seized control over the financial situation, and creates room for distinctiveness as well as the pursuit of synergies.

This overall narrative is thus my interpretation of how the organisational members construct and share interpretations of the organisational events concerning the management of the postmerger integration process.

It further contains smaller, inherent stories. One is ‘Claiming artistic responsibility’, where my informants share the interpretation that the former CEO was promised a wrong job and that the job description crossed the line of autonomy of the festivals by granting him artistic responsibility. The story is exemplified here by an informant: ‘it just wasn’t the right CEO who had been chosen (...) it was totally unrealistic – it was just as if you had asked me (festival director) to take the job – [the former CEO] was interested in content, right? So he had an idea about entering into the strategic development of each festival (...) and he had asked to become administrative and artistic CEO (...) which meant that he became a CEO in an environment of resistance (...). He had just been offered the wrong job’ [FD]. Besides being a story stressing an artistic identity claim this is also one of many examples on sensemaking; the ‘interruption’ [Weick 1995:4] that the CEO wants to become ‘administrative and artistic CEO’ triggers the sensemaking.
Another story is ‘Streamlining the names’ in which my informants present the incident where
the former CEO suggested naming the new feature film festival CPH:PIX and renaming Buster
CPH:KIDZ trying to create a corporate identity. He ‘really wanted this CFF to be something’ [FD].
The story has two different morals depending on who tells it. One draws on an argument of
distinctiveness; e.g. ‘it was maybe not the wisest decision when there was already something called
CPH:DOX and which they all thought was a cool name, right? Why would you then make up
something which was almost the same?’ [FD], ’if we look to much alike then it will be one (…) 
branding hell you know? [FD] and ‘it’s like Telia with Telia Home, Telia Trio and Telia…” [FD] and
another draws on a more joint and synergy pursuing argument; ‘it wasn’t me picking that name
(…) but I had nothing in particular against it – I did think that it was an obvious thing that there
was (…) some name features reappearing and I thought it stood out after all’ [FD]. There are thus
both interpretations drawing on a utilitarian-oriented logic and others on artistic-oriented logic in
this story; however, generally the claims address an artistic identity.

The next story I will present within the narrative of ‘Parenting’ is ‘The new CEO’ which
manifests itself as a significant event for my informants and also to some extent marks a positive
shift in the integration process thus putting an end to the uncertain period following the forced
marriage; ‘then when [the CEO] entered (…) everything changed a lot because he is an experienced
person and because he understands his role and because he is a good personnel manager (…) it
gives a totally different peace to work having a guy like him’ [FD] and ‘I think the greatest turning
point is definitely that [the CEO] has become CEO (…) [because of] his professional skills as well
as his personality (…) what is needed is a more pragmatic, rational, and at the same time fatherly
figure’ [HSM]. Because what should a CEO do? ‘(M)anaging administration and personnel and
clean up the economy’ [FD] and ‘[The CEO] is like; it [CFF] is not something [FD]. The members
further describe him as a one they can ask for advice but who grants them liberty in taking decisions
for their festivals.

A fourth and last story is on ‘Family members’ which is a story where the members can be seen
as constructing the festivals as siblings, for instance; Buster as the ‘little brother’; ‘Buster is … they
see themselves as the little festival’ [HSM], and DOX as the ‘teenager’; ‘they don’t really want to
be seen with the rest of the family in public (laughs)’ [FD].

The narrative of parenting and the stories presented in this paragraph will be further interpreted
shortly.
The ancestors

Other shared stories are about the ‘old days’ of NFF and CIFF.

There were two families; the NFF family and the CIFF family. It all began with NFF which had been started by entrepreneurial forces back in 1989 seizing the possibility of showing films at night in the cinemas. The festival was successful for many years drawing on both a grassroots profile and way of organising. In 2000 Buster was launched by DFI and a range of public institutions. In 2002 DOX was launched by NFF in collaboration with DFI and at the same time CIFF was, backed by political favour, started by some other entrepreneurial powers but with another aim, with a more professional organisation, and with another more international agenda of red carpets. Buster became a part of CIFF in 2007.

This is the narrative on the ancestors. Within it there are stories and linguistic artifacts. E.g. the original festivals are often described as ‘families’ in this way also comprising of DOX and Buster, respectively; ‘I didn’t know if I should like this one... you know, this family or the other family but they had so many problems from the old days - they had been competing so much – they hated each other so much that it was a very, very tough period standing in the middle’ [FD]. A narrative element that this quote also highlights is the ‘fighting between the families’ because ‘there was a lot of fighting’ [CEO]. However, how are the families different? The NFF family which is NFF and DOX is discursively constructed in the stories as ‘grassroots’; for instance in these examples; ‘especially NFF which was sort of grassroots’ [CEO] and ‘they came from the old NFF which was really a more underground- and grassroots-like festival’ [HSM] and Natfilm ‘was kind of grown out of nothing and we were friends with our board’ [HP; emphasis added]. Moreover, the NFF family is described as ‘authentic’; e.g. in this quote that also exemplifies the ‘grassroots’; ‘even though it has come to be a very big festival then it is grown out of the underground and its whole identity is built upon a great authenticity in relation to the underground (...) [a] political underground and a (...) music underground and an artist underground which has made DOX the success it is [FD]. In comparison CIFF is described more as ‘red carpets’ [CEO;EMP], as ‘a culture-political project and (...) blue-ribbon-something-Princess-Alexandra-kind of thing’, right?’ [FD], and also as ‘a much more commercial and traditionally managed endeavour with a board that held meetings and a director’ [HP; emphasis added]. The CIFF family is furthermore described more as ‘administratively clever’ [HSM;FD;EMP], as ‘by far better administrated (...) than [NFF] (...) [and] it (evaluation) was something I was used to doing at CIFF’” [FD]. Moreover;
Stories are also about the complexity of the new organisation versus the old NFF where knowledge had become ‘tacit’ and everyone knew every aspect of the festival: ‘everything took place very implicitly (..) they had done it so many times before that they didn’t even have to speak to each other’ [HSM], ‘we came in the morning and sat down by our machines – we knew exactly what to do and got to it and then we left at night and had maybe said (...) a few sentences to each other’, and ‘because I come from a small handful of people where everybody knew everything – where all decisions were taken jointly – if the phone rang; everyone could reply on anything because you knew these are the deals we have made... [HP].

These stories - where some are better described as linguistic artifacts [Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges 1990] (‘grass roots’ equals NFF, ‘family’ as a metaphor) - are used throughout my informants’ accounts as descriptors of identity. For instance PIX is described as having ‘an NFF profile’ but at the same time it is described as having ‘CIFF administration’ and ‘if you look at the festival – the way it was carried out, it was more along the lines of NFF than CIFF. A small thing; there were no red carpets’ [CEO].

Other shared stories are more anecdotal in their presentation. For instance there is the story on an employee who has been a part of the festival since the beginning; on how he ‘never sleeps’ [EMP;FD, observation notes, March 3 2010, PIX joint meeting], and ‘when he drove all the way to Eastern Germany to pick up films’ [EMP;HP] which both stress the entrepreneurial powers that started NFF and the dedication needed when making film festivals.

These are told by organisational members who were part of these old festivals but also by new organisational members. This way the story ‘travels’ [Gabriel 2000:13] and becomes a part of the identity and ‘the institutional memory system of the organisation’ [Boje 1991:106] and the old festivals’ ‘legacy identities’ [Walsh and Glynn 2008] to some extent persist by being continuously kept alive by being retold as collectively shared artefacts [ibid.].

Poetic modes

Reading the narrative of ‘The forced marriage’ through a typology of organisational stories allows me to analyse it by type and explain its significance [Gabriel 2000]. The narrative can be seen as constructed as a ‘tragic story’ leaving ‘lasting scars on their victims’ and by using this ‘poetic trope’ the members ascribe meaning to the merger [Gabriel 2000:60]. The members thus by portraying themselves as ‘undeserving victims’ in a plot which ‘can be summarised to a trauma (...)
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to [the] group’ stresses their non-existing possibilities of affecting the political decision and furthermore points to a shared storytelling of the organisations’ establishment [ibid:69,70]. However, on the other hand ‘a tragic story can be undermined by finding a way of (...) presenting a victim of his or her own actions’ [ibid:83] which was a nuance to the narrative described in the end of ‘The forced marriage’. Inspired by Søderberg’s [2003] use of Greima’s actantial model and lifting it to a collective storytelling level 'The forced marriage’ can furthermore be presented like a somewhat reverse fairytale.

By performing this analysis members can be understood as not constructing themselves as active subjects when experiencing the unpleasant merger process, but rather as receivers and as victims of a synergy pursuing strategy pushed through by The Municipality aided by other public institutions. With the boards pulling in one end of the rope and the public institutions in the other the festivals are seen as being unable to move; and further unable to affect the synergy-driven decision. Applying the adapted concept of Organisational Identity (cf. 2.6.1) to the narrative the festivals are seen as forced into the merger and this is thus the claimed central feature; we are here because we are forced to do it; the narrative is thus a part of the collective identity of the CFF claiming their status as victims as a central part of their collective identity. Moreover the narrative of the forced marriage stresses the uncertain position of the festivals as subjects to a political system, claiming uncertainty about the claimed enduring features of the organisation. The claimed distinctive features of CFF in this narrative are business-oriented stressing synergies, professionalization, and large-scale operations. The OI constructed in this narrative is hence based on a more utilitarian logic.

As a contrast to the tragic story an epic story of leadership is constructed ‘focusing on struggle, achievement, and victory’ [Gabriel 2000:146]. Firstly, the first CEO is cast as the villain causing the struggle by crossing the line between both autonomy versus corporate and distinctiveness versus synergy [Gabriel 2000]. Secondly, the present CEO is cast as the hero who achieves restoring the balance by giving back autonomy to the festivals (on artistic content). Thus a story of artistic victory and heroic agency is created [ibid.]. The OI constructed in this narrative is – symbolized by the achievement - focusing on preservation of artistic content and distinctiveness driven by a more artistic logic.

Fig. 4.1. Actantial analysis of ‘The forced marriage’
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Another theme from the *epic story* is the present CEO who is ‘coming to the rescue of everyone else’ and seen as symbol and a gathering force balancing the two logics [Gabriel 2000:74]. *Narratives* like these ‘generate commitment and even a sense of duty to emulate the hero’ [ibid.]. It is a story of a skilled CEO that the groups within CFF all can identify with and ‘whose acts echo their desires’ [Gabriel 2000:56]. The *story* can be seen as functioning as a sensemaking device enacting progress in the PmIP and the collaboration between members since ‘[s]ymbols are not merely repositories of meaning; they are also attempts to conquer suffering’ [ibid:93]. Recognising through the shared storytelling that ‘different conceptualizations exist regarding what is central, distinctive, and enduring about the organisations’ establishes that CFF carries multiple organisational identities [Pratt and Foreman 2000:20]. The *narratives* point to two opposing ideologies; an artistic and a utilitarian and the identity of CFF can be expressed as hybrid [Albert and Whetten 1985; Glynn 2000] (cf. 2.6.1.). I will return to this point - and further describe how the two logics are narratively represented - in the next paragraph.

*Sensemaking, stories, and linguistic artifacts*

As presented above, my informants besides *narratives* also used *stories, linguistic artifacts* and *sensemaking* in constructing identity. Where the *narratives* were more shared and revealed shared interpretations on the organisation these were more *ambiguous* accounts indicating ongoing negotiation of identity. Stories of *‘The ancestors’* and stories of ‘the other festivals’ are thriving in the organisation and are being used as ways of constructing identities. Thus by taking a differentiation perspective [Martin 2002] other types of collective identity construction is revealed. Kleppestø suggests that in ‘certain situations group membership is of vital importance and actors emphasize group identity and boundary’ [Kleppestø 1998:150]. This situation of a PmIP can be seen as such a ‘situation’ and besides emphasising their own festival’s identity by primarily referring to it, often the festivals - as a way of understanding and constructing their collective identities - compared to one another: e.g. on how the work in the festival is organised, one festival directors says; ‘we are constructed differently than PIX’ [FD] and another festival director ‘we are very similar to PIX’ [FD]. Moreover, on the profiles; ‘we want to speak to a more specific segment where PIX also want to be someone who can go out and take a more broad section of the population, right? It is a more popular culture festival and DOX definitely has a narrower and more youth-oriented focus ’ [FD]. This way the festivals construct collective identities for themselves by in- or excluding other members across CFF. The festivals further claim different purposes; where the quote above indicates that DOX is more specific in its profile and more auteur-
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oriented: ‘we are all the time pushing the limits for documentaries out into a borderline territory’ [FD], PIX stresses its dynamic relation with the audience; ‘to get an input from the audience when we do something, well, we are actually there because of the audience (...) we don’t do it for our own sake’ [FD] and Buster describes its festival as ‘good quality entertainment’ [FD]. PIX and Buster are this way presented as more audience-driven.

The ambiguities in the linguistic artifacts were for instance; CFF as ‘family’ and ‘three different festivals’ [FD], as both ‘small percentage of the joint work’ and ‘fantastic administrative advantages’ [FD]. Furthermore CFF as both providing ‘a CEO and an accountant of high quality not possible for individual festivals’ and ‘primarily an umbrella organisation’ [EMP], and as ‘servicing the festivals’ [HSM], ‘existing because of the festivals’ but at the same time as symbolizing ‘a certain strength (...), professionalism, and a strong administration behind’ [CEO], and the festivals as ‘brands’ within CFF [FD]; thus indicating that the two logics (artistic/utilitarian) are concurrently at play and used by all members in CFF – thus also within each group (member) – suggesting firstly, an ongoing collective identity negotiation process of holographic character and secondly, that these logics are flexibly used for supporting identity claims in different situations. Further, as presented, the informants use the ‘The ancestors’ when negotiating identities, e.g. CIFF as ‘red carpets’, ‘administratively clever’, ‘commercial’ and ‘traditionally managed’ representing a more utilitarian logic. In contrast NFF is portrayed as ‘grassroots’, ‘authentic’, ‘friends with the board, and ‘grown out of nothing’ representing a more artistic logic. These linguistic artifacts used by the members assist them in negotiating identity by drawing on symbolic artifacts that link the present with the past [Yanow 2006] and ‘[l]abeling, or naming, is calling things into being’ [Czarniawska-Joerges and Joerges 1990:340].

This way members enact the two logics of the hybrid identity through these cultural manifestations using ‘The ancestors’ (being represented by the stories on CIFF and NFF), comparisons (among festivals), and linguistic artifacts (ambiguous classification of what CFF is). Furthermore, identity is sustained by use of the linguistic artefacts (labels) since: ‘the durability of the identity is actually contained in the labels used by organizational members to express who and what they believe the organization to be’ [Gioia et al. 2000:64].

These ambiguities can be seen as on one hand an expression of having more identities within CFF and on the other hand it indicates an expression of a sensemaking process of negotiating identity happening within CFF. I will look more into sensemaking in analysis 2.
In analysis 1a I have by constructing a family narrative established that CFF through storytelling and sensemaking is constructing a hybrid, holographic OI (based on an artistic and a utilitarian logic) and fragmented collective identities. This I have established through presenting the narratives of ‘The forced marriage’ and ‘Parenting’ which indicate the level of integration between the members generally accepted. By constructing stories about when the line (distinctiveness & autonomy vs. synergies & corporate) was definitely crossed e.g. ‘Claiming artistic responsibility’, ‘Streamlining the names’ the balance was further elaborated and the two logics of artistic and utilitarian expressed. The narrative of ‘The ancestors’ established that the identities of the previous festivals are used as symbols of artistic and utilitarian logics which are further used as building blocks in the identity construction within CFF. In the story of ‘The new CEO’ the CEO was constructed as a symbol - a strong, respected, and understanding leader - indicating that he is important for the balance of autonomy and synergies and this way he also forms part of the identity construction. Linguistic artifacts and stories further showed that the members by comparing to each other further construct fragmented collective identities. The festivals expressed different purposes; DOX as more auteur-driven and PIX and Buster as more oriented at the audience.

4.1.2. Artefacts as co-constructing organisational identity (1b)

In this section I will argue that - and show how - the artifacts; consisting of web pages, posters, and physical arrangements in the case co-construct the hybrid identity and affect the balance between the artistic identity and the utilitarian identity.

Stories are only one means of getting access to the OI and in this paragraph I will, by assuming a ‘holistic’ approach to culture [Martin 2002:60], look into other artifacts within CFF which inform OI. These other artifacts are more concrete and perceptible than stories [Gagliardi 1990], they are ‘corporate artifacts, the most evident, concrete and tangible manifestations of the culture of organisations [Gagliardi 1990:8]. Artifacts are ‘cultural signals, which send messages to the members of the organization’ [Larsen and Schultz 1990:282] and through both a pragmatic and hermeneutic dimension they affect meaning creation [Gagliardi 1990;2007]. (Cf. 2.6.2.).

The culture - which is socially constructed, dynamic, and ‘the meanings people share in a given situation’ [Gertsen et al. 1998:37] - is continuously embedded in artefacts actors construct which, in
turn, affects the construction and reconstructs the culture which is thus ‘an ongoing interpretation process rather than a stable structure of values and norms’ [Vaara 2000:82]. In my understanding of culture there are thus both the reflexive processes of actors’ sensemaking and the symbolics of ‘tangible’ cultural manifestations. On these grounds I see the physical space and objects as artifacts co-constructing the social reality and the identity of CFF through managed identity work [Reff Pedersen and Strandgaard Pedersen 2008] which brings me to take a closer look at these.

**Physical space**

When listening to my informants’ stories on the merger process and the histories of the festivals, a recurrent element was constructing the stories around a physical place; e.g. ‘The others stayed in Gothersgade (...) and then came in. But Farimagsgade is divided in the way, you see, that there was one room and then a main building in two floors and some more space, right’ [HP] and ‘we had just moved to Stockholmsgade and lived in fantastic premises there – totally amazing with own cinema and they were totally restored and everyone was thrilled to be there’ [FD]. Thus physical settings by functioning as cues in the sensemaking processes appear as important elements in their accounts. A requirement in the merger agreement was that the festivals were to share physical space and that the festivals were forced to move in together was, as exemplified and established in ‘The forced marriage’, something members interpreted as inevitable and a decision they could not influence. The physical integration is a part of the quest for gaining synergies by reducing facility costs, however other synergies can be achieved by living together if further integration is sought; closer collaboration on projects, sharing staff, technology, administration etc. which is a debated balance that I will deal with in analysis 2.

CFF moved to new premises in spring 2010 which entailed a different allocation of offices between the festivals and secretariat (cf. 3.3.6). The moving might ‘reflect changing fundamental needs’ but can ‘also take on symbolic significance’ [Berg and Kreiner 1998:56]. Instead of having their own, separate office space within a larger complex the festivals and the secretariat are now - with their permanent employees - assembled in one hallway. This renders them physically closer to each other in the daily work processes which might prescribe more joint action given the pragmatic dimension of artifacts [Gagliardi 2007]; ‘the idea is, kind of, to be closer to each other, right?’ [FD]. It further, in the hermeneutic dimension [ibid.], symbolises a corporate culture [Berg and Kreiner 1990; Schultz and Larsen 1990]. In other words since ‘(p)hysical settings inform members of a certain culture of the meaning of some particular setting’ and the members ‘read’ this meaning [Berg and Kreiner 1990:61] the new premises with its more integrative allocation of offices
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(bounds) might reconstruct a reality that is more in line with the utilitarian and synergy-pursuing identity. Moreover, having a 1st floor with management and permanent staff and then a 2nd floor with temporary staff might reflect a more corporate symbol by drawing on an institutionalised symbolic code of hierarchy [Berg and Kreiner 1990] thus adding to the construction of the utilitarian identity. This can further be illustrated by drawing on the framework of Pratt and Foreman; moving to the new premises with its more integrated division of space can be seen as a managerial response of going from compartmentalization to aggregation by using a physical means. This suggests a managerial intention to forge links between the identities [2000]. Members have also expressed a concern regarding the division between volunteers and permanents; ‘I hope that it will give more stability that we will have a direction department on 2nd floor and then we have all these volunteers and stuff coming and going on the 1st floor. We are also a little bit concerned of course about what happens with the communication because [it is important to] hear what’s happening’ [FD].

Thus the moving to new premises and the new allocation of offices can be seen as shifting the balance in the construction of the hybrid identity from the artistic (distinctiveness) towards the utilitarian (synergies) due to its symbolic meaning and practical implications.

Visual and graphical identity; websites, festival posters, and -programmes

Box 4.1. CFF front page. Source: www.cphfilmfestivals.dk
The home page of CFF is only a front page without any subpages. It is kept in black and the logo of CFF on top of the page is simple. Below a flash banner in three second intervals shows the logos of the three festivals. By clicking on the logos you are directed to a separate home page for each of the festivals. Their three logos represent distinct graphic identities. DOX with its characteristic * and PIX that has abandoned the colon as a way of creating distinction between the two: 'now the difference is that PIX has removed its colon … and everything DOX does, there is a colon to (...) and the future is maybe that PIX will only be PIX [and not CPH PIX]' [HP].

Returning to the website; below the flash banner the festivals’ full names and dates are listed. Then a list of the management group and the Chairman of the Board figures with interactive e-mail addresses in the names. And this is it; a simple and modest home page reflecting a toned down existence of CFF and that the secretariat exists to be of aid to the festivals and not the other way around.

Moving on to the festivals’ websites these have different graphic layouts but are basically built up similarly in their logics. It appears from their websites that they are part of CFF, however not on the front page. A festival director explains the graphical identity: ‘we are known as Buster, we have our own identity, our own colours, our own audience which has nothing to do with the [other festivals] [FD] and the marketing director explains ‘they (the festivals) need to continue being different (...). The festivals have huge influence on their visual identities (...) [and] the way we choose to use pictures or (...) take programme content and put it into our calendar - there is a lot of things we can do that is not about reinventing the identity but using the identity already there’ [HSM].

On the posters (and in the festival programmes) for the festivals only a small logo for CFF features in the very bottom. The CEO explains the managerial intent: ‘this organisation (CFF) is quite boring to the citizens of Copenhagen (...) they should (...) put all their interest in the festivals (...) you can
look at this poster (points to PIX’s poster from 2009 hanging on the wall in the office) and you would not find anything saying [something] about CFF which I think is absolutely right’ [CEO]. The posters and the website are this way reflecting the bipartite marketing strategy (cf. 3.3.6). The festivals do not appear concomitantly on posters; an exception of this was the joint banner at Berlinale\textsuperscript{16} where the festivals appeared side by side: ‘the only place where we have done [public arrangements] (...) we did for instance a huge campaign under the Berlin festival this year – outdoor campaign – where we – because they are so big those huge outdoor posters in the area, right? - and that we wouldn’t have been able to do individually so there we have kind of split up the huge posters right? Where we have kept our own logos and dates on and so on. So things like that we can do but it’s not like it says ‘Copenhagen Film Festivals’ there with big letters, well, it’s primarily an advertisement for the three festival, right?’ [FD]. This is further an example of a sensemaking; an explanation of why synergy is pursued in an area where they do not usually perform joint actions. By using a utilitarian logic of cutting costs and stating it as an exception for the sake of the artistic logic the action is made sense of and ‘fits’ with the frame of the balancing between distinctiveness and synergies in CFF.

As a contrast to the physical space above these artifacts (websites, posters, and programmes) can be seen as mainly supporting the construction of the artistic and distinctive identity by separately presenting the festivals [Baruch 2006]. Using the framework of Pratt and Foreman; maintaining distinct logos, a discrete joint logo and website as well as separate web sites can be seen as a managerial response of sustaining multiple identities through symbolic compartmentalization [2000]. However, synergies are reached by for instance the shared poster which enacts a more corporate and utilitarian identity [Baruch 2006]. This maintains the distinctiveness of the artistic identity as well as the synergy pursuit of the utilitarian. This way, I will argue, the hybrid identity is sustained and co-constructed by the visual and graphical artifacts.

* 

In analysis 1b of physical artefacts it is established that the moving to new premises and the new allocation of offices might shift the balance in the construction of the hybrid identity from the artistic towards the utilitarian. As a contrast to the physical space the artifacts (websites, posters, and programmes) can be seen as supporting the construction and sustaining of the artistic identity.

\textsuperscript{16} Berlin International Film Festival
However, some actions are taken where synergies are sought by presenting the festivals along side each other constructing a more corporate and utilitarian identity.

4.1.3. Recapitulation of analysis 1

In this section I, firstly, argued that members in CFF - by means of stories as expressions of a shared belief system and unmanaged identity work - construct a hybrid and holographic organisational identity based on a utilitarian (the purpose of the festivals to reach a market and the secretariat to pursue synergies; however supporting the festival) and an artistic logic (drawing on the festivals’ collective identities and their festivals as central and as the core value). I focused at the stories told; epic and tragic stories were narrated casting the members as victims of a forced merger and other actors as villains and heroes in the negotiation of the balance between synergy/corporate and autonomy/distinctiveness. The CEO was established as a symbol and thus as a bridging element between the logics of the hybrid identity.

Secondly, I established that fragmented collective identities are constructed within CFF through linguistic artifacts and stories of the ‘ancestors’ persisting within CFF further assisting the construction of the two logics within the hybrid identity.

Thirdly, I focused on managed identity work; artifacts in shape of physical arrangements, websites, and posters in the case and argued that they co-construct the hybrid and fragmented identity. On one hand the moving can be seen as shifting the balance in the construction of the hybrid identity from the artistic (distinctiveness) towards the utilitarian (synergies) due to its symbolic meaning and practical implications. On the other hand the websites and posters separated the artistic identity based on the individual festivals from the utilitarian synergy-pursuing identity.

I pointed to the increasing integration that the new premises and other artefacts symbolise.

4.2. Analysis 2. Identity in collaboration and competition

Guided by sub question 2: How do the organisational members make sense the processes of collaboration and competition?

In this analysis I will argue that by use of sensemaking on dimensions of collaboration and competition the members in CFF negotiate the balance between synergies and distinctiveness. I will point out that an emerging frame of shared interpretations exists which guides collective action and informs OI. However, a grey area of differing sensemakings is also present in CFF.
In contrast to analysis 1 the present analysis is taking a more process-oriented perspective on the identity construction focusing on action exemplified by processes of collaboration, and competition. Building upon a Weickian notion of organizing (cf. 2.6.2.) I will thus - by focusing on the processes between the members - look at how the members of CFF make sense of the actions and the new relationships they are in; the change in ‘us’ and ‘them’ - and understand how they negotiate OI through these processes.

‘To understand sensemaking is to be sensitive to the ways in which people chop moments out of continuous flows and extract cues from these moments’ [Weick 1995:43].

The analysis is built upon two main themes - formed on basis of the patterns of ‘moments’, ‘flows’, and ‘cues’ performed by my informants - which I have identified in their accounts; collaboration and competition. Since the two are closely interconnected in the accounts I have chosen to structure the analysis as one section.

Sensemaking is - for the purpose of investigating identification in the processes of collaboration and competition - seen as a ‘metaconcept that highlights the role of internal discussions in organizational processes’ [Vaara 2000:86]. Sensemaking occurs when ‘identities are destabilized’ and ‘(d)iscrepant events (…) trigger a need for explanation’ [Weick 1995:18,4] and since 'beholders vote and the majority rules' [ibid:6] it is (also) a collective, cognitive process. The individual is acting ‘as the organisation’ when he embodies values, beliefs, and goals of the collectivity’ [Chapman et al. in Weick 1995:23] why the festival directors are through ‘social process’ representatives of their respective organisations [Weick 1995:39]. ‘To talk about sensemaking is to talk about reality as an ongoing accomplishment that takes form when people make retrospective sense of the situations in which they find themselves and their creations’ [ibid:15] and ‘sensemaking is grounded in identity construction’ [Weick 2001:18]. I thus see identity as an ongoing process; a dynamic, relational construction why it makes sense to look into sensemaking of discrepant events in interaction between the members since these, as I understand them, will inform collective identity.

4.2.1. Making sense of the processes of collaboration and competition (2)

Since ‘(i)dentities are created in relation to other significant groups’ [Klepepestø 1998:149] I find it interesting to look at the processes between the members within CFF; ‘the interaction itself’ [ibid.].
‘Identity is (...) not a question of what we are, but of what we become as we try to make sense of the world’ [Kleppestø 1998:150] and in my interviews there are several interesting occurrences of interpretation and sensemaking related to identity in the processes of interaction between the members within CFF. The processes are presented by members as an ongoing negotiation between them and can be seen as sensemaking processes where ‘rules’ are in the making concerning; what can be collaborated on? And what is termed competition? In other words: what can and cannot be shared?

Collaboration and competition among the festivals are, on an overall level, laid out by the members as being present in several organisational ‘dimensions’ such as administration and technology, contents of festivals, finances and funding and staff/volunteers.

On administrative matters concerning operations as accounting and housing, collaboration is generally agreed on being an advantage. For instance, on the central accounting position of the secretariat it was said that: ‘in comparison to having an external accountant which [we] previously had, it is worth a million’ [FD]. This is in accordance with the previous analysis’ point on the utilitarian logic being linked to CFF. The collaboration between the festivals in terms of technology is also highlighted by another informant: ‘there is some technology we are testing now, right? Which I hope we can get up and running for PIX but which at any rate can benefit the other festivals, right? But this I believe is of vital importance; that we keep on pushing the festivals onwards in that direction’ [FD]. In this way an opening towards more collaboration and sharing of technology is made. However, the CEO sees a limit to the collaboration when it comes to the sharing of staff; ‘Well, we could not have a group of people one day doing Buster, the next PIX, and the other DOX. It is not possible. Well, it is, but then it would just be some by far inferior festivals – you need people who are specifically enthusiastic about the product they work with’ [CEO]. He thereby links the devotion of the staff to the artistic logic, making it something which cannot be shared.

In the debate on the content of the festivals competition and overlap was mentioned: ‘there is established a Programme Committee (...) and it was actually more a damage control in order for us to not step too much on each others’ toes because there are definitely some overlaps where ... when is a film a children’s film and [when is] a film for youth and when is it for adults? (...) and we (DOX) have from the beginning had a focus on music and event and they (PIX) have chosen that
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[also]’ [FD]. Moreover: ‘the definition of feature film and documentary is not always razor sharp – there is overlap – well, like DOX we also have a music programme – we don’t focus as much on it as they do but it is a part of [our] program as it was on NFF, one can say, right?’ [FD]. The first quote indicates a sensemaking that there has been too much overlap but that the Programme Committee is a help in this regard (I will return to this shortly). The last quote is an example of a sensemaking explaining the overlapping music element. It is furthermore an act of identification by use of an ancestor (cf. 4.1.1) as a legitimising element for the music content.

With regard to the **financing and funding** of the festivals (an aspect of great significance), competition was clearly mentioned: ‘it’s nice of course to have an economy person and stuff but it costs us more now to have an administration – we have to find more money and we are not that independent any longer (...) we still have to compete with a lot of things especially financial subjects (....) We apply (for funding) maybe together - then we have to find out how we share it; who’s more important in the family? Everyone says ‘I’m more important!’’’ [FD]. In this way, the competition was seen as too strong to outweigh the advantages in administration, not least reflecting the ongoing process of debate on the division of funds.

Combining **content** with **finances and funding** the following example demonstrate competition among the festivals:

**FD:** ‘We try to help each other, but the competition word is always underneath (...) For example last year before we became a family I wanted to have a media laboratory for new media and gaming – two and a half years ago I asked for the money from different foundations and [got them]... but I didn’t want to come out immediately because I wanted to be more clever – it was a new area – and (...) we wanted to make it big and needed a little bit more money but meanwhile the other festival (...) came out last year with this two-day event for gaming and it destroyed you know the new (...) so we have to go out and push a lot of people to believe that kids are also important’

**TT:** ‘But is it a problem when you don’t have the same audience?’

**FD:** ‘Yes, because the money is limited’

[60]
Inspired by Weick’s prescription on how to understand sensemaking the quote can be interpreted as; the moment chopped out of a continuous flow (‘last year’), the extracted cue (that the other festival used the ideas which destroyed the novelty of their project), and the sensemaking (competition on content). So on one hand this indicates that the idea, the content and the novelty, is seen as very important and that competition on content exists. On the other hand, this can be interpreted as if the competition on funding (as scarce resources) is perceived as affecting content by constraining the possibilities for carrying out the same projects. Either way it is an example of how ambiguous the situation of collaborating and competing at the same time can be for the festivals and a situation presented several times throughout my interviews.

However, as the following quote referring to a management meeting shows, communication and coordination eases the integration process; ‘that was where this discussion came up; ‘but if I then have some money and if I have some good ideas and I can finance it (...) then why do ... who are we?? (...) Why do we have to discuss?!? Can we say that I can’t do it?!?’ and something like that. It was very explosive, right? Anyway, the discussion generally turned out quite alright and it (...) was also a discussion about the festivals wanting to delimit, right?’ [HP].

In line with this; an area where the festivals have decided to actually collaborate on differing by compromising and thus preventing competition is the Programme Committee; ‘the collaboration which needs to exist on the programme level (...) – if you can enter that without considering each other as competitors up front but [rather] enter into it and say: ‘well, we can help you, you can help us and let us then agree on which films we don’t (...) compete on’ [FD] and ‘it has been established [that the] head of programmes meet once a month and talk about this and that concerning content, right? But there is still some marking of territory we kind of have to get over in that context, right? Like there is when we sit at a management meeting and each of us sit there with our baby and not necessarily are ridiculously in agreement about how to cut it, well, that I don’t think we will put to sleep right away, but obviously (...) in time it is something we need to become better at’ [FD]. The sensemakings on the Programme Committee show that the members - by having common interpretations of the conflict over content as being negative and using it as a cue - are coordinating collective action [Weick 1995], thus enacting shared sensemaking.

There is generally a positive attitude towards collaboration and an intention of increasing it but further a shared sensemaking that it is, and will continue being, an ongoing process of negotiating and compromising. This was seen in some of the previous quotes and can be further illustrated by here: ‘I think it is developing towards something that is rather optimal well I will say that (...) where
there is still a problem - which there probably always will but that you can sort of work your way through – it is clearly in relation to the program and the profile, right?’ [FD]. Thus, despite the fact that collaboration is developing, the distinctiveness of each festival is here defined as a problem, inhibiting further integration.

The different examples I have presented indicate that the festivals generally share the sensemaking that administration and technology can be shared and that collaboration on content and on funding is a negotiation process entailing compromises. There are thus not necessarily completely shared values and common interpretations on the different matters but an emerging ‘frame’ for performing these interpretations [Weick 1995:110]. This emerging frame can be seen as guiding collective action as e.g. in the Programme Committee; thus negotiating both the identities of the members and the collective identity of CFF

The sensemakings I have found also differ, though, and thus indicate a lack of a shared frame in some areas what I term a grey area. For instance; the festival director of DOX makes sense on the collaboration on volunteer recruitment (cf. 3.3.6) carried out between the festivals in 2009; ‘it was really a disaster for us so we won’t do that again… when a volunteer recruitment person is put on [what is] actually our base and which is also used on all other festival yeah (sighs) we will do that different this year in order to kind of – because we want to – in order for it not to become a tribe – so if you actually want to be a volunteer or intern at DOX then it’s simply – it is precisely our values being represented and not, well, the whole package (...) because our identities are so different (...) we have extremely many different needs (...) so that’s why many of those joint things that we could actually be joint on actually can be hard to be joint on’ [FD]. This way the volunteers are - by a sensemaking obviously ‘grounded in identity’ - categorised as part of the distinct identity which needs to be protected [Weick 1995:6]. The identity of DOX is defended and this is a way of constructing meaning on what can and cannot be shared. It is thus both a retrospect construction of meaning and something that ‘can be used prospectively’ since the sensemaking prescribes that DOX will not join the volunteer recruitment in the future [Weick 1995:23]. Contrary to this is

17 It has been stressed by several of my informants via e-mail that there have been very positive shifts in the collaboration processes during the last period of writing this thesis and I see this as a further indication of an emerging frame being constructed.
another festival’s view that volunteer recruitment might be a place to seek synergies: ‘we have an idea that we will make a card system (...) that if you are a volunteer for one festival then you get this [for instance] a badge so you can see all kinds of movies free [etc.] and if you work for two festivals you can get this, if you work for all three festivals you can get this’ [FD]. There are thus different sensemakings on the volunteer issue, indicating that there are different interpretations of what is core content and needs to be protected and kept distinct to maintain the festivals’ separate identities. One interpretation of these discrepancies could be that one sensemaking is stressing the need to draw a line at volunteer recruitment in order for the festivals not to resemble each other too much and the other sensemaking as seeing it as possible to pursue synergies on. Another explanation on this could also be that Buster experiences difficulties in recruiting volunteers (which is not a problem for DOX) which then would make Buster more interested in the collaboration. Other issues I found these discrepant sensemakings on and which forms the grey area were sharing and exchanging permanent staff and pursuing shared hotel deals.

Diverging sensemakings can possibly function side by side without problems [Weick 1995:41] however; in the processes of pursuing synergies across members in CFF these sensemakings will probably be challenged and negotiated. Thus it will be interesting to follow the development in CFF.

What I see is that the festivals in many areas agree on the dimensions of what can be shared and what cannot; thus indicating an emergent but rather shared frame for interpretation. However, there is also a grey area characterized by differing sensemakings on some of the dimensions relating to content indicating a negotiation process grounded in identity construction happening within CFF.

4.2.2. Recapitulation of analysis 2

In this analysis I have shown how the members experience and make sense of their interrelationship as simultaneously being competitive and collaborative within dimensions of administration and technology, funding and finances, content, and staff. There is a shared sensemaking, an emerging frame, that artistic content is belonging to the distinctive sphere of each festival whereas the synergies are to be found on more administrative and ‘humdrum’ activities. However, as the analysis showed the sensemakings of what content comprises of differ between the members, the grey area. It was thus established that the members perform divergent sensemakings within the dimensions of content and staff; some saw volunteers as a critical part of their festival’s identity and not a dimension on which synergies could be found. Finally, there seems to be a
tendency towards a sensemaking of a more integrated organisation, also on issues of content and other dimensions that was previously considered not possible to share.
Chapter 5. Discussion

The paradox of simultaneously creating synergies and maintaining distinctiveness has through the two analyses been examined in the case of CFF. By focusing on construction of OI in the PmIP I have established that CFF through storytelling and artefacts construct a holographic, hybrid OI driven by an artistic-oriented logic and a utilitarian-oriented logic claimed by all members. By using a narrative approach I gained access to shared storytelling which showed that critical incidents of a management pushing the balance between distinctiveness and synergies too far in the early PmIP had provided the frame for shared interpretation of the balancing point. Moreover, I have established physical artefacts as managerial actions, which co-construct the hybrid OI and affect the balance between distinctiveness and synergies. Through a process perspective I have pointed out – by examples of collaboration and competition - that there is an ongoing sensemaking taking place about what can be shared and what needs to be distinct; a sensemaking which is in some areas clearer than others.

In my initial considerations of the paradox within CFF I wondered how the pursuit of synergies could be aligned with the need of cultural products to be distinct. Glynn [2000] showed that the ideologies within a hybrid OI of a symphony orchestra originated from and was claimed by distinct professional groups; the musicians (representing the artistic logic) and the administrators (representing the utilitarian logic); however what this study shows is that CFF constructs a hybrid OI based on both logics which originate from all members. Thus, what is interesting in my case is that the ideologies are not referring to specific groups but are rather holographic OI claims [Albert and Whetten 1985] brought forward by all members. Glynn points out that: ‘Professionals have a stake in maintaining their identity in a professional field, and claiming a set of identity attributes that can be used to their advantage in society and/or in the marketplace of business’ [Glynn 2000:285]. This is interesting because it furthermore seems as if the two ideologies are instead ‘operationalised’, that is, claimed by the members through storytelling in specific situations where either a utilitarian logic or an artistic logic makes sense to them. This hybrid identification seems to provide a way of balancing - and organising for - the paradox between pursuing synergies and maintaining distinct identities and further providing a means for making sense of an otherwise
confusing situation. Synergies and distinctiveness are then balanced in accordance with the hybrid OI.

However, in analysis 2 I further showed how different sensemakings formed an ongoing negotiation of OI especially concerning the interpretation of which dimensions relate to content. This is therefore a grey area with different approaches to what can be shared and thus pursued synergies upon. This balancing point is exactly where the paradox between synergies and distinctiveness is expressed by members and where possible conflict arises. Thus the flexibility gained by multiple identities has a drawback of intraorganisational conflict when negotiation of these identities is necessary [Pratt and Foremann 2000]. The grey area can be interpreted as an outcome of the management style of the CEO allowing for competitive processes in debate over for instance funding and content. Moreover, it can be seen as an outcome of the different fragmented collective identities; that the festivals have different profiles, cultures and - as a sign of the artistic professions of documentary and feature film - are basically different in their logics. However, this negotiation is in motion; both the narratives and the sensemaking showed a movement from almost no wish for sharing and collaborating to increasingly more sharing among the members. In time one outcome of this increasing integration might be that the festivals will end up being too alike in their expression because they have become less flexible and less focused on their differences. This could endanger the cultural value of the festivals [Lampel et al. 2000].

Furthermore, storytelling informs the role of the CEO. The narratives of ‘Streamlining the names’ and ‘Claiming artistic responsibility’ clearly show that ‘tension and conflict can erupt (…) when one identity element is emphasized over the other’ [Glynn 2000:285]; in this case the CEO’s claim of the utilitarian logic. The storytelling, in the narrative of ‘The new CEO’, reveals an interpretation that the understanding of the balance between the two logics is of crucial importance to the festivals. It can also be discussed whether the OI negotiation process has been so confusing and extreme that the members were ready for change when the present CEO took over? The ‘sharp debates regarding institutional mission, values, and identity’ which Albert and Whetten suggest follows the ‘change in collective status’ can thus be seen as having been settled at the new CEO’s arrival [1985:99]. This - along with his management style of maintaining the balance between synergies and distinctiveness - generally causes more stability and more joint OI claims. Either way
the CEO’s balancing of the synergies and distinctiveness of the festivals is seen to be an important piece of the puzzle of ‘success’ for CFF in pursuing both purposes.

The holographic hybrid OI, as I have suggested, is another explanation to why CFF is functioning quite well despite the aforementioned paradox. I further wonder if the dual nature of film festivals – that they both have an ‘event’ and market oriented purpose of selling tickets and attracting audience (a utilitarian purpose) and a purpose of forming programmes of artistic quality (an artistic purpose) [e.g. Rüling and Strandgaard Pedersen 2010] – contributes to making the joint construction within CFF possible and hence synergies and distinctiveness concurrently obtainable? This may also explain why DOX - as the most auteur- and least market oriented festival – is most protective of its identity and stresses the issues of the grey area. The contextuality of the festivals’ different approaches to audience and the extent of the grey area seem of great importance for the interpretation of the possible integration of each festival. However, in line with the symbolic leadership expressed in the case, the festivals are granted autonomy to have different ways of collaborating with each other and CFF and are thus integrated to a different extent. I see this as an important point in the well-functioning family; that the CEO pays attention to and makes room for these different needs that nurture distinctiveness.
Chapter 6. Conclusions

In this chapter I will provide answers to my research question and sub questions.

- How is identity constructed - and synergies and distinctiveness balanced - in postmerger integration processes of cultural-creative organisations?
- How is identity constructed through cultural manifestations?
- How do the organisational members make sense of processes of collaboration and competition?

Organisational identity in CFF is socially constructed by use of cultural manifestations as storytelling and physical artifacts and also through processes of sensemaking. The organisational identity is through these means established as being hybrid and holographic but at the same time as continuously being negotiated and constructed in processes between members by use of managed and unmanaged identity work and is therefore in flux.

**Firstly**, by performing genre narratives the members construct the holographic, hybrid identity based on two logics; the artistic and the utilitarian, and these narratives show the overall balance between the logics and between synergies and distinctiveness. Epic and tragic stories of opposites are narrated casting the members as victims of a forced merger and other actors as villains and heroes in the negotiation of the balance between synergy/corporate and distinctiveness/autonomy. Moreover, these narratives construct the CEO as a symbol who is seen as a crucial and bridging part of the hybrid identity by understanding and performing this balance between the logics as well as between synergies and distinctiveness.

**Secondly**, the storytelling - through linguistic artifacts and stories of the ‘ancestors’ persisting within CFF - is shown to further assist the construction of the two logics within the hybrid identity and establishes that fragmented collective identities of the festivals are also constructed within CFF.

**Thirdly**, managerial actions as artifacts in shape of physical arrangements, web pages, and posters are established to co-construct the hybrid and fragmented identity. The moving is seen as shifting the balance in the construction of the hybrid identity from the artistic (distinctiveness)
towards the utilitarian (synergies) due to its symbolic meaning and practical implications. The websites and posters, however, separates the artistic identity based on the individual festivals from the utilitarian synergy-pursuing identity. I point to the increasing integration that the new premises and other artefacts symbolise, which may affect the balance between distinctiveness and synergies.

_Fourthly_, it is shown how the members experience and make sense of their interrelationship as simultaneously being competitive and collaborative within dimensions of administration and technology, funding and finances, content, and staff. There is both a shared sensemaking - an emerging frame - that artistic content is belonging to the distinctive sphere of each festival whereas the synergies are to be found on more administrative and ‘humdrum’ activities. However, differing sensemakings forming a grey area in terms of what can be defined as core content also exist.

_Finally_, there seems to be a tendency towards a storytelling and a sensemaking of a more integrated organisation, also on issues of content and other dimensions that was previously considered not possible to share.

_Generally_, the study has showed that postmerger integration processes are complex and that members apply storytelling and sensemaking in claiming more identities in their need to cope with contrasting logics. Managers, by taking into account these identities, can facilitate balancing these logics.
Chapter 7. Thesis in retrospect and forward perspective

This interpretive case study of PmIP is useful since it has shown how changes can be interpreted and embraced by organisational members. By taking into account its context-specificity managers will obtain an understanding of how storytelling, physical artifacts, and managerial actions inform and affect change processes.

Taking a retrospective view of the thesis I could have chosen multiple interesting paths. It would have been interesting to - inspired by Gioia and Chittipeddi’s interpretive study of managed change and ‘the symbolic and meaning-construction aspects of the CEO-role’ [1991: 445] - focus more on sensegiving. By thorough observation and focus on the CEO’s stories I could have looked at how the CEO – upon his accession - engaged in sensemaking and further how he actively engages in sensegiving in relation to the organizational identity. Moreover how this sensegiving is connected to members’ sensemaking [ibid.]. This way getting a more nuanced insight into – what the thesis has shown – the CEO’s crucial role in identity construction and the balancing of synergies and distinctiveness. This in order to better understand the narrative and sensemaking processes between the managed and unmanaged organisation [Gabriel 2000] in relation to identity construction.

An obvious continuation of the thesis could be to look further into the concept of loose coupling [Orton and Weick 1990] and study how the structure in CFF is socially constructed and what the couplings mean to concurrent synergy pursuit and retention of distinctiveness. By broadening the scope and looking beyond CFF’s boarders it could further be explored how it – as a professional cultural organisation - manages multiple stakeholders.

By engaging in a longitudinal study with the narrative approach one could gain insight into the ‘changing patterns of identification, justification, and causation among organizational actors’ [Søderberg 2003:5]. Thereby looking into e.g. the differences between the festivals and how their different scopes, profiles, and cultures have affected their interpretation of the merger over time.

For further studies another interesting angle would be to focus on the film festivals as temporary organisations and look into how this feature of organising is connected to narrative and identity
construction; and moreover what role narratives play in organisational learning when an organisation is mainly temporary?
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Appendix III. List of informants (anonymised)

CEO: CEO
FD: Festival director
HSM: Head of Sponsorship and Marketing
HP: Head of Production
EMP: Employee
### Appendix IV. Interview guide template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Balancing distinctiveness and synergies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Innovation</td>
<td>- Ensure a modulated innovation trend that enhances synergies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>- Ensure a better understanding of the production plan and the need for flexibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>- Ensure the best understanding of the production plan and the need for flexibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Keywords**: modulation, innovation, synergy, flexibility, production, planning.
## Balancing Distinctiveness and Synergies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region A</td>
<td>Innovative approaches for enhancing synergies and distinctiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region B</td>
<td>Enhanced partnerships for improving efficiency and diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region C</td>
<td>Collaborative initiatives for fostering innovation and adaptability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:**

- Region A
  - Innovative approaches for enhancing synergies and distinctiveness.
  - Enhanced partnerships for improving efficiency and diversity.
  - Collaborative initiatives for fostering innovation and adaptability.

**Key Points:**

- Innovative approaches for enhancing synergies and distinctiveness.
- Enhanced partnerships for improving efficiency and diversity.
- Collaborative initiatives for fostering innovation and adaptability.

---
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Appendix V. Interview transcriptions

(Not available for public)