



UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG  
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, ECONOMICS AND LAW

# Ready, Set, Action!

## Organization in Film Production

---

*Analyzed from the perspective of project-based organizations and culture producing organizations and illustrated through displays of group dynamics, power and leadership*

**Department of Business Administration  
Management & Organization  
Spring 2013  
Bachelor Thesis**

Authors:  
*Daniella Petersen 910523-3903  
Huilin Shi 890601-8182*

Advisor:  
*Marja Soila-Wadman*

## **Abstract**

This thesis focuses on organization and management in film production, analyzed through the perspective of project-based organizations, as well as the perspective of film/culture producing organizations. The analysis is based on previous research in the fields mentioned above, and empirical data collected through three interviews; one truly in depth, and two more brief, with professionals working in film production, both in front and behind the camera in different positions in the hierarchy, as well as a student of film art. The analysis is conducted with the two different perspectives described above, by analyzing three features found to be ever present in both the field of management as well as in this particular field; group dynamics, power and leadership. The thesis shows the vital importance of film workers having excellent social skills, necessary for dealing with the job uncertainty, short-term way of working, conflict management and securing future employment. Hierarchy is a large part of organization in film production, with many levels of middle management. In addition film production is characterized by individual work where problem solving is vital for maintaining one's reputation. Leadership is particularly difficult as it is a balancing act between administrative and artistic duties and different leadership approaches for different occupations. This thesis concretizes and defines organization in film production and all the implications the complex nature of the organization have for those working in film.

**Key words:** film production, organization, management, project-based organization, culture producing organization, group dynamics, power, leadership.

# Table of Contents

- 1. INTRODUCTION.....5**
  - 1.1 Background..... 5**
  - 1.2 Problem Statement..... 6**
  - 1.3 Question formulation and hypothesis ..... 7**
  - 1.4 Purpose..... 7**
  - 1.5 Limitations ..... 8**
  - 1.6 Definitions ..... 9**
  - 1.7 Disposition .....10**
  
- 2. METHOD..... 12**
  - 2.1 Choice of sources for the literature review.....12**
  - 2.2 Choice of empirical data and interviewees .....13**
  - 2.3 Method and result of finding our interviewees .....14**
  - 2.4 Critical evaluation of literary and empirical sources .....15**
  
- 3. LITTERATURE REVIEW ..... 18**
  - 3.1 Group dynamics, power and leadership .....18**
    - 3.1.1 Group dynamics.....18
    - 3.1.2 Power.....18
    - 3.1.3 Leadership.....19
  - 3.2 Making a film .....19**
    - 3.2.1 Key figures .....19
    - 3.2.2 Preproduction.....20
    - 3.2.3 Production (principal photography).....20
    - 3.2.4 Post-production .....21
  - 3.3 Project-based organizations .....21**
    - 3.3.1 Basics of project-based organizations .....21
    - 3.3.2 Special characteristics of project-based organizations.....22
    - 3.3.3 Special complexities of project-based organizations .....23
  - 3.4 Film/culture producing organizations - qualitative research .....23**
    - 3.4.1 Basics of film production.....23
    - 3.4.2 Management and hiring process in film production .....24
    - 3.4.3 Group dynamics and occupational responsibilities.....25
  - 3.5 Film/culture producing organizations - quantitative research .....27**
    - 3.5.1 Modus operandi .....28
    - 3.5.2 Work conditions.....28
    - 3.5.3 Inequality .....30

3.5.4 Work environment .....	31
3.5.5 Uncertain job market.....	32
<b>4. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>4.1 Interview with producer/production manager Erika Malmgren.....</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1.1 Group dynamics .....	34
4.1.1.1 Teams.....	34
4.1.1.2 Short projects .....	34
4.1.1.3 Creative organizations.....	35
4.1.2 Power .....	36
4.1.2.1 Structure.....	36
4.1.2.2 Short projects .....	36
4.1.2.3 Surveillance .....	37
4.1.2.4 Power distribution .....	38
4.1.2.5 Equality .....	39
4.1.3 Leadership.....	40
4.1.3.1 Leadership approach.....	40
4.1.3.2 Multiple sources of leadership .....	40
<b>4.2 Interview with filmmaker and actor Peter Carlsson .....</b>	<b>41</b>
4.2.1 Group dynamics .....	41
4.2.2 Power .....	42
4.2.3 Leadership.....	43
<b>4.3 Interview with film art student Xichen Wang .....</b>	<b>43</b>
4.3.1 Group dynamics .....	44
4.3.2 Power .....	44
4.3.3 Leadership.....	45
<b>5. ANALYSIS and DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>5.1 Project-based organizations .....</b>	<b>46</b>
5.1.1 Group dynamics .....	46
5.1.1.1 Social skills and company culture.....	46
5.1.1.2 Structure.....	48
5.1.2 Power .....	49
5.1.2.1 Hierarchy .....	49
5.1.2.2 Job uncertainty.....	49
5.1.3 Leadership.....	50
5.1.3.1 Sources of leadership.....	50
<b>5.2 Film/culture producing organizations .....</b>	<b>51</b>
5.2.1 Group dynamics .....	51

5.2.1.1 Responsibility to shape good group dynamics.....	51
5.2.1.2 Modus operandi.....	52
5.2.1.3 Stress.....	53
5.2.2 Power.....	54
5.2.2.1 Hierarchy and relationship with management.....	54
5.2.2.2 Making mistakes and inequality.....	55
5.2.2.3 Hiring policy and process.....	56
5.2.2.4 Surveillance and micromanagement vs. trust and delegation.....	57
5.2.2.5 Sources of power and multiple aspects of managing.....	58
5.2.3 Leadership.....	59
5.2.3.1 Sources of leadership.....	59
5.2.3.2 Approaches to leadership.....	60
5.2.3.3 Multiple sources of leadership.....	61
5.2.3.4 Acquirement of leadership skills.....	61
<b>5.3 To summarize.....</b>	<b>61</b>
5.3.1 Group dynamics.....	61
5.3.2 Power.....	62
5.3.3 Leadership.....	63
<b>6. CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>6.1 To conclude.....</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>6.2 Suggestions for future research.....</b>	<b>65</b>
6.2.1 On a smaller scale.....	65
6.2.2 On a larger scale.....	66
<b>7. REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>7.1 Articles.....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>7.2 Books.....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>7.3 Webpages.....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>8. APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>8.1 Interview guide.....</b>	<b>70</b>

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

There seems to be few industries as glamourized as the film industry; an industry where many wish to work, but where few can break into. The film industry is interesting from many points of view, not the least creatively, however there are more sides to film making than just the creative aspect, and one of them is management in film projects. However, research on management in film production is seemingly quite rare, as finding relevant material regarding management and film production was very difficult when conducting preliminary research. This could imply that there is a lack of research on how management is practiced in such a niched environment as film production.

This is why this thesis try to elucidate management in film production, by examining how group dynamics, power and leadership presents itself, since our hypothesis is that film production provides a very unusual working environment filled with creativity, uncertainty due to its short-term engagements as well as its many points of view of power. However, studies have been made on the work environment in film production, for example by Klerby and Näslund (2010). However, these studies are mostly concerned with statistics and not analysis, and therefore should be evolved by conducting an analysis of the results while at the same time conducting new studies like this one to purely focus and specify certain conditions one can find in film production.

One can ask if it is fruitful to conduct such a study, is there even a fair amount of films being produced in Sweden each year in order to draw any conclusions? In addition, Charlie Chaplin once said, *“Movies are a fad. Audiences really want to see live actors on a stage.”* (quotationsbook.com). No disrespect to the great Charlie Chaplin, however, it is easy to see that he was very wrong in his predictions. In fact, in 2010 Sweden ranked number 21 on the list of which country produced the most amount of movies that year. We can also see from this list that Sweden produced around 50 films a year in 2005 and 2006, to suddenly drop to around 25 film a year in 2007 and 2008, in our best guess due to the global recession. However, the number of films produced per year has since increased, and in 2009 and 2010 more than 40 films were produced a year (Screen Australia). Therefore, it could be fruitful to conduct studies like the one made in this thesis, partly because of the seemingly unexplored

research field and partly because of the rising popularity in producing films in Sweden.

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Examining organization in film production is not an attempt to solve a practical problem; it is more an attempt to illuminate a theoretical problem, since we ourselves had great difficulty in finding research on management in film production. Therefore we would like to fill in the gaps and contribute new knowledge in the field of management. We could argue, like Finney (2008), that this could provide practical help to those involved in film production, where the transition of knowledge, especially to those who recently entered the industry, seems to be very difficult and rare.

This means that this thesis could shed light on a fairly unexplored industry, and contribute new knowledge in the field of management as well as provide further understanding for those working in film production. Understanding ones industry could only be beneficial, for example potential issues could be found and be eradicated. Therefore, this thesis is relevant for peers and researchers in the field of management, as well as those actually working in film production.

The choice to study organization in film production from the point of view of project-based organizations and film/culture producing organizations is because these two points of analysis gives us a view of multiple sides of the complexity that is film production, and could therefore cover the two main organizational features of film production.

Early on in our research, we found three different features that often define organization in film production; group dynamics, power and leadership. Therefore, we have tried to analyze our two points of view, project-based organizations and culture producing organizations, through these three features, which are also very central to the field of management. They also have a tendency to flow into each other, as they are all strongly interconnected, however we have still attempted to separate the three and focus on the strongest indications in each feature.

To investigate and concretize the problem statement, we have posed one main question, as well as a two research questions to help us answer our problem statement, as displayed below.

### **1.3 Question formulation and hypothesis**

*From the perspective of project-based organizations and from the perspective of culture producing organizations, how does organization present itself in film production? Or in other words, how is film production organized?*

- What special organizational *characteristics* define film production, a short-term and creative organization?
- How does the *relationship* between different staff, e.g. directors, actors, producers, production companies etc., look and affect the organization in film production?

These questions are based on a hypothesis formulated before any research had been conducted, which means that the hypothesis was solely based on presumptions made about film production. The hypothesis was that film production is a niched industry with no real equal in how it is organized. Also, the hypothesis was that relationships between parties in film production and features such as group dynamics, power and leadership is characterized differently in film production in comparison to permanent conventional organizations.

### **1.4 Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to analyze how film production is organized by looking through two perspectives; from a project-based organization perspective as well as a film/culture producing organization perspective.

By examining organization in film production we wish to fill in the gaps and contribute new knowledge in the field of management. And like previously stated, we hope that that this could provide practical help to film workers, especially to those new in the industry, as the transition of knowledge seems to be difficult and rare.



## 1.5 Limitations

There are many different points of view one can take when researching and examining film production, therefore we quickly realized the importance of limiting ourselves to make sure we would not stray too much from our chosen point of view and subject.

Firstly, we chose to focus on the filming part of the process of film production, meaning that we pay no attention to the pre- and post-production of filmmaking. This also means that we are interested in examining the stories of the people who work on set, those who are on location. The reason for this is because we find it to be most interesting and exciting.

Secondly, we chose to focus on theories regarding project-based organizations and culture producing organizations, as we felt that this most fairly described the complexities of film production. Furthermore, Whitley (2006) provides another compelling reason for examining project-based organization; not only is project-based organizations increasing in popularity, but this particular way of working is spreading from film production to other industries, often technological. This means that examining project-based organization, and in turn film production, can give valuable insight to all project-based organizations.

In addition, as we found clear indications of group dynamics, power and leadership when researching film production, we felt that this also was very interesting, as well as salient for the field of management. We felt that power structures are of certain interest, as we assumed that the different sources of power, e.g. director, producer, financier etc., can create a crucible of personalities with different goals and therefore create interesting issues and situations worth examining. Moreover we believe that by studying these issues and situations, lessons can be learned to further understand and facilitate future work in film productions, as well as in other industries.

Finally, we chose to focus on Swedish conditions. This was because we felt that we as Swedish citizens have a duty and interest to examine Swedish conditions, especially since it seems as very little Swedish research has been made on the subject. Furthermore, examining foreign film production would be too much and too difficult of an undertaking for this thesis, therefore we leave this for someone else. This is also why we will not attempt to draw any general conclusions on either project-based organizations or culture producing organizations

as determinants of film production, nor on group dynamics, power and leadership in film production in Europe or the world. However, we do feel that some general conclusions can be drawn about film production in Scandinavia on the basis of our research.

## **1.6 Definitions**

We felt the need to specify and define certain terms, which we will be using extensively in this thesis. These are based on theories, which we then have interpreted and used as a method of analysis. The interpretations of group dynamics, power and leadership are defined below, however the theories on which the definitions are based on are presented in the *literature review* chapter.

By *group dynamics* in this report, we mean how groups, in which people often are unfamiliar with each other, work together as well as act in film production, with support from Forsyth (2006) and Cartwright and Zander (1968). There are many different theoretical perspectives on group dynamics (Forsyth. 2010), however in this thesis behavioral perspectives of group dynamics are most relevant.

By *power* in this report, we mean how hierarchical or flat the power distance is in film production. Also who has the most power and how does the power distribution between different parties present itself. We also examine surveillance from an interpretation of Foucault (1975), of how supervisors micromanages staff or delegates responsibilities. We also focus exclusively on power based on position, which Nothouse (2010) refers to as positional power.

By *leadership* in this thesis, we mean the person that make decisions and has the “administrative” duties and well as the person who inspires and motivates the staff, with support from Northouse (2010). Like Jönsson & Strannegård (2009), we make no distinction between the two parts of leadership, and believe that it is most fruitful to see these two parts, them being administrative duties as well as inspiring and motivating, as one cohesive essence of a leader and leadership. We will not discuss what is good versus what is bad leadership, as this is an entire subject on its own.

Sometimes minor comparisons to *permanent organizations* will be made. An organization is a person or a group of people intentionally organized to accomplish an overall, common goal. All organizations operate and carry out their activities according to overall values, such as personality or organizational culture. (MacNamara) Lundin and Söderholm (1994) define permanent organizations as being more defined by goals, production processes and survival, as they are much more long-term in their concept. Abrahamsson and Andersen (2005) highlights the importance of culture in organizations, and claim that culture is a product of long-term interaction between people, and that one way of maintaining organizational culture is through ceremonies for example, in our interpretation activities which works as team building. In this thesis, permanent organizations refers to the structure where a group of people are employed by the organization on a long term contract and have long term goals. Also, we see that permanent organizations exercise culture and team building activities.

## **1.7 Disposition**

This thesis begins with an *introductory* chapter and begins with some *background* on the subject, followed by a sub-chapter regarding *problem statement* and *question formulation and hypothesis*, followed by the sub-chapter on the *purpose* of this thesis. The introductory chapter finishes with sub-chapters on *limitations*, where the boundaries of the research are defined, as well as a sub-chapter on *definitions* used throughout the thesis, for increased understanding and clarity.

The second chapter covers the different *methods* utilized for writing this thesis. The chapter on method begins with a sub-chapter *motivating and explaining the literary sources* used. After this, a sub-chapter *motivating and explaining the first hand empirical sources* are discussed, followed by a sub-chapter on *how the search of the empirical sources was conducted and the results* from this search. The chapter on method finishes with a sub-chapter on the *critical evaluation* of both the literary and empirical sources accompanied by motivations on why they are solid and reliable.

The third chapter is the *literature review*, where previous research on the subject is presented. This chapter is divided in five sub-chapters, beginning with a sub-chapter which briefly presents theories on group dynamics, power and leadership, the second is about how to practically *make a film*, this to provide valuable background knowledge and increased

understanding. This is followed by a sub-chapter on *project-based organizations*. The literature review finishes with two chapters on *film/culture-producing organizations*, the first with *qualitative* research, and the last on *quantitative* research.

The fourth chapter is where the *empirical data* is presented, divided into three sub-chapters by the three interviews conducted. The first interview presented is a thorough personal interview with a film producer/production manager, the second and third are email interviews with a small-time actor and film art student respectively.

The fifth chapter is the *analysis* of the previous research in accordance with the empirical data. The analysis is divided in two sub-chapters, the first on *project-based organizations*, the second on *film/culture producing organizations*, where three points of analysis is used, them being *group dynamics, power and leadership*. The chapter finishes with a summary of the most important findings divided under the three features.

The sixth and last chapter is the *conclusion* where the *question formulation* and *hypothesis* is answered, with a sub-chapter on *suggestions for future research*.

In addition there is a list of *references*, divided into three sub-categories; *articles, books* and *webpages*. The thesis also has an *appendix* where the *interview guide* for the interviews conducted for the empirical data is presented.

## **2. METHOD**

### **2.1 Choice of sources for the literature review**

We have found a number of useful sources to examine what research has been conducted in this specific field previously. We could not find an abundance of research, and not all sources have a direct connection to our subject, however, we have been able to derive useful information from these sources. We chose to conduct qualitative research in this study. Bryman & Bell (2003) wrote that qualitative researchers are interested in matters of meaning while quantitative research are often connected to conducting hypothesis- and theory-testing, often utilized in the field of natural science. Because of the lack of research in the field of management and organization in film production, we have chosen to examine research concerning a few different fields.

Firstly, we are only presenting theories on the three features, group dynamics, power and leadership, briefly because we have little interest in conducting research on what they are more specifically or what is good and not. This thesis focus plainly on these basic descriptions as anything more extensive would shift the focus of this thesis as well as lead into a whole other field of management. We believe that by simply studying film production from the point of view of project-based organizations and culture producing organizations, finding these three features in all of their simplicity is easy, and provide more than enough insight. We leave more extensive research on these three features as their own subjects to others. To be noted is that no connections will be made between the theories on group dynamics, power and leadership and the displays found in the analysis as the theories and the interpreted definitions are the basis of the analysis, therefore making over explicit connections to those theories would be overstating the obvious.

Secondly, we have researched how to practically make a film. We felt that this was necessary for us, and our readers, as this is a subject we, and we are sure many others, have very little knowledge of. We felt as some background knowledge was necessary to fully understand the problem statement.

Thirdly, we have examined project-based organizations, simply because film production is a form of a project-based organization, as well as to try to determine if the short-term way of

working affects people working in films and their actions, as well as the organization of film production. By studying theories about project-based organizations, we could shed light on one complex part of film production.

Lastly, we have attempted to find and study research on film/culture producing organizations, even that which is not strictly management related. We felt as we could deduce many conclusions from studies regarding how film workers felt about their work environment for example. Here we chose to study both qualitative research, for an in depth look into the field, as well as quantitative research as we felt that this created both validity as well as useful information. We chose to separate the two types of research (qualitative and quantitative) in the literature review into two separated sub-chapters for increased clarity. This was also because the quantitative research is based on surveys on the work environment in film production, where no in depth analysis has been conducted on the results. However the data itself is still very valuable, as the results will be analyzed in this thesis even if the original authors made little attempt of this themselves.

## **2.2 Choice of empirical data and interviewees**

Early on we understood that there seems to be a lack of research useable to answer our problem statement. Therefore, it was an easy decision to choose to conduct our main research through interviews. The legitimacy in using interviews for data collecting is supported by Bryman & Bell (2003) who also mentions that the research interview is a prominent data collection strategy in both quantitative and qualitative research. Through interviews, we could receive a full view of our issue, and receive valuable first-hand knowledge. This decision was also based on the fact that we felt as qualitative research would suit our research better, than any quantitative research would. Furthermore, there would not have been time to conduct many interviews, as this would not have enabled us to receive in depth answers to our questions, as well hindered an in depth analysis buried by empirical data.

We chose to conduct one personal interview as well as two interviews via email. We would have preferred to have conducted only personal interviews, however, we decided that all knowledge is beneficial for our research, and therefore gathered all the information we could. Also, even though email interviews were not as in depth as personal interviews, we felt that they gave us a good mode to compare and ensure our results from the in depth interview.

We decided to conduct semi-structured interviews, which means the interview has pre-written questions but the questions can be varied in order and have follow-up questions (Bryman & Bell. 2003). We used a pre-written interview guide (see appendix) with general questions as well as person/occupation specific questions, to once again ensure and further validate our results while still allowing the interviewee to somewhat digress and give freedom to their answers, which we believe is a proper approach to receive as much information as possible.

When we thought about the people who would provide us with suitable knowledge to answer our problem statement we decided that we wanted as wide a range of insights as possible. Therefore, we decided that we would enlighten our issue by interviewing people from as many different occupations as possible, and from different positions in the film production hierarchy. Therefore, wanted our prime respondent to be working as a film producer or similar, as they can give us great insight in how it is to practically make a film as well as provide knowledge of what happens during production, on set, as well as give us insight in what happens when more than one producer or production company is involved. This would also mean that they would be working behind the camera and be in the top of the hierarchy. We felt as film producers would have the most overall knowledge and could provide us with much valuable information. We also wanted the point of view of actors, who literarily are in the middle of the action, preferably one of lower status to give us insight from the bottom of the hierarchy.

We also wanted other personnel, such as directors, scriptwriters, stage workers etc. to further widen our view of the issue. Unfortunately, there was no possibility for us to interview any other personnel, partly due to little access, party due to time and length limitations of this thesis. In addition, we wanted to examine the view on group dynamics, power and leadership from future film workers, ergo, those who are studying film today. Therefore, we chose to interview a student of film production to add yet another point of view to our analysis.

### **2.3 Method and result of finding our interviewees**

Initially, we made a simple Google search for production companies in Sweden, and started by sending out nine emails, where seven were to different production companies of varying size, one was for the Swedish Film Institute, and one was to the film school at the University

of Gothenburg. Furthermore we found a network for women in film called Doris Film where we found five women all involved in film production in some way or another, which we emailed.

We also contacted two acquaintances of Huilin Shi; Xichen Wang is a film art student studying in France, and Peter Carlsson is an actor who has had numerous small roles in Swedish films such as *Johan Falk* and *Irene Huss*.

We received a reply from one of Sweden's largest production companies, Film i Väst, where they said that they could not personally help us. However, they did give us two personal email addresses to two freelancing film producers, as well as three suggestions of production companies situated in Gothenburg. Moreover they recommended two studies, *Alla mår bra?* by Klerby and Näslund (2010) and *Film- och TV-arbetare i rampljuset* by Wibe (2006), on the work environment in film production that they thought could be helpful.

Six of those emailed answered either no or that they would get back to us. Unfortunately, this never happened. All in all, we have sent out twenty-one interview requests and in the end confirmed three; filmmaker, actor and film art student Xichen Wang via email, as well as with actor Peter Carlsson, also via email. We conducted a 70 minute long personal interview with freelancing film producer/production manager Erika Malmgren, whom we found through Film i Väst, which obviously was our most in depth interview of all, and an invaluable source of knowledge for our research.

## **2.4 Critical evaluation of literary and empirical sources**

If one would study the sources used in this thesis some questions might be raised. When looking at the literary sources many are quite new, while others are considerably older. However, we made an assessment of each of the articles and books used and determined and established their validity, deciding that they are not dated.

Also, some sources are based on studies made in Britain for example. And even though we will make no attempt to generalize our findings on a Europe or world wide scale, we believe that with the limited supply of film production research we could not afford to discard research made in our specific field of study, and therefore chose to utilize these sources. Also,



some sources mention TV-workers as the main or co-focus of their studies, which is not where we have placed any focus whatsoever, however, as previously stated, we cannot afford to dismiss valuable knowledge in the field of film production, and in this case we felt as these two fields are close enough related to retrieve valid and relevant information. In addition, we exclusively studied academic articles published in academic journals, to yet again confirm their validity. Many of the authors are well known in their respective fields, therefore we found that all of them were proper to use for our research.

Regarding our empirical sources, we felt equally assured of their reliability. There were only three empirical sources used, however, much of what was said is corroborated by previous research. Moreover, all of the interviewees are experienced in their respective fields and has no discernible agenda for not providing truthful information, as well as no reason for being biased. There is always a personal interpretation, however we trust the information we were given.

Also, one could ask if any general conclusions could be drawn from our findings. We believe that with the support and correlation between theoretical and empirical data general conclusions can be drawn, at least about film production in Sweden, and possibly Scandinavia. We also believe that general conclusions can be drawn even if all film projects are unique; we found they share special characteristics even if there are minor differences, and that this constitutes grounds for generalizations.

However, one could criticize and evaluate how three interviews could provide enough knowledge to draw conclusions and make statement of what results can mean. Surely more interviews and even more extensive theoretical research would have been beneficial, however, as this thesis would not allow for that amount of research, it would be impossible for us. Although, even if the research could be more extensive, we do feel as the results presented are valid, especially as many correlations can be found between theoretical and empirical data.

Lastly, one could argue that our interpretations are incorrect; after all it is practically impossible to conduct a completely objective analysis, however we feel no bias to our results, and are very free from our hypothesis, therefore we feel as the analysis is unbiased and also valuable. There is no way one could claim that any analysis, especially in the field of

management, is completely correct, one could only attempt to come as close to reality as possible, which we have attempted and in our mind succeeded fairly well with.

## **3. LITERATURE REVIEW**

In this literature review, previous research is presented and divided into four different sub-chapters, the first briefly presenting theories on group dynamics, power and leadership, the second pertaining to project-based organizations, the third pertaining to qualitative research on film/culture producing organizations and lastly a sub-chapter on quantitative research on film/culture producing organization in the form of studies made on the work environment in film production is presented.

### **3.1 Group dynamics, power and leadership**

Here theories on the three utilized features are briefly presented. There are only brief descriptions as to not shift focus of the essay, while still defining and explaining the concepts of them.

#### ***3.1.1 Group dynamics***

Forsyth (2006) writes that Kurt Lewin (1951) first established group dynamics; which means the scientific study of groups, as well as the action, processes, and changes that occur in social groups. Furthermore, Cartwright and Zander (1968) calls group dynamics a “field of inquiry dedicated to advancing knowledge about the nature of groups, the laws of their development, and their interrelations with individuals, other groups, and larger institutions” (p. 7).

#### ***3.1.2 Power***

Northouse (2010) claims that the concept of power is related to leadership. The reason is because power is part of the leadership influence process; it is the capacity or potential to influence. People such as doctors, teachers and ministers have power when they have ability to affect other’s beliefs, attitudes, and course of actions. When they are exercising influence, they are using their power. Northouse (2010) also says that there are two major kinds of power in organizations, they are position power and personal power. Position power is the power a person has as his position in the formal organization system. Personal power is the influence capacity a person/leader has from being trusted by followers. (Northouse, 2010) Abrahamsson and Andersen (2005) claim that hierarchy is present in all organizations on one level or another, and cannot be deleted. Furthermore, Foucault (1975) describes the process of

surveillance as hierarchical with those above surveiling those below, and describes how it is an economical tool of management to ensure that work is fulfilled properly.

### ***3.1.3 Leadership***

Northouse (2010) says that leadership is a process when an individual influences a group of individuals towards a common goal. Leaders and followers are both part of the leadership process, so the relationships between them are vital. According to Jönsson and Stannegård (2009), managers cannot only focus on administrative procedures or only coach and motivate without control. Leadership involves dealing with stressed situations where a confident personality and steadfast values are important. This is also important for establishing trust with employees; employees must trust their employer and supervisors or controlling or leading the employees would be difficult. (Jönsson & Stannegård. 2009)

## **3.2 Making a film**

To start, one should know that there are four distinctive phases in film production, and they are, in time order, “*Development*”, “*Pre-production*”, “*Production (principal photography)*” and “*Post-production*”. Below is Clevé’s (1994) description of what the *director*, *producer* and *production manager*, some of the more principal professions in film production, does during these four phases.

### ***3.2.1 Key figures***

Clevé (1994) describes that the producer is one of the few people working on a film production from beginning to end. In the development phase, the producer conceives an idea for a movie, develops it into a presentable package, and tries to raise production funds in order to get the project into pre-production. First, the producer usually searches for material that could be turned into a successful (financially) feature film, such as novel, stage play, a real life-story, or even a song. In addition, the exploitation rights needs to be purchased, which can be difficult; therefore the easiest solution is most often to find an existing screenplay; even if it needs to be re-written. Secondly, the producer must find a production company/studio that is willing to provide funds for the film production. This is where the process of packaging truly begins, by, for example, securing a famous actor or an accomplished director, this makes the “package” more attractive. After all this has been done,

it is the time for the producer to hire a production manager to handle different administrative duties which they will not do themselves, such as break down the screenplay or work out the budget. When the producer has a final screenplay, and financial backing, it is time to move to the next phase – Preproduction.

### ***3.2.2 Preproduction***

During preproduction, the production manager must handle the screenplay breakdown, shooting schedule, location scouting, budget, casting and unions, permits, hiring of staff and crew, unit supervision, permit clearance, equipment rental and stock, lab supervision, payroll service, insurance, post-production preparation, and so on. During pre-production the director has responsibilities such as collaborating with the writer on the development of the script, helping the casting director in hiring actors, helping the production manager to make shooting schedule, as well as planning the overall look and feeling of the film together with the art director and the director of photography. (Clevé. 1994)

### ***3.2.3 Production (principal photography)***

Clevé (1994) explain that when all the tasks during pre-production are done, it is then time for the next phase: production (principal photography). This is where shooting (filming) begins, which means that the main action of the work has shifted from an office to the set or location. The production manager is responsible for a glitch-free shoot, the logistics and the overall organization. The assistant director is responsible for the flow and continuity of activities on the set and keeps the production manager informed about the status of the production and is also in charge of the observance of union regulations, such as proper lunch breaks and correctly completed paper work. There are four distinctive phases of operations on the set during production: blocking, lighting, final rehearsals and shooting. In blocking, this basically means that the director sets up the shot, determine the look of the scene and of the film, and make creative decisions with the actors. Shooting starts when the director calls “Sound rolling. Camera rolling. Slate number X. Action.” And shooting stops when the director calls “Cut.”

### ***3.2.4 Post-production***

When all scenes have been shot and principal photography has been completed, the post-production phase begins. In this phase, the producer discusses order and selection of scenes with the director, reviews the final cut of the film after it is edited, in some cases, polishes, revises and restructures the film to create the final cut, works with a distributor to secure distribution for the film, reviews the distributor's advertising campaign for the film, and so on. Often, the production manager finishes the tasks related to the production office, such as handling rental houses, lab, insurance, payroll, accounting, and bookkeeping and after this leaves the production. (Clevé. 1994)

## **3.3 Project-based organizations**

Below different theories explaining and examining project-based organization is presented. It is a selection of theories most pertaining to the subject of film production.

### ***3.3.1 Basics of project-based organizations***

Gareis (1989) provides a good definition of what a project is. He writes, "*A 'project' is an organization, which is established for a limited time period to solve a complex (relatively), unique problem.*" (p. 243). Gareis (1989) claims that project management creates new demands on management skills that no longer are specialized skills, but a general one that all managers should possess. Gareis (1989) continues by saying that it is important that project managers and project staff, in this case producers and film crew, represent the parent company from which the project emanates from, and not just the project. In addition, it is important to define the project carefully, for example in time, budget etc., so to facilitate the (film) crew in doing their best work possible. Moreover, each project has its own project culture, with norms, values and beliefs, and this culture is important to develop for increasing the excitement and commitment for the project vision, and therefore is a tool for managing a successful project. Other tools include having clear roles and communication as well as vigorous planning according to Gareis (1989).

Staber (2004) explains that project organizations are becoming increasingly common, and are often defined by the uncertain environment that they operate in, and poses several examples, the film industry being one of them. Staber (2004) explains that even though the environment

often is uncertain and high-risk, the projects themselves are very structured with much hierarchy, where projects success is found when a broad spectrum of individual knowledge become collective knowledge. Also, because there is a time limit for each project, like Gerais (1989) explained previously, there is no time for any evaluation of ones work for future benefits and engagements. It also means that there is no time for any HR-related activities, such as team building, which is most often found in permanent hierarchical organizations.

### ***3.3.2 Special characteristics of project-based organizations***

Staber (2004), much like Finney (2008), talk about how people working in project-based organizations are most often freelancers, and that this means that they themselves must create networks and opportunities to transition knowledge and learn new skills. According to Staber (2004), this leads to a riskier work environment in comparison to permanent work environments, which in turn lead to people working in project-based organizations spending much time developing good relationships with others as to make sure that they will be considered for employment in the future.

Lundin and Söderholm (1994) highlight what differences one can find between project-based organizations and permanent organizations. Time, task, teams and transition define the project-based organization. Time is in reference to the fact that project-based organizations are time limited and often very stressful. Task points to the fact that project-based organizations often have very clear and separated tasks that different people perform. Team means that it is the time and task that brings people together, which forms a team. Transition is where projects often circulates around some sort of change, something is becoming something else and there is an obvious difference between the before and after picture with project-based organizations. A permanent organization on the other hand, is more defined by goals, production processes and survival, they are obviously much more long-term in their concept.

Furthermore, Lundin and Söderholm (1994) discuss that tasks can be repetitive or unique. In a project-based organization tasks are most often unique, while in permanent organizations they are often repetitive. Furthermore, the teams and people within them have different expectations and beliefs in project-based organizations, as they are time-limited, in comparison to those working in a permanent organization. Moreover, this also means that

people in project-based organizations accept conflicts more than in permanent organizations, simply because they know the situation is temporary.

According to Blair, Grey and Randle (2001), film production companies are project-based organizations. Also, several production companies often produce the same film, if they can provide what is needed for the production, usually meaning financial capital. An example of this is Britain in the 19th century; 342 different production companies made 454 feature films.

### ***3.3.3 Special complexities of project-based organizations***

According to Blair, Grey and Randle (2001), film production is based on a project-by-project level and each product of the project is unique, and the process is organized around individual projects rather than any production company. Furthermore, in this industry people are employed project-by-project and are usually self-employed, meaning freelance, and they usually have no long-term association with any particular film production company. In their study on film productions results showed that 59% of the crew had always worked self-employed and never had been permanently employed in the film- or television industries. (Blair, Grey and Randle. 2001)

Turner and Keegan (1999) neatly sums up the complexities of project-based organization; since no project is the same as any other, there is not a recipe for management and control that suits all projects; this leads to hierarchy not being useful in the same manner for coordination and communication; there is no job security because the projects are time-limited; also, because no two projects are alike, future skill sets which will be needed is difficult to foresee; and finally transfer and storage of knowledge is very difficult.

## **3.4 Film/culture producing organizations – qualitative research**

Below qualitative research on film/culture producing organizations is presented, as to display what contemporary research has been conducted pertaining to management and film production today.

### ***3.4.1 Basics of film production***

Finney (2008) claims that film production is highly demanding, badly organized and disunited, but also a great example of project-based organizations where information is



seldom harvested and passed on. The reason for this is partly because there is no full proof recipe of how to create a successful film, people learn by experience and is difficult to concretize. Finney (2008) has no concrete suggestion of how to increase the transition of knowledge, but speaks more of how producers can increase the chances of a successful film project. He states that the personality and previous experiences play a large part in the success of a film, as well as a producer's capability of coping with risks and failures during the creative process. Furthermore, Finney (2008) argues that it is very important for producers to delegate, as they have many different responsibilities and tasks, and also claim that without delegating, the film project will fail.

### ***3.4.2 Management and hiring process in film production***

Blair (2001) explains the odd hiring process in film production, which further complicates the industry. There are no advertisements used to attract potential staff, and resumes are also highly uncommon, mostly employment happens through contacts - often family, friends or previous employers, and by experience in the business. This leads to job uncertainty, which fortunately decreases by experience. In addition, those in charge of hiring have much responsibility for the people they hire, if it turns out that someone was a bad fit, then it is the responsibility and fault of the one who hired the ill-fitting crewmember. Furthermore, there is little room for errors, especially if you are new in the industry. If mistakes are made and it is the fault of someone established, their career might not be affected in any greater extent. However if someone is new and have no real reputation yet, a mistake might cost a rookie his/her career. Blair (2001) elaborates on the film production job market by claiming that there is a small elite who runs the industry, and that it is not necessarily skill that got them into the elite group, but often other things such as personality traits or the ability to understand and fit into group culture, that determine career success.

Blair (2001) continues by pointing out that the heads of departments are most often those who the employees sees as managers, and not necessarily those who possess actual management or supervising positions. The heads of department teach their staff how things are to be done and therefore often work in a very autonomous way. This way, management is not very detail oriented, but more about reaching the director's targets and goals, meaning, *how* to reach them are not as important. Moreover, this leads to the heads of department representing their

staffs' work, and they are therefore responsible for the product, which in turn affect their own reputation and future job possibilities.

Another reason for this autonomy is that film crews have very specific specialist knowledge, e.g. lighting shooting etc., which management often do not possess, meaning that micromanaging would neither be possible nor productive. Also, in the different departments, a way of working is quickly established, and micromanaging would be inefficient and disturb the creative process. (Blair. 2001)

Dex et al. (2000) conducted a study on British TV-workers' perceptions and opinions of uncertainty, on the basis that there is no job guarantee in the TV- or film industry. The job uncertainty and short projects creates much worry, and in the process stress for the majority of the participants of the study. The group who were most affected by the job uncertainty was freelancers, or those who were employed by very small firms. Also, Dex (et al. 2000) believes that this uncertainty and way of working will have detrimental effects on both the quality of the products, meaning TV-programs, as well as on productivity.

### ***3.4.3 Group dynamics and occupational responsibilities***

Soila-Wadman (2003) presents her findings when interviewing a number of people working in film as well as observing the action of shooting a film in her dissertation. Soila-Wadman (2003) found that many people working in film, even those who did not have strictly creative tasks, were very committed to the film as well as to its director, who they would work extremely hard for, to achieve the director's vision. She continues to confirm the briefness of the projects, and that prolonging filming often is unthinkable as many in the crew have future commitments in other projects. Also, she found that it is very important to have a high functioning team with good group dynamics, and that many who work in film downplay friction and conflicts and accept hardships just because the projects are short-term. Moreover, the director's job is not only to provide a safe and trusting atmosphere for the actors, but also to create this atmosphere for everybody in the film crew, as to make sure that they can work and create to their full ability.

Soila-Wadman (2003) discusses the different roles a director must fill, and claims that in Sweden, the director has the final cut of the film, the director are the one in charge. However,

the director cannot only make decisions, they must also inspire and motivate, as well as create a safe and trusting environment, as discussed above. A director must balance both the creative process along side the administrative process of film production. In Soila-Wadmans's (2003) studies she found that film production is highly hierarchical, however, that this is accepted and necessary according to the film crew. However, even if the director is the manager and makes all of the decisions, the director cannot be a tyrant and micromanage if he/she would like the respect and cooperation of the team. Therefore communication is a very important tool to facilitate a good work environment.

Furthermore, the issue of who makes the decision is highlighted with the director and the producer, whom often seem to argue about fulfilling the vision while on a tight budget. This is where negotiation is necessary, and where many directors choose to take on the role as producers themselves as to avoid to be forced to compromise too much. (Soila-Wadman. 2003)

Soila-Wadman (2003) points out that different directors are more or less inclusive in their work. Some focus solely on the relationship with the actors, while some focus on the relationships with the rest of the crew as well. This boils down to the pursuit of giving all of the staff a chance to have their creativity flow, as well as mutual respect for everyone working in film production, just not the actors and managers.

Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) examined leadership in culture producing organizations, in film production and orchestra performance to be exact, and found that the organization for making a film, also known as film crew, is temporary, which means that most people come and work for this specific film. Later, when the film is done, the crew is also gone. Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) says that a film production team in Sweden usually consists of 15 to 25 people, and that the people are usually different from film to film, however, many directors and producers like to work with the people they have worked with before who did a satisfying job.

Furthermore, film production is a costly activity, so it is very important to plan and prepare well before shooting. The crew's plan can be changed, even frequently, so the crewmembers should have social skills and be able to work together under pressure. However, the film crew works in their own specializations; the photographer works with the camera, the sound

technician records the sound etc. The way that the director manages the crew is unique and changes from different projects. Also, the process of the creation is unique, since scripts, crews and locations differ from project to project.

Also, Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) learned that there often is much negotiation and discussion on how much work is enough for the film crew. Some are very committed and excited about the project, while for others the film is simply a job, and nothing too be overly engaged in.

In addition, Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) explained that it is the director's responsibility to create the conditions for an artistic spirit to emerge. One of the directors who were interviewed explained that she believed that compartmentalizing the technical staff and the creative staff is disadvantageous, as everyone needs to be a part of the creative process.

Moreover, in Swedish film production, as previously stated, the director has the right to "the final cut" and decides how the final film will look like. The director also has to balance the financial demands with practical matters and artistic ambitions. This means the director has to be careful when making decisions, otherwise grave financial and artistic consequences can arise. Therefore, it is also important that the film crew does not question and challenge decisions made. Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) learned that this demanded a sensitive yet strong director, the director must be both a fierce leader, yet artistically aware to be able to see nuances of behavior for signs on how to act. This means also knowing when to act and not, as to not disturb the process unnecessarily.

### **3.5 Film/culture producing organizations – quantitative research**

Below quantitative research on film production is presented. To be noted is that it is the work environment in film production that is examined, but that the authors have made little analysis from the results.

In a study on the work environment in Swedish film- and TV-production made in 2010 by Anna Klerby and Lovisa Näslund with support from a number of Swedish film institutions called *Alla mår bra?*, people working in the film and TV industry were asked a number of questions in order to determine the psychological as well as physical work environment. In

all, 694 people participated in the study and were divided into 7 different occupation categories: A-functions (director, photographer, costume, make-up, scriptwriter, casting director etc.), actors, miscellaneous artistic staff (property master, props, etc.), director assistants (script girl, storyboard artist, filming manager etc.), technical staff (grip, chauffeurs, sound technicians, special effects, electrician etc.), production crew (producer, line producer, production manager etc.) and miscellaneous assistants.

### ***3.5.1 Modus operandi***

The survey places much focus on the fact that the film industry mostly operates on a freelance basis, and therefore has a deep analysis of the recruitment process. The study showed, and has been validated through foreign studies on the subject, that the majority (38 % and 20 %) employed on film projects are asked to participate in a project by the producer or other staff they already know. It is very rare to be hired through a job advertisement (2 %) or by contacting the producer or director oneself (7 %).

The study shows that workdays are generally longer than the standard nine-to-five workday and also examines which occupation category received payment for overtime and not. This is relevant in an analysis of power distribution. The survey showed that the categories which receive payment for overtime most often are director assistants (52 %), technical staff (49 %) and miscellaneous artistic staff (47 %), and the categories which receive the least payment for overtime are production crew (8 %), actors (10 %) and A-functions (13 %). The authors claim that the reason for not receiving payment for overtime is mainly because it is not included in the contract, but that the “filming culture” is that you work until the work is done, which provides increased flexibility, but can lead to unhealthily long work days.

Noteworthy is that the film industry is operated through short projects and that the amount of people having a tenure, in all occupation categories with the exception of production crew (circa 9 %), 0 % had tenure, and practically all staff is hired on a time-limited basis.

### ***3.5.2 Work conditions***

When examining work environment, the researchers divided the work environment in six different areas: work leadership (how the work is being organized, relationship between colleagues and supervisors etc.), freedom/development (freedom to speak one’s mind,

contentment in current work position, future career etc.), well-being (physical and psychological health, how well one feels at work and how this level of well-being affects one's health etc.), terms and conditions/resources (salaries, education, time to prepare etc.), equality/discrimination (gender, nationality, harassment etc.) and finally ergonomics/physical work environment (attritional wear, accidents, preventative measures etc.) (which is not displayed here because of low relevancy to the subject). The responses were scored on a scale from 1-5, where one is very bad/not true and five is very good/very true.

In all occupation categories it was found that work leadership was good. The score was around 3,5-4,2. However, noteworthy is that questions regarding receiving positive feedback as well as supervisors motivating staff received lower scores. This is believed to mean that film crews work very independently to solve problems and is trusted by their supervisors. The survey also shows that the occupation categories most affected by this lack of affirmation is A-function and miscellaneous artistic staff, and those least affected are actors and production crew.

Questions regarding freedom/development are of particular interest for this thesis. The survey posed a question asking how outspoken one could be. The categories that felt like they could be very outspoken, were, not surprisingly, actors (4,1) and production crew (4,1), and the categories, which felt like they could be least outspoken, were miscellaneous artistic staff (3,2) and miscellaneous assistants (3,4). The authors claim that this is connected to how pleased some categories were with the work leadership. Klerby and Näslund (2010) stated that besides the difference of status and power, which they believed to be the foremost reason, the assistants for example are expected to be loyal towards the supervisors who hired them, and therefore feel as they cannot speak their mind.

The freedom/development area also showed that most people (70 %) believed that they would still be working with film in five years, while 30 % believed that they would work somewhere else, particularly the miscellaneous assistants. Klerby and Näslund (2010) sees this as a sign of the incredibly tough labor market in the film industry, where people might not be able to find work in film production even if they want to and tries to.

On the subject of well-being, all occupation categories were displaying high scores; i.a. because of feeling like work had meaning, between 4,0-4,6, with actors and production crew

in the top and miscellaneous artistic staff and director assistants in the bottom. The categories in the bottom are the categories that experience the most stress at work, which can lead to multiple diseases/problems, while the categories in the top felt the least stress. Obviously there is a clear connection between well-being and stress in film production. When asked about stress related disorders, e.g. back pain, inability to relax, upset stomach, sleep problems and exhaustion, the same pattern reappears. Occupation categories, which experienced little stress like actors, had few of these problems, while director assistants suffered considerably more often from these problems.

### ***3.5.3 Inequality***

In the area of terms and conditions/resources the survey showed the overall lowest scores, with great discrepancy between different occupation categories, specifically between actors and production crew who had very high scores while miscellaneous artistic staff and A-functions had the lower scores. Generally miscellaneous artistic staff and A-functions felt as they had little time to prepare, little time to finish their work tasks, were paid too little etc. Klerby and Näslund (2010) connects this with the ability to speak ones mind as well as with how high or low scores were in the question if all staff were met with the same respect. People who scored high in this area were, like before, actors and production, while those who greatly disagreed was miscellaneous artistic staff. This is once again a clear sign of power and status according to Klerby and Näslund (2010).

On the subject of equality/discrimination the survey show low scores, perhaps with the exception discrimination on the basis of gender (1,5 on a scale of 1-5). Klerby and Näslund (2010) claim that the occupation category that experience discrimination the most is miscellaneous artistic staff, and believe that this is because their professions are considered to be of the lowest status, as well as women feeling inequality more than men. The survey also showed that inappropriate and unwelcome sexual language or actions were very low, only around 5 % for both men and women. Moreover, the survey shows that 59 % felt as they could/would talk to a coworker about such an encounter, however, only 6 % would discuss it with the supervisors/production management, and 18 % would not say anything at all. Klerby and Näslund (2010) believes that this is another sign of the somewhat disconnected, but trusting relationship between management and ordinary staff, as well as way to ensure to be hired again and not seem troublesome.

In conclusion, the occupation categories that suffer most from work environment related issues are A-function and miscellaneous artistic staff, and those who suffer least are actors. Klerby and Näslund (2010) assume that this could possibly lead to strife, decreased productivity and creativity, and discontent.

*Film- och TV-arbetare i rampljuset* is a Danish study conducted in 2005, and it was summarized and translated in 2006 by Gert Wibe. Wibe claims that the study is the most comprehensive study of film- and TV workers' work habits ever done. Wibe (2006) believe that even though the study was not conducted in Sweden, the two countries are similar enough to enable parallels to be drawn. Wibe claims that Danish film projects are mostly run by freelancing staff, which is also the case in Sweden.

#### **3.5.4 Work environment**

When it comes to group dynamics, most people enjoy the social climate in the work place, however, 80 % reports of conflicts in the work place, both between colleagues, supervisors and employees. The three main reasons for these conflicts are work hours and time pressure, bad economy in the production, and management.

The study also shows how the mental health of people employed in the Danish film industry compared with Danes in other professions, were about 10 % worse than the national average in all categories.

In a small survey conducted by Teaterförbundet, presented by Wibe (2006), the results showed that the average amount of months employed as a film worker is 17,2 months in the last three years, which is less than 6 months per year, well below people employed in other industries. Moreover, 92 % stated that they worked much over-time somewhat or very often of their workdays. Even more disturbing is the fact that 85 % worked under contracts, which did not give compensation for over-time. Furthermore, 23 % felt as they could influence their work schedule/hours, while 78 % stated that they could somewhat influence, or not influence all, their work schedule. In addition, Wibe show that a whopping 96 % felt as they had a somewhat or very stressful job. To be noted though is the fact that 96 % still perceive their work to be acceptable.



### ***3.5.5 Uncertain job market***

Despite of the job uncertainty in the film industry, 52 % were employed 9-12 months per year, 26 % were employed 6-9 months per year while 22 % were employed only 0-6 months per year. Some of this is presumably voluntary unemployment/time-off, however, some of it is certainly involuntary. Wibe (2006) even claims that one fourth of Danish film workers survive solely on extremely short assignments, sometimes as little as between 1 hour and a few days.

Moreover the study showed what freelancers believed to be most vital to secure an employment. The vast majority believed that freelancers had to be known in the business, actively create contacts as well as have an ability/be ready to “sell” oneself to receive job offers. When job offers are made they are mostly made by the producer or other staff ask or through recommendation by other colleagues. Only about one third of them received jobs by asking the producer or director directly. To facilitate this more than two thirds were involved in networks in one way or another.

In addition on the subject of the unsecure job market, 37 % stated that they had secured work for a long period ahead, 27 % stated that they had not secured any future work, however they believed they would be employed, and 22 % stated that they were very unsure or had no future work planned whatsoever. Wibe also claims that many freelancers felt that they could not show that they are unemployed and therefore put on a brave face as they were often competing for work with many other colleagues. They believe that their chances for work decreases if they showed their issues with employment.

On the subject of work hours per day and week, it is as expected most often more than the “normal” 40 hours per week, only 25 % states that they have normal work hours, which means that 75 % have very long days, often with too much over-time in their own opinion (50 %).

## **4. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS**

Below the empirical findings are presented, by making a detailed account of what was said during the in-depth personal interview with producer/production manager Erika Malmgren, and what was written in the two interviews via email with Peter Carlsson and Xichen Wang. Before any data is presented, each account of the interviews begins with an introduction of the interviewees. The answers given are presented under the feature they were concerning, meaning that the interviews are divided into sub-chapters regarding group dynamics, power and leadership for increased clarity and understanding.

### **4.1 Interview with producer/production manager Erika Malmgren**

Erika Malmgren is 35 years old and has been working with film since middle school and used to help her stepfather, who is a scriptwriter, at work as a child. She later went on to study film, specifically to become a film producer, in both Sweden and Denmark and received her degree from Högskolan i Väst. However, even though Malmgren has studied to become a film producer, which she has not quite started working as full time, Malmgren mainly works as a freelance production manager. Malmgren have produced a number of short films as well as a feature film, however, she did not receive payment for her work and have not started her own company. We found that this gave Malmgren a unique insight in film production since she has worked in several positions, however, we decided that we would conduct the interview from a production manager point of view since Malmgren has worked as a production manager for about ten years and therefore is most experienced in that position. We also conducted the interview under the pretense of production of a Swedish feature film.

Malmgren explains that in film production, there is a producer at the top of the hierarchy, who brings in a director. The producer and director together hire a scriptwriter, photographer, scenographer/art director and all other heads of the creative departments. The production manager is directly below the producer and is brought in after funds have been raised for the film and shooting is scheduled to begin. Since funding can take several years to complete, the production manager start working on a film circa 3 months before shooting. Her work includes helping to plan the entire process of shooting the film, hire the necessary staff and negotiate teams and terms with for example actors and other personnel. Malmgren writes a “shooting plan”, i.e. a detailed hour-by-hour plan of where staff needs to be and what they

need to be doing together with the shooting manager. Malmgren also have responsibilities for HR-issues and union-issues as well as economic responsibilities like making sure everybody is on budget, basic accounting as well as handling salaries and making deals and getting job estimates from car services, technical services and other side operations. In addition, Malmgren points out that all of her work tasks differ between film production and no film productions are exactly the same. Finally, when shooting is finished and Malmgren's work is over, Malmgren does what is called a transfer, or handing over of a sort, of all shooting reports, all lists of personnel and contracts to the producer, and the film is passed on to those responsible for the post-production like cutting and sound for example. In conclusion, a production manager makes sure that the film is shot on time and on budget, and rarely has any creative work tasks.

#### **4.1.1 Group dynamics**

##### ***4.1.1.1 Teams***

When Malmgren think of the term group dynamics, she thinks of how a group of people, who does not know each other very well, comes together to work intensively for a short period of time to never see each other again. Of course there is a possibility that you will work with the same people again in different constellations and under different circumstances, but that is something that you cannot know beforehand. Malmgren believes that this way of working appeals to many who work in film, who are constantly searching for the perfect team, to get a kick out of working in symbiosis with people they do not know, and still having everything work perfectly. With this in mind Malmgren points out that this way of working also can result in a dysfunctional team. The film can still become great, but the group dynamics can suffer and the process might not be as enjoyable. This is where leadership becomes vital, and Malmgren explains that leadership, the role of inspiring and motivation the staff, is mostly the directors job, therefore it is very important how the director work with the group, how inclusive and interactive the director is, since the structure of group dynamics evolve from the director and out to the staff.

##### ***4.1.1.2 Short projects***

When asked about the nature of the short projects, and how working in such an environment differs from more "normal", stable, long-term work situations, Malmgren believes that it does

differ. There is no time to procrastinate what so ever, and there is a need to get to know each other quickly, as well as understanding one's role in the production quickly. She continues by saying that there is no producer, or film production staff in general, who think long-term, who think about e.g. strategies concerning how to make the staff be content for years to come and other typical HR-questions, since the staff will not be working together in two months time anyway. The film is the goal, and after the film is finished it is time to move on. Malmgren adds that therefore there is no evaluation of any kind, that one must self-evaluate one's work. The only confirmation of one's performance is if the same people hire one again or not.

#### ***4.1.1.3 Creative organizations***

When talking about the difference in working in such a creative environment in comparison to a permanent one, Malmgren does not necessarily think that people work differently, as long as they perceive their work to be creative or are very passionate about their work. However, Malmgren does think that it is something special that ties the staff together when producing a film. It is a special sort of reward to see one's name in the credits and attending the premiere; even if the film is not very good one can be proud of one's accomplishments. Malmgren believes that having this clear goal, the finished film, does create a strong bond between the staff. Malmgren continues to explain that if she would hold a different job, she would still be working in a creative environment, e.g. theater, since she thinks it would be more meaningful.

Malmgren continued by saying that the process of film production is not necessarily financially sound, since Swedish film production rarely produces large profits, or even aim to produce large profits, which she believe points to film workers working in film because they are fiercely passionate, maybe unlike more traditional businesses. However, there are in fact production companies in Sweden who are larger with financial growth as its main purpose, however, these are not many and these values does not reach the process of film production itself.

Malmgren also points out that against popular belief, film production is not dopey and structure-less, but quite the opposite. Even though there may be some more unstructured creative types, there is meticulous planning and control of practically every minute of the day, and no room for improvisation and a "we will see how it goes-attitude". However, there is

some room for improvisation and some less structured ways of working in front of the camera, the director allowing, however, behind the camera utter organization needs to rule.

## **4.1.2 Power**

### ***4.1.2.1 Structure***

Regarding power Malmgren explains that film production is somewhat hierarchical, a sort of “Hollywood-light version” way of working. Since the teams in Sweden are so small, while American film crews are considerably larger where staff is only concerned with their task and nothing else, Swedish film crews often operate more trans-boundary. However, there is a structure of heads of department and middle management, who are individually responsible for their budgets and their staff. Malmgren also points out that these layers of management is something that one should go through with any thoughts or issues, and not as a low level employee directly confront the director or producer with. By not following the strict lines of communication and respecting peoples stature in the production means making a disservice to oneself and could provide a bad reputation. However, Malmgren added that the structure still is relatively flat, only with more levels of management, where employees can make mistakes without being sanctioned or fired as in the U.S.; meaning it is not overly strict.

### ***4.1.2.2 Short projects***

Working in short projects leads to a great deal of uncertainty according to Malmgren. There is no security or certainty that next month’s salary will even exist. Also, there is often a highly irregular work schedule, where some months or years can be very hectic, and other periods there is nothing to do. This uncertainty often presents itself in the middle of filming where people start to look ahead and try to find more work.

This leads into a fear of doing wrong. Many people in film production would rather work night and day to solve a problem than to be the one who complains about issues. It is all about receiving good references when filming is over, to make sure that one will be hired again. However, Malmgren explains that with experience it is easier to avoid problems because you know how to make sure that things will (probably) run smoothly. She believes that it is easier to raise issues and to say that a situation is unsustainable in a permanent company, and that

people in film production basically are more careful about what they say and do, because of the uncertain nature of the industry. She adds that many people accept that it will be very hard, grueling work for a few weeks, but it is only for a short period of time so it is all right. Malmgren does point out that with experience and once one is established in the business, people can make demands.

#### ***4.1.2.3 Surveillance***

When the question of power is discussed Malmgren explains that there is no “surveillance” being exercised on staff, and she seems to be somewhat surprised and uncomfortable with the expression. She says that she does delegate and give much responsibility, and that it all comes down to having a functional team and hiring proficient staff. Malmgren continues to explain that the amount of surveillance that she does exercise is more of a checking in, e.g. checking in with the different heads of department to see if they are on budget and on time, to see that everything is working smoothly. Although, Malmgren adds that many times she does not even have the time to ask these questions, and explains that not hearing anything at all often is a positive sign. There is of course exception to this rule, where people might be over-worked or being over-confident in their ability to perform certain tasks, but she claims that micromanaging is neither her management style nor a sustainable way to work. This also means that there is little or no affirmation or confirmation that someone is doing a good job, it is very rare to receive compliments or pats on the shoulder for work well done. When discussing the (potential) issue of not giving praise for work well done and not implementing typical soft HR-values in film production, Malmgren believes that it would be beneficial to give more praise, and that it even could lead to more productivity, or at the least make people feel more secure.

When asked if Malmgren often experience that she is being surveilled she says that it is very rare and that she is given much responsibility, but adds that the few times where producers are too hands on and in everyone’s business it is very unpleasant and that she then feel like she stops taking responsibility. She adds that it is therefore very important to examine people’s references and make sure that one never gives a good review of someone who might have done something strange or wrong. This she feels is sometimes not fair, since one’s judgment can be clouded by personal issues or other trivial events, however it is highly important to have one’s own back since a good review of a bad employee will reflect badly on oneself.

Malmgren also adds that if an employee is not doing their job well she does have a tendency to micromanage since she does like to be in control and expects others to work just as hard as she does. She believes that this might not be the best leadership approach as it could worsen the situation by making the employee feel less emancipated.

#### ***4.1.2.4 Power distribution***

When reflecting on who holds the most power in film production, Malmgren explains that it is difficult to name one person since there are so many levels of management from start to finish in film production, but believes that during filming the director and producer holds the most power, together with the financier who brings funding. Because it is very difficult to receive funding in Sweden they do have a lot of power in the end. She also explains that their power differ, and therefore much conflict rarely exists, at least between financier and the rest of the staff. However, Malmgren believes that the situation is different abroad and that financiers are much more hands on in the production. Malmgren also explains that in Sweden the distribution companies have much power over film productions in the sense of deciding to show the film in, for example, theatres or not. Malmgren even goes so far as to describe it as a hostage situation. She continues to say that she believes that friction between the director and the producer is beneficial, and through this friction a better film can be made by combining the best ideas and thoroughly discussing, and sometimes arguing about, everything.

Malmgren also connects back to the question on surveillance to say that the producer must be able to trust that the director he or she hired is proficient and can make the vision come to life.

When asked about the power of the actors Malmgren explains that she does think that a few Swedish actors hold power over the film. As an example Malmgren explains that some A-list actors holds a fair amount of power. If an A-list actor arrives late no one will fire him/her over this, since he/she might be the reason why funds for the film even exist, and A-list actors themselves are very aware of their worth and can use this to influence the film. She also believes that A-list actors could influence the script if he does not care for a scene, however this is up to the director, and that many directors welcome suggestions to make the film more natural, as well as the importance of having the actors feel good, and therefore be able to produce a better film when the actors can perform better and be more comfortable about their work.

When asked about her level of power, Malmgren says that she has some power, however it is not too extensive, since she has no creative power as well as having a manager of her own. Although Malmgren explains that she does have power over how the film is produced, for example over the amount of work hours, on whether or not to accept overtime etc., even though the director might object. Her amount of power depends on how much respect is given by the director and thereby the need of consulting the producer for support. She continues to say that she sometimes craves more power, while still feeling that it is more secure to have a manager in case anything would go very wrong and she herself needs help.

#### ***4.1.2.5 Equality***

Also, Malmgren wanted to briefly discuss the subject of equality and gender in film production. Typical gender roles apply in film production; directors, photographers etc. are generally men, and production management and staff, makeup etc. are generally female while producers mostly are fifty-fifty. She does see a trend of more equal job allocation with women in typical male occupations, which Malmgren think is great, however, there is almost none the other way around with men in typical female jobs. Malmgren believes that this is because of power and prestige; that typical female jobs are worth less and are less serious. Malmgren explains that this perception is very difficult to break and she admits that she herself sometimes forget the struggle in creating a more equal industry, even if she in general does try to be forward thinking and go against the stream. Malmgren explains that she believes that these issues are very connected to the question of power and group dynamics, and adds that this also includes the fact that film production is a very Caucasian industry with little diversity of ethnicities. Even though creativity favors neither gender nor ethnicity, film production unfortunately does not mirror the level of diversity society show. Malmgren adds that not all who works in film have the interest in fighting against old norms and ways of doing things.

On a happier note, all age groups are represented in film production and that the gender distribution in the team as a whole is fifty-fifty, it just varies in the different occupations. Malmgren continues to point out that the film industry is very difficult to break into, but that it is very possible to climb the career ladder and work one's way up, even without formal education. Malmgren adds that people are tested in the beginning of their careers by the more experienced staff, just like the experienced staff was tested when they were new; this is the



way it has always been done, and also might be necessary since it is a very slim business with much competition where many people would like to work. Moreover, people who are in the industry already treat each other fairly and do not step on others to get ahead, but she does not deny the fierce competition and that people are very replaceable.

### **4.1.3 Leadership**

#### ***4.1.3.1 Leadership approach***

Malmgren also described the director as having different approaches to different members of the team. Actors are often pampered and cosseted, a cliché which Malmgren confirmed to often be true. The director therefore lead and approach actors with more feelings and fluidity, while the members on staff who work behind the screen, people like Malmgren for example, are led in a more administrative way since their tasks are not as creative. Malmgren continued on the subject of actors to confirm that they are driven everywhere and have people to cater to them, as well as many times having their staff, for example their hairdressers act as faux-therapists. They are given special treatment, which Malmgren says can have negative effects, but she adds that she also find that this is appropriate, fair and necessary since actors place their hearts and souls in front of the screen for everyone to see, something that takes courage and is not easy to do.

#### ***4.1.3.2 Multiple sources of leadership***

When broaching the subject of more than one producer/production company being involved Malmgren explained that most of the time only one party is involved, but Malmgren did share an experience where there were two producers from the same production company who were working on the same film, where issues arose. One of the producers was a salesman type of person, who was great at selling the film to others and being good at PR and so on. The second producer were much more crass and realistic and more aware of the different limitations of the film. They both wanted to produce a great film, but had two completely different points of view, which lead to much confusion for the staff, especially when the first producer promised more time and money than possible, which was later contradicted by the second producer right before filming, which created many problems for the staff. Malmgren explained that having one producer is often more functional, and that he/she needs to be able

to communicate both with the creative staff as well as to the administrative staff and be very clear. The producer therefore needs to be the typical leader as well as the typical manager.

## **4.2 Interview with filmmaker and actor Peter Carlsson**

Peter Carlsson is a martial arts trainer and IT consultant. He has been very involved in music, dance and drama since he was a child and now works as a filmmaker and hobby actor in his spare time. Carlsson has participated in multiple small roles in Swedish films such as *Johan Falk* and *Irene Huss*.

### **4.2.1 Group dynamics**

Carlsson says that he thinks of group dynamics as people interacting and growing together even if they do not have a definite leader. Carlsson explains that from an actor point of view, the group dynamics between actors is up to the actors themselves, because they must personally figure out how they will make a scene realistic and credible. It is very much about them trying out different voices, different speeds of movement and how they should act according to description. This means that group dynamics in film productions must be creative and open, otherwise it will not look natural or be a good result at the end, according to Carlsson.

As an actor Carlsson thinks that it is a responsibility to be able to interact with other actors during shooting, as well as talking with the director after each scene. It is difficult to understand the process if you do not ask others what to do.

Carlsson thinks group dynamics, as well as power and leadership; present itself differently in film/culture producing organizations in comparison to permanent organizations, partly because time and money always creates stress. Time is always too brief in film production in Sweden; therefore Swedes are very good at pumping out films quickly, but usually with many errors involved. But in the U.S., their production times are usually very long, including TV-series, but they are also more costly. Also, on the subject of company culture, Carlsson believes that permanent companies are building company culture around their timetables and costs and is very experienced in creating culture. Film productions are all so different,

meaning that it probably cannot be compared with permanent companies according to Carlsson.

#### **4.2.2 Power**

He thinks power is something quite negative, because leaders, who are strong, possess wealth or have a fancy title, just because they possess these things, might abuse power and are therefore automatically followed. In Carlsson's experience, the director has "power" to instruct how he/she wants the film to look like, but it is seldom exactly what he/she expects. They usually have a picture in mind of how the scene should look, but often prefers that peoples act in a way that is most natural to them. Extras however, like Carlsson, are under the supervision of the "extra-manager" who have all the power and tells them where to go, and what to do. Extras rarely have any power to change anything.

Carlsson claim that the director has the final word in film production, but that the power distribution in film production differs from different countries and cultures. For example, in Sweden the hierarchical structure in descending order is the production company, the director, and finally the actors who have most power, however, Carlsson adds that actors rarely have much power. But in the U.S. the order is often reversed with the actors, then the production company and finally the director having the most power.

As Carlsson understood it, film production companies are rarely involved with how filmmaking is performed; they care only if it is executed within the budget and schedule, but this way practice no open displays of power. The film production companies' only power is to shut down production if they determine that it is impossible to complete the film in a satisfying and realistic way. However, completion is most often possible. The directors along with actors shape their group dynamics where they usually, with the right leadership of the director, may complete a film. Carlsson adds that he does not think the relationships between all relevant parties change if more than one film production company is involved in one production. He believes that this is because everything is solely based on budget and time, at least in Sweden.

### **4.2.3 Leadership**

Leadership, on the other hand, Carlsson sees as something positive, because it is where people interact with each other, and come together in a group and work for the same goal, and the leader is the one who makes them to feel united.

Carlsson thinks that leadership is a skill developed through experience, that no one could learn leadership through studies and then automatically lead. In film production, it is usually the director who has knowledge about leadership, and that these skills probably do not come from any education, but from experiences.

Swedish directors usually have pretty good leadership skills, at least that is what Carlsson has experienced in the productions he has been involved in, and the director usually asks the actors how they want to do scenes, from the description of the script. However, actors in Sweden often behave very arrogantly towards extras and staff as opposed to the director, who most often show much respect to all staff. Carlsson therefore think about leadership exercised by actors, like Carlsson, as following the directors, because they usually have a very good knowledge of people, wants everyone to work together as well as wanting to hear others' opinions. This leadership style is very common for Swedish directors, while he has heard that directors from other countries in general are quite difficult to work with. Carlsson believes that the reason for this is that there are very few Swedish directors, and only those who are particularly skilled in the profession and has the most experience works in the industry.

## **4.3 Interview with film art student Xichen Wang**

Xichen Wang is a film art student in University of Paris VIII, France. His primary courses are film aesthetics, film history, film analysis, screenplay writing, film law and economics, film shooting, video recording, video editing and film and animation production.

The reason why he wanted to study film is because he grew up watching film and theater. Wang started out studying acting at a Chinese college. In addition, because of his passion for film, he also set up his own film studio during his studies in China. Moreover, Wang also began to write his own scripts, as well as direct his own work. Wang described “a kind of unspeakable feeling of satisfaction and accomplishment” when he was on stage or behind the

camera, but especially in front of the screen. Since France is the birthplace of film, Wang decided after graduating from college, to move to France to continue his film studies.

Wang says that because he is studying the art of film, his studies have more focus on film theory research. Therefore, there is little education on leadership or management, group dynamics and power. Although, in courses regarding film law and economics these terms have been lightly introduced. In addition, in Wang's opinion, terms such as group dynamics, power, leadership and management are unlikely to apply to the film crew. Personally he feels that these terms are more sociological or economical, and do not belong to an artist.

#### **4.3.1 Group dynamics**

On the subject of group dynamics, Wang says that in most cases, once the crewmembers feel comfortable with each other then they might become a fixed shooting team. It is his personal opinion that if you want to have a good relationship or coordinate the members of the crew, then you should not to be too rigid, not manage the crew like one would manage a company, because the art itself is not rigid or constrained. The members of the crew should respect one another and even become good friends according to Wang. This is because if there is an irreconcilable conflict, it can only be resolved in accordance with the contract, which have been made before the production and often do not have the best outcome. In fact, the film crew is sometimes just a casual team according to Wang; therefore leadership and management do not particularly exist. Wang continued by reminding us that film production is not a "company", and should not be thought of or handled like a company, it is more of an organization of coordinated people; so "normal" rules do not apply.

#### **4.3.2 Power**

Wang claims that power is neither a term nor an issue that he has ever encountered in his studies. He believes that the division of labor erases all questions and issues of this, and feels that he cannot contribute more of a detailed answer, as he has never thought about power to any great extent.

When pressed more on the subject of power, Wang does admit that the person who has most power in film production in many cases is the producer. This is because the producer and

director discuss the preliminary paperwork, ensuring the script and the selection of the main actor. When they encounter problems one of the parties will have to compromise. Wang believes that during pre- and post-production, the producer and the director would both have to compromise, however, during shooting the producer will have to compromise more.

### **4.3.3 Leadership**

On leadership, Wang says that the director is the interpreter of the screenplay, the mirror of the actor, the organizer of the play. Therefore, he would call the director the "leader" or "manager"; however, the most appropriate definition would be the "organizer" according to Wang. This is because the director considers the scheduling of shooting, as well as solves problems of artistic creation. In addition, Wang believes that the crew is more coordinated than actually lead.

## **5. ANALYSIS and DISCUSSION**

Below an analysis of the empirical data and theories are presented, where connections, correlations and parallels are drawn between theories and empirical data, where each connection is followed by a discussion of what these connections might mean. The analysis and discussion are analyzed from the point of view of project-based organizations and then film/culture producing organizations, and is much like the empirical data presented under the three different features; group dynamics, power and leadership. And as a reminder, no connections will be made between the theories on group dynamics, power and leadership and the displays found, as the theories and the interpreted definitions are the basis of the analysis, therefore making over explicit connections to those theories would be overstating the obvious. Lastly, a brief summary of the most important findings completes the chapter.

### **5.1 Project-based organizations**

#### **5.1.1 Group dynamics**

##### ***5.1.1.1 Social skills and company culture***

Malmgren's view on group dynamics define much of what project-based organizations are all about; working closely with people, often not familiar with each other, for a short period of time. This ties in to what Lundin and Söderholm (1994) says about how teams are formed around a task with a strict time limit. In addition, this leads into what Malmgren explained regarding working in short projects and how HR-practices are managed. She claims that there are no time for any type of evaluation of one's work, much like Staber's (2004) statement that no typical HR-activities, such as team building, is used, nor is there any evaluation.

Malmgren claims that the lack of HR-activities is because of the short nature of the projects/films. Carlsson even claims that group dynamics in film production cannot be compared to permanent companies, because company culture cannot be created in the same manner. This could point to that group dynamics presents itself differently in film production than in permanent organizations. It seems as there is no time to get to know each other, that people must be sure of themselves and their ability as well as be very proficient socially, as to facilitate the process of getting to know each other. Friendliness and interactivity is vital for completing a successful project. It could also mean that the team might bond quickly, but it

could also mean that the bond is shallower, especially because the projects are ending soon, and because competition in the business is so fierce.

However, Gareis (1989) actually claim that projects do create a culture with norms and beliefs, which is corroborated by Lundin and Söderholm (1994), and that this culture is unique in every new project. A sort of company culture could probably grow in film projects, just like previous authors claimed, however, the cultures are probably not as deeply anchored as in permanent organizations, as the culture have no time to develop, and no effort is put into creating a suitable culture, something that many companies often struggle with and place much importance in. This looser, shallower culture could mean that film workers must create their own culture within themselves, something that they can believe in as the “organization” they currently work for lacks strong culture, as to give them motivation and inspiration as well as pride.

In addition, Wang have similar thoughts as Carlsson, and claim that trying to analyze film production as a project-based organization or through group dynamics, power and leadership for example, is meaningless, since he believes that film production cannot be compared to a permanent organization. Carlsson and Wang might be right, maybe there is no use in comparing film production to permanent organizations, however as both Malmgren and other authors have been able to find common denominators, it is still fruitful, as long as one can spot the differences, as in the shallow nature of film project culture and increased need for social skills.

Furthermore, the strange way of working intensely with people one does not know, much conflict can arise. However, both Malmgren and Lundin and Söderholm (1994) claim that this is often accepted, and that people will work tirelessly to solve problems because they know the situation is temporary. This is also confirmed by Soila-Wadman (2003) in her research on film/culture producing organizations. Once again this is a sign of the need for social skills. One can claim that film workers must be able to cope with conflict better, however, sweeping issues under the rug and simply accepting problems is not exactly coping. Therefore one can say that film workers must be able to partly cope with conflict and partly keep calm and be patient when issues arise, and not create increased friction even if one might want to. Since conflicts have no time to fester like in permanent companies, solving them unless they are a risk for production might not even be worth the trouble, especially since seeming like a



troublemaker could harm someone's career. This avoidance of confronting issues could most probably increase uneasiness in the work place, where people pretend to be content and smile while being uncomfortable and angry. Also, suppressing these feelings of uneasiness could be harmful to film workers health in the long run, and might not be subduing issues, but rather creating new ones.

Erika Malmgren confirmed much of the features of project-based organizations. For example, she mentioned that even though a film might not be of particularly high quality, people are always proud when they see their name in the credits. A connection can be made with Gerai's (1989) statement that in projects, not only does the employees represent the project, but also the parent company. In the case of film production where there is no parent company, and everyone is self employed, this means representing yourself, something that was discussed at length by Malmgren. This ties back with what she said about having no evaluation of one's work, the only confirmation of work well done is if one is rehired in the future, if one have represented oneself well that is. This representation of oneself is also a reason for why being socially skilled is very important. One needs to show that one is proud of the work done, as this could convince future employers of one's skills, complaining about the product would certainly look bad and not inspire confidence, as the product is the result of the director's vision, and therefore this would mean that complaints would indirectly be in regards to the director him/herself and could be seen as disrespectful.

#### ***5.1.1.2 Structure***

Malmgren also crushed a cliché about film production being very unstructured and dopey, saying that film production is very structured, especially behind the camera where every minute of every day is planned carefully. This concurs with what Gerai (1989) said on how to conduct a successful project, planning vigorously, clear communication, and distinct definition of the project. This could mean that film workers must also be very proficient in their work, since there is no room for flexibility or carelessness. They must take their work seriously and work well under pressure. Permanent organizations also have deadlines of course, however this level of strictness seems rare. Because staff has no leeway, this could create feelings of rigidity and lead to frustration.

Malmgren claims that the short-term way of working often attracts certain people, people who enjoy the variety. This connects to what Lundin and Söderholm (1994) says about tasks being less repetitive and more unique in project-based organizations than in permanent organizations, this could also be one of the attractive features of working in project-based organizations, and in film production especially. In addition this ties back to Malmgren's statement that she would probably work in a creative environment even if she would not work in film production. People working in film production seems to have an interest in working this way as well as have a feeling that creative environments are important. It seems as it takes a certain type of personality to deal with the complexities of film production in its project form. It seems as it takes a certain level of bravery, as job uncertainty is a large part of project-based organizations, as well as restlessness, where repetitive work in a safe environment simply would not suffice for a content work life.

## **5.1.2 Power**

### ***5.1.2.1 Hierarchy***

Regarding hierarchy, an integral part of power, Malmgren claims, much like Staber (2004), that film production is hierarchical, but not as much as in Hollywood, and that in Sweden tasks are much more trans-boundary than in Hollywood. This statement goes against both what Gareis (1989) and Lundin and Söderholm (1994) claim about conducting a successful project and how tasks work; that tasks are very separated and that this is needed for projects to work properly. This most probably due to the less strict hierarchical nature in Sweden, as well as film production being a very specific type of project-based organization. This hierarchy seems somewhat flat, while still maintaining many layers of middle management and strict lines of communication. This could create confusion for staff as different aspects of the hierarchy is stricter than others. However, the hierarchy could facilitate the dissipation of conflicts, as there is a clear structure with someone in charge who can solve problems that occur on a lower level of the hierarchy.

### ***5.1.2.2 Job uncertainty***

When revisiting the issues of uncertainty when working in short projects, Malmgren claimed that there is much uncertainty, and Staber (2004) even claims that this uncertainty is what defines project-based organizations. Staber (2004) continues by saying that freelancers must

create their own opportunities for decreasing this uncertainty, as well as creating good relationships with others as to secure future employment, something that staff in permanent companies do not need to bother with. These activities could potentially take up much valuable productive time, and cause distraction from the work that need to be performed and lead to less efficiency. The security provided in permanent companies could therefore contribute to a more productive work place. In addition the constant pressure of representing oneself and always being the best version of oneself could lead to increased stress and ultimately resentment towards the industry, especially if one's efforts are not rewarded by future employment.

Dex (et al. 2000) agrees that uncertainty can cause stress, and claim that in film production, those most affected are freelancers, which make up the majority of staff. Klerby and Näslund (2010) showed that 0 % of all working in film production are hired on a long-term basis. Turner and Keegan (1999) concur in their summary of the complexities of project-based organizations, and Blair, Grey and Randle (2001) showed in their study that 59 % of people working in film production have never been anything else than self-employed, ergo, many people are subjected to this uncertainty and stress that project-based organizations create. Even if this uncertainty can seem attractive to people working in film as discussed above, having a steady source of income should not be belittled for people's well-being. Even if it seems thrilling for film workers to be free and have a varying job, commitments such as providing for one's family must take priority, therefore the job uncertainty must create more stress than thrill, and could in the long run be expensive for society, as stress-related illnesses follows and costs money. One could therefore argue that from a societal point of view this uncertainty should be decreased.

### **5.1.3 Leadership**

#### ***5.1.3.1 Sources of leadership***

Malmgren mentioned an experience where issues arose because more than one producer was involved. One hypothesis of ours was that film productions where more than one producer or production company were involved this would create increased issues. This was partly confirmed by Malmgren's statement, however, according to Blair, Grey and Randle (2001) the standard is that more than one production company usually is involved in every film project, therefore this questions goes somewhat unanswered. This hypothesis has no clear

answer yet, as nothing has been completely confirmed. There is a proverb that goes “too many cooks spoil the broth”, so maybe there is not necessarily an issue of power struggles, it could mean that if too many people are involved with too many ideas being considered, then maybe this could lead to the broth, or in this case film, becoming pandemonium. However, as the norm seems to be that more than one production company usually is involved, maybe this chaos does not occur, or is handled proficiently.

## **5.2 Film/culture producing organizations**

### **5.2.1 Group dynamics**

#### ***5.2.1.1 Responsibility to shape good group dynamics***

Malmgren points to the fact that leadership is very important for group dynamics to work properly and continues by saying that the director is the one who must take charge of the group dynamics, that the leadership of the director is what affects group dynamics the most, and that all of this depends on how inclusive and interactive the director is. This is confirmed by Soila-Wadman (2003) who claims that it is the director’s job to create a safe environment where people can work to their full ability. In addition Soila-Wadman (2003) develops what Malmgren said on inclusiveness. Soila-Wadman (2003) says that this depends mainly on the director, since some focus only on the actors, other on the crew as a whole, something that Soila-Wadman (2003) sees as signs of respect, not only for those with power. For the director to treat the entire staff well, no matter their hierarchical status, is certainly a sign of respect, and should be expected. Staff would probably feel more committed and inspired if the director treats them well, it creates loyalty and a good work environment, with trust and respect, where people can work more better than if they would feel as they go unnoticed by their supervisor and feel unnecessary. Everybody want to feel as they are part of a team, and in a situation where roles must be established quickly and there is no time for relationships and mutual respect to grow, the supervisor, in this case the director, must be extra diligent for this relationship to emerge.

Carlsson does not quite agree on this matter, and claim that from his point of view, creating a functional group, at least between the actors, is the responsibility of the actors themselves. He does say however, that this demands an open-mindedness and active communication with the

director, which can be connected to what Soila-Wadman (2003) says on fluidity when dealing with groups as well as the inclusiveness of the director. Wang claim that it is not a single persons responsibility to shape good group dynamics, instead he believe that it is everyone's responsibility and being respectful and being good friends is crucial in case inconsolable conflict would arise.

Carlsson and Wang have a point that everyone needs to actively work to achieve good group dynamics, it cannot solely depend on the director. The director needs to inspire active participation, and the director should also place some of the responsibility on the rest of the film crew, actors included. If everybody feels committed and feels as they are a part of a contributing group, there are endless opportunities for group dynamics to prosper, it seems as the director provides guidance, but cannot create good group dynamics on his/her own. This also means that conscious efforts needs to be made as there are no HR-activities to shape good group dynamics. Unfortunately, all directors might not be as open and communicative as Carlsson says is necessary, which then could lead to scattered and isolated groups with little connection to each other, which could cause problems with e.g. communication, something vital for all organizations, which must flow smoothly for effectiveness.

#### ***5.2.1.2 Modus operandi***

When discussing the way people in film work in comparison to those working permanent jobs, Malmgren thinks that there might not be a difference, as long as the job is perceived to be creative. Malmgren believes that there is something special in film production that binds everybody together. This is correlated by Soila-Wadman (2003) who claims that many working in film production, even those who do not have creative jobs, will work day and night for their director and his/hers vision. However, Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) did point out that for some working in film production it is just a job. However, for working in such a demanding business with long hours and much competition, according to Klerby and Näslund (2010) and Wibe (2006), it seems highly unlikely that this is common, especially with Malmgren's testimony that film production in Sweden often have little financial gain for those involved. Malmgren claims that people work in film production simply because they are passionate. It therefore seems as the decision of working in film is a very deliberate one, and nothing one would simply fall in to, as it requires much efforts to even get one's foot in the

door. One can even go so far as to argue that for film workers, no other industry, no matter how creative, would ever be relevant for them to work in.

### **5.2.1.3 Stress**

Carlsson agrees that group dynamics does present itself differently in film/culture producing organizations, however he believes that this is because of the lack of money and time pressure, which creates stress. This seems as a reasonable conclusion since Wibe (2006) show that conflicts arise because of work hours and time pressure, bad economy and management issues. As Carlsson do not define how he thinks group dynamics present itself differently, one can only guess that groups might be less close-knit as everyone constantly worries about finishing their work on time and budget, and the inevitable state of unemployment that might follow the end of the project. The pressures can lead to a more introverted way of working where much focus could be placed on oneself, and not the group, which could hurt the group dynamics.

Stress was something Malmgren spoke about outside of the parameters of the interview, and seems to be the norm in film production. Klerby and Näslund (2010) found that even though their study showed that well-being was very high for all occupation categories, mainly because people felt their work had meaning, stress levels and stress-related illnesses were very high for some categories like assistants, while lower with categories like actors who suffered little from stress. In addition, some occupations, again assistants and artistic staff, felt as they had little time to prepare, were paid too little etc. Klerby and Näslund (2010) believe that this is because of their inability to speak their minds and lack of status. This could obviously have deep detrimental affects on people working in film, however it is difficult to say if people in film are more stressed than in permanent organizations. Although, combined with the job uncertainty, Wibe (2006) showed that 48 % were only employed 0-9 months a year, it is not difficult to imagine that stress levels could be higher in film production than the country standard. This is confirmed by Wibe (2006) who found that the health of film workers were about 10 % worse than workers in other industries.

## 5.2.2 Power

### 5.2.2.1 *Hierarchy and relationship with management*

Revisiting the issue regarding trans-boundary tasks, Malmgren explained that in Sweden people work trans-boundary, while Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) claimed that people work in their respective specializations, ergo with little trans-boundary activity. Once again this questions is equivocal.

Malmgren says that film production is hierarchical, which Soila-Wadman (2003) confirms. Malmgren continues to describe the structure in film production as layers of middle management and department heads, who are responsible for their respective staff. This is corroborated by Blair (2001) who claims that these heads of department are often seen as managers by their respective staff even if they lack managerial power, and that they often teach their respective staff the work process. Malmgren adds that these layers must be respected and that staff should not bypass them when relaying thoughts or opinions.

The effect of not being lead by people who are not strictly one's supervisor could have both positive and negative effects. This could mean that supervisors are ill-informed of the work going on, something Malmgren spoke about, and that the department heads makes decisions which might not function well with the other departments and create isolated groups which will be difficult to manage. It could also mean that people feel less supervised and more free to do their work under the eyes of a colleague, not a manager; where communication can flow smoother as staff might be more comfortable discussing issues with people who are more colleagues than supervisors. The hierarchy could also decrease effectiveness when many layers of middle management is used, and the taller the pyramid the more complex lines of communication become, while the hierarchy at the same time might be necessary to control and manage a organization as diverse as film production where different departments risk becoming isolated and disparate. Also, the hierarchic nature of film production suggests a level of formality and strictness, something one might associate with creative environments.

The unwillingness to discuss issues with supervisors is corroborated by Klerby and Näslund (2010) who show in their study that if for example some type of harassment would occur, very few would confide in their supervisor, and almost a fifth would say noting at all, mostly because people do not want to be perceived as troublesome. This could potentially be a huge

issue in film production. If people are afraid of raising important issues like harassment in the fear of becoming passed over for future employment, terrible offences could happen and people could take advantage of each other, especially of those in lower status jobs, where coincidentally most are women. Issues must be able to be raised as to increase the status for both certain occupations, and certainly for women. Especially since harassment will make people feel unsafe in their work place and impact their work negatively, both quality and quantity wise.

#### ***5.2.2.2 Making mistakes and inequality***

Malmgren points out that mistakes are more or less accepted in Sweden, while they might not be in Hollywood for example. This connects to what Blair (2001) says on mistakes, that it can be devastating for a less established persons career, while mistakes and repercussions lessen with experience. Mistakes, like Malmgren explained, are probably not as devastating in Sweden as they can be abroad, however, together with the fierce competition and the slim industry, mistakes could definitely have larger, worse impacts in film production than in other industries. However this is dependent on what profession someone has, as Klerby and Näslund (2010) found that e.g. actors and production crew felt as they could be very outspoken, while lower status professions, such as assistants and artistic staff felt as they could be less outspoken.

Furthermore, equality is something that cannot be overlooked in any industry, including film production. According to Malmgren and Wibe (2006), different occupations are male and female, and those who are typically male are often male because of the prestige and power that comes with the occupations. This is confirmed by Klerby and Näslund (2010) in their study where women who were harassed believed that this was because they had low status jobs in comparison to their male counterparts. This inequality that some occupation categories must feel could have potentially damaging effects on production, as people might work less passionately and less productively as well as feel resentful towards those in higher status occupations and not respect their decisions. Also, this inequality regarding prestige and status determining benefits feels very archaic and dated, but is defining for film production nonetheless.



The fear of making mistakes often lead to people trying to solve problems on their own, avoiding complaints and creating good relationships with others, just to make sure to be hired again according to Malmgren. Also, Wibe (2006) showed that freelancers believe that being established in the industry and creating contacts were most important to secure future work, as well as putting on a brave face in periods of unemployment is important to appear attractive for employment. The fear of making mistakes and fighting to be hired again could potentially be crippling and decrease productivity, and can cause larger issues to arise if problems are not solved correctly. If staff would ask for help disasters could probably be evaded and time could be spent better. This fear is one of the biggest differences between a permanent organization and a film/culture producing organization, and definitely one of film production's more negative aspects.

### ***5.2.2.3 Hiring policy and process***

The complex way of hiring and creating job opportunities are described by many researchers, e.g. Klerby and Näslund (2010) and Wibe (2006) showed that staff were mostly hired through the producer themselves and Blair (2001) says that hiring is mostly done through contacts, and that those hiring or recommending someone to hire are always responsible for that person, meaning that if they would perform badly, it would reflect negatively on the person hiring or recommending them, much like Malmgren says. This could possibly lead to talented people being overlooked when they could have been powerful assets to production. Blair (2001) also says that it is not necessarily the most talented who are running the industry, but instead often those who fit in well and play well with others, something that might be necessary as the industry seems to require good social skills, but this could also mean that once again talent is overlooked and opportunities lost.

This relates somewhat to what Finney (2008) says about knowledge in film production being acquired through experience, which concurs to what Malmgren said regarding the possibility to climb hierarchically, even without any education, since in the film industry education does not secure a good career. This also connects to what Malmgren said about not wanting to complain, people who are positive and easy to work with seem to have an edge on their competition when climbing the hierarchical ladder. Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) also claim that even though staff differs between projects, producers and directors often hire people they have worked with before because it creates security, because they know the staff

performs their job well, it is a safe bet. This points to the fact than once you have your foot in the door, or in this case industry, one can easily stay unless grave mistakes are made as few chances are given to outsiders and new talent. It seems as it is an industry that is incredibly difficult to get in to, but easier to remain in, as well as education being, perhaps not unnecessary, but definitely not a requirement as skills needed in film production are often not acquired through studies.

#### ***5.2.2.4 Surveillance and micromanagement vs. trust and delegation***

A clear sign of power is surveillance, meaning micromanaging vs. delegating, ergo how much power those in supervising positions are willing to let go of. Malmgren claims that micromanaging happen, though that it is very rare, and often have detrimental outcomes such as lack of commitment and excitement in those subjected to micromanaging. Malmgren claim that delegation is necessary for production to run smoothly, and that people, specifically the director and producer, have to trust in each other's abilities. This is corroborated by Klerby and Näslund (2010) who claim that supervisors usually trust their staff, and that this is the reason for the lack of affirmation for work well done. There is not even time for simple surveillance and receiving regular updates is rare. This is once again where references and making sure that employees have performed well becomes crucial, as to being able to trust their work. This trust could certainly be a positive expression of power, and could empower staff, as being trusted by one's supervisor is a sign of one's competence. This confidence could lead to staff taking on too much responsibilities, but hopefully the confidence would instead lead to increased passion, increased work ethic and increased productivity.

The need for delegation is well established by several researchers; Finney (2008) goes so far as to say that without delegation, film projects will fail and that the producers and their ability to delegate responsibility are vital for success. Blair (2001) claims that as long as the director's goal is reached, the process itself is not important and that the heads of department should work the way that suits them best. Furthermore, Blair (2001) continues by saying that this creates an autonomy that is strengthened by the fact that people working in films are specialists in their own fields, and therefore micromanaging might not even be possible, much less fruitful, when those managing do not possess the knowledge required for any extensive managing. Soila-Wadman (2003) continues to explain that even if film production can be very hierarchical, this is often an accepted and necessary organization for the film project to

be able to run smoothly. However, the director, who is at the top of the pyramid, cannot micromanage if he/she wants the staff to perform well, micromanagement would not create a good work environment.

As micromanaging is one of the more negative expressions of power, micromanaging would create a bad work environment and make people less inclined to work, as it would lower their confidence and feel redundant. Also, to be micromanaged by someone who does not know how to practically best perform the work could certainly create feelings of resentment and anger, and lead to decreased work performance. Therefore it seems that film production requires more freedom and delegating of responsibilities than in some permanent companies where tasks are more similar and less specialized.

#### ***5.2.2.5 Sources of power and multiple aspects of managing***

Malmgren claims that several people hold the most power in film production, the producer, director and financier to be exact. Soila-Wadman (2003) concurs that the director has the right of the final cut, and is therefore in charge of the film. In addition, Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) claim that the decision of the director is final, and must be adhered and respected by the crew, since the director balance both artistic and financial needs, and therefor has a more complete vision of different issues than someone solely working with artistic or administrative tasks. Carlsson agrees that the director has the most power and control the vision, but that in reality the vision rarely becomes as planned. It all depends on how inclusive, like Soila-Wadman (2003) says, the director is and how much freedom is given to the actors in their performance. The rigidity vs. the freedom in film production has previously been discussed, and it seems as it is not only the artistic and administrative tasks that must be balanced by the director, but also the rigidity and freedom. Striking a perfect balance must be difficult, but with freedom being more present than rigidity, chaos can arise, and with rigidity being more present than freedom, the product could suffer and become less than what it could be. Therefore a supervisor in film production, this case the director, must balance several aspects that permanent supervisors never have to. One could therefore argue that managing film production is more difficult than managing permanent organizations.

Moreover, in Soila-Wadman's (2003) research she found that arguments between director and producer are very common, and that many take on both roles simply to avoid compromise.

Wang agrees and says that issues can arise between producer and director. In general Wang believe that the producer has the most power, however he does say that during shooting the director's power trump the power of the producer, and that compromises are inevitable. This situation is similar to the experience Malmgren explains regarding the issues with the two producers. Also, arguments can arise based on how respectful the director is towards his/her staff, like Malmgren as a production manager for example. If the director would not listen to her regarding shooting schedule for example, the producer steps in and order the director.

Therefore, friction and power struggles seem to be unavoidable in film production with many strong individuals in management positions. This friction and power struggles could potentially interfere with production and cause delays if decisions are not agreed upon in a timely manner, and could also cause discomfort with the other staff and in turn decrease confidence in management. However, Carlsson claims that having more than one producer usually is not a problem, as production companies in his opinion only had power regarding doing a project or not, meaning production companies does not have considerable power during shooting.

Regarding the power of the actors little research exists, however, Malmgren gave a clear picture of this power in Sweden. A-list actors seem to have some level of power, simply because they are a big, if not the biggest, reason a film receives funding, something that is rare in Sweden. Because of this, they do have some level of power, they can be late and can sometimes change scripts etc., however, this seems to depend on the director, how inclusive he/she is, which connects back to what Soila-Wadman (2003) said on inclusive directors. Carlsson does not feel as actors have much power, at least not extras such as himself. Actors possessing power could be beneficial as changes made by them could make scripts and scenes for example seem more natural and better suited for the respective actors, but could also lead to detrimental effects on production as actors only see their side and therefore cannot perceive the impact on production as a whole.

## **5.2.3 Leadership**

### ***5.2.3.1 Sources of leadership***

Malmgren claims that the director most often is the leader in a film project, with both creative and administrative duties, having the power to make decisions as well as being the one who

motivates and inspires the staff. Wang agrees and claims that the director is more of an organizer of sorts, but that the director must show both creative and administrative leadership just like Soila-Wadman (2003) claims. Klerby and Näslund (2010) also found that the film crew in general perceived leadership as very good. As previously stated the director must be a highly skilled manager since they must balance many aspects that permanent managers does not, and this could also mean that they must inspire more. Since culture is more shallow in film production, staff might need to be more inspired than in permanent companies, however, since those working in film production most often are very passionate, they might be inspired simply by working with film and with what they love, they might not need any more motivation than what they already possess inside. However, inspiration and motivation is still vital, even if it comes naturally for film workers, especially since work is stressful due to lack of money and time as well as the job uncertainty. The director must be a leader and remind film workers of why they are there, even if times are tough. One could compare this to a permanent organization going through some sort of crises for example, with the only difference being that it is a state of crises for every film production.

### ***5.2.3.2 Approaches to leadership***

The director also have different leadership approaches; they treat staff differently depending on what they do, e.g. by pampering actors and being more sensitive to them, while being more clear and precise with those working behind the camera. This is confirmed by what Soila-Wadman (2003) says on the role of the director, e.g. that they must create a safe environment and communicate well. Soila-Wadman (2003) also agree that some directors only focus on the actors, and give them very preferential treatment, however there are those who spend as much time on the relationships with other staff as well. Soila-Wadman and Köping (2009) found that separating the administrative from the creative crew was not fruitful and that everybody needed to be included in the creative process and the director needs to be a fierce leader, but at the same time be sensitive to people's behavior.

The need for different approaches to leadership depending on who is lead place yet another layer of difficulty on leaders, in this case the director, in film production. Leadership in film production therefore requires a level of sensitivity that permanent organizations does not require, even if permanent organizations also require sensitivity of course. Furthermore, these different approaches to leadership is most probably necessary, but could be perceived as

unfair by staff who might not be as pampered as actors for example, many might not be as understanding as Malmgren, and could be resentful of some occupations' preferential treatment. This resentment could one again have detrimental effects on productivity and work performance because of feelings of being less important or overlooked.

#### ***5.2.3.3 Multiple sources of leadership***

When discussing the case of the two producers, or in the hypothetical case of more than one production company, there is both a power as well as leadership dimension. More than one producer can create a power struggle, and can in turn cause problems in leadership attempts, like in the case described by Malmgren; the two producers lead very differently, and their leadership styles collided. In this case the two different leadership approaches gave out different signals to the staff, and created much confusion.

#### ***5.2.3.4 Acquirement of leadership skills***

Carlsson has a positive view on leadership and claim that leadership is learned through experience and not through studies. This concurs with what Finney (2008) says on knowledge being acquired through experience. This could definitely be true, as education is not a requirement for a successful career in film production. Moreover, since conditions are so unique in film production, experience might be the only way of properly learning how to lead in film production. However, education is never completely redundant or unnecessary, and therefore could be valuable when being a leader in film production, especially if more attention and priority would be given in teaching this particular kind of leadership.

### **5.3 To summarize**

As the analysis and discussion is very extensive, a quick summary of the most important findings divided under the three features; group dynamics, power and leadership, are presented below.

#### ***5.3.1 Group dynamics***

As shown, group dynamics is of vital importance for completing a successful film project. There are higher demands on those working in film, especially socially. Possessing proficient social skills and being able to play well with others can secure one's career and reputation.

Ergo, being good at your job is not enough; people need to like you since having good references is the only merit that counts in film production. Since there is no time for any HR-activities or team building exercises, the responsibility of shaping a well functioning group is the responsibility of the staff, with guidance from the director. The director's role should not be downplayed, as they have a huge effect on group dynamics, depending on how inclusive, respectful and skilled the director is. The demand for proficient social skills is also important regarding dealing with conflicts and when representing oneself as a freelancer. Therefore "company culture", or in this case project culture, is often more shallow and unique to every project. Also, since film production is such a demanding industry, it takes a certain kind of person to be able to work in film production. High stress levels and job uncertainty can create a hazardous environment; therefore it requires determination and tenacity.

### **5.3.2 Power**

Film production is very hierarchical, with many layers of middle management that should not be bypassed. Job uncertainty defines film production; especially since those working in film are most often freelancers with no tenure, and the subsequent worrying can therefore lead to decreased productivity and poor work performance. Confiding in supervisors is rare, as they can be a positive or negative reference for future employment; disturbing them with any issues are avoided, even in cases of harassment, simply to not come across as a troublemaker. However, the perception of being a troublemaker does not apply to all film workers equally, since this thesis showed that great inequality, especially due to gender-bound occupations, are created by the perception that some occupations are more prestigious and of higher status. This in turn created many psychological issues with those of lower status professions. Also, making mistakes could be disastrous for one's career, therefore film workers try to solve all problems without support from their supervisors, simply because they want to ensure a good review. All of this is because of the peculiar hiring process where reputation determines one's career, meaning that appearance and personality is of vital importance. Moreover, micromanaging is useless and detrimental in film production, where delegation is crucial for success. Furthermore there are multiple sources of power, especially between the director and the producer. The director has final cut, but power struggles can still arise even though it is rare.

### ***5.3.3 Leadership***

Multiple sources of leadership can create issues when too many ideas are considered, however, the strongest source of leadership is the director, who has both administrative and artistic leadership as his/hers duty. This is a difficult balance to strike, and film production therefore demands a very skillful leader. Inspiration and motivation must also be prioritized extensively as the stress and worry for film workers are so intense; they need much support from their leader. There are also different approaches to leadership, and the director must be able to balance how to lead their crew, and ensure that everybody receives the support that they need. These heightened leadership skills are acquired from experience, and is difficult to grasp only through studies, however studies could be a great tool for learning.



## 6. CONCLUSION

In the final part of the thesis the conclusion pertaining to the two points of view used, meaning project-based organizations and film/culture producing organizations, and a concretized answer to our problem statement, research questions and hypothesis is presented. The conclusion ends with some suggestions for future research based on questions that arose during writing of the thesis, which could not be examined in the boundaries of this thesis.

### 6.1 To conclude

As shown in the previous chapter *analysis and discussion*, film production is organized in a very intricate and unique way, and this thesis could potentially be a comprehensive and defined guide on organization in Swedish film production.

Film production is a complex organization, which is unique in its own way and cannot be classified as anything but film production. Even if there are many similarities and corresponding features between film production and project-based organizations, there are significant additional characteristics that make film production too specific to simply call a project-based organization in its simplest form, and it would lead to a too simplistic analysis if film production would only be analyzed from the point of view of project-based organizations. It is a project-based organization, but a very complex type of project-based organization and should therefore be covered in the project-based organization literature as its own sub-genre.

In addition, to analyze film production only from the point of view of culture producing organizations is not enough either, as culture producing organizations include a far too diverse range of organizations, e.g. opera, theatre etc., with too many variations. Therefore film production should be considered its own subject, which need to be studied further and more in depth on its own. However, to study film production from the point of view of project-based organizations and culture producing organization still proved fruitful as many conclusions could be drawn that benefits knowledge and research in the subject of management.

The summary of the most important results show how film production is organized, and in addition, it seems as relationships and conditions are extraordinarily demanding, where

ordinary skills required in all types of industries are needed to be very proficient, or extremely well honed by those working in film. Being good is simply not good enough in such a demanding business as film production; one needs to be extremely skilled, no matter occupation. This means that the increased pressures, constantly having to put on a brave face and suppressing issues or potentially troublesome feelings can lead to resentment for the industry and colleagues, health issues and lower productivity.

We found that there are many signs that points to that organizational characteristics are somewhat different in film production in comparison to permanent organizations. However, even if characteristics differ, it is more in the sense of them being extreme than fundamentally different. Ergo, except from the job uncertainty and all that follow, many characteristics are actually the same; it is the extremeness of them that is the difference. In addition, it is because the relationships between different parties in film production are very unique, especially regarding status and power. This is partly due to the unparalleled composition of project-based organization and culture producing organization and the subsequent organizational hybrid that film production is. The hypothesis was that film production is a niched industry, where previous organizational rules do not apply, and in this thesis the hypothesis seems to be substantiated.

## **6.2 Suggestions for future research**

This thesis identified how film production often is organized and focused on how group dynamics, power and leadership present itself and affect the organization from the point of view of project-based organizations and film/culture producing organizations. Since film production seems to be a quite underdeveloped area within the management field, and this study cannot cover all aspects of management in film production, therefore, some suggestions on how to proceed will be presented as this thesis raised new, interesting questions.

### **6.2.1 On a smaller scale**

This thesis presented disturbing information regarding the great job uncertainty and stress-related illnesses worrying cause, is there any way to mitigate this? Research on how to provide a safer environment for freelancers in film production could potentially save the Swedish state much money in unemployment benefits and medical expenses.

Further research on the inequality between occupations, gender and ethnicity could further enlighten the issue and create awareness and potentially decrease the inequality. It could also help create a safer environment, especially for women, where harassment and other offences could be made nonexistent.

### ***6.2.2 On a larger scale***

Management in film production has been researched to some extent, but within the management field these studies have been conducted on modern film productions. Therefore, since film has a history of about one hundred years, how has the organizational structure changed over time?

This thesis only covers film production, however TV-production is another unexamined area. Does the organization differ from film production? If it does, then how? Since engagements in TV often are longer, does that shift the three features group dynamics, power and leadership? Do we see the same sort of issues regarding e.g. inequality and stress-related illnesses? Research on TV production can shed further light on screen-based culture producing organizations, and contribute to the knowledge on film production.

Staber (2004) says that project-based organizations are becoming increasingly common. How is this utilized in other culture producing organizations such as theatre, art, and opera for example? Also, can we see similar features in film production in these culture producing organizations as well? Do we see the same sort of issues regarding e.g. inequality and stress-related illnesses in these types of organizations as well?

And finally, how is film production organized and managed in Hollywood, one of the most lucrative and largest producers of film? Can one find differences between Swedish film production and Hollywood film production because of the difference in budget, scale, country culture etc.? What can be learned from the Hollywood way of producing film?

## 7. REFERENCES

### 7.1 Articles

Blair, Helen. 2001. You're only as Good as Your Last Job: The Labour Process and Labour Market in the British Film Industry. *Work, Employment and Society*. Vol. 15 No. 1, p. 149-169.

Blair, H; Grey, S & Randle, K. 2001. Working in film: Employment in a project based industry. *Personnel Review*. Vol. 30 No. 2, p. 170-185.

Dex, S; Willis, J; Paterson, R & Sheppard, E. 2000. Freelance Workers and Contract Uncertainty: The Effects of Contractual Changes in the Television Industry. *Work, Employment and Society*. Vol. 14 No. 2, p. 283-305.

Finney, Angus. 2008. Learning from Sharks - Lessons on Managing Projects in the Independent Film Industry. *Long Range Planning*. 41, p. 107-115.

Gerais, Roger. 1989. Management by Projects - the Management Approach for the Future. *International Journal of Project Management*. Vol. 7 No. 4 November, p. 243-249.

Klerby, A & Näslund, L. 2010. Alla mår bra? *Film & TV Producenterna & Teaterförbundet*.

Lundin, R & Söderholm, A. 1994. A Theory of the Temporary Organization. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. Vol. 11 No. 4, p. 437-455.

Staber, Udo. 2004. Networking Beyond Organizational Boundaries: The Case of Project Organizations. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. Vol. 13 No. 1 March 2004, p. 30-40.

Turner, J.R. & Keegan, A. 1999. The Versatile Project-based Organization - Governance and Operational Control. *European Management Journal*. Vol. 17 No. 3, p. 296-309.

Soila-Wadman, M. & Köping, A-S. 2009. Aesthetic Relations In Place of the Lone Hero in Arts Leadership: Examples from Film Making and Orchestral Performance. *International Journal of Arts Management*. Vol. 12 No. 1, p. 31-43.

Whitley, Richard. 2006. Project-based firms: new organizational form or variations on a theme? *Industrial and Corporate Change*. Vol. 16 No. 1, p. 77-99.

Wibe, Gert. 2006. Film- och TV-arbetare i rampljuset. Sammanfattning av en dansk studie om film- och TV-arbetare. *Teaterförbundet*.

## 7.2 Books

Abrahamsson, B. & Aarum, J. 2005. *Organisation – att beskriva och förstå organisationer*. Ljubljana: Liber.

Bryman, A. & Bell, E. 2003. *Business research methods*. New York: Oxford.

Clevé, Bastian. 1994. *Film Production Management*. Amsterdam: Focal Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1975. *Övervakning och straff*. Lund: Arkiv Förlag.

Forsyth, Donelson R. 2006. *Group Dynamics*. Wadsworth: Thomson Learning.

Forsyth, Donelson R. 2010. *Group Dynamics. Fifth edition*. Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.

Jönsson, S. & Strannegård, L. 2009. *Ledarskapsboken*. Malmö: Liber.

Northouse, Peter G. 2010. *Leadership: theory and practice*. Fifth edition. USA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Soila-Wadman, Marja. 2003. *Kapitulationens estetik – Organisering och ledarskap i filmprojekt*. Stockholms Universitet, Stockholm: Fields of Flow.

## 7.3 Webpages

Quotationsbook.com. Accessed 8/4-2013. <http://quotationsbook.com/quote/27504/>

MacNamara, Carter. Managmenthelp.org. Accessed 1/6-2013.

<http://managementhelp.org/organizations/definition.htm>

Screen Australia. Accessed 8/4-2013.

<http://www.screenaustralia.gov.au/research/statistics/acompfilms.aspx>

## **8. APPENDIX**

### **8.1 Interview guide**

Like previously explained, three interviews were conducted; one in-depth personal interview with producer/production manager Erika Malmgren, and two interviews via email with hobby actor and filmmaker Peter Carlsson and film art student Xichen Wang. Our three interviewees were asked a series of questions presented below.

#### **Introduction to the interviewees**

We will pose a number of questions to try to answer our problem statement: *How is film production organized?* To answer this fairly large question we will pose questions regarding project-based organizations and film/culture producing organizations, as well as questions about group dynamics, power and leadership, with special focus on power. By group dynamics we mean how groups, whom often are unfamiliar with each other, work together as well as act in general in film production. By power we mean how hierarchical or flat the power distance in general is in film production. Who has the most power and how does the power distribution between different parties present itself, and micromanaging vs. delegating. By leadership we mean who makes the decisions and has the “administrative” duties and well as the person who inspires and motivates the staff.

We will start by asking you a few questions about yourself and your background, and then move on to questions regarding your thoughts on group dynamics, power and leadership, about the relationship regarding group dynamics and leadership between all relevant parties and finish with a few questions about power.

We appreciate all the information we receive; therefore you can speak about your own experiences and concrete situations. If you are uncertain about a question that you may not understand or know the answer to, feel free to ask or make an educated guess; there are no right or wrong answers, and we would like to gather as much information and knowledge as possible from you. You may answer as few or as many questions as you would like, and be as thorough or brief as you would like. Thank you in advance; your help is much appreciated!

## General questions

- Tell us shortly about your background.
- Tell us about your work? What function do you fill?
- What do you think when you hear the terms group dynamics, power and leadership?  
What do they mean to you?
- Are group dynamics, power and leadership something you ever consider or think about in your profession?
- What can you say in general about group dynamics?
- What can you say in general about leadership?  
Who is usually responsible for exercising leadership?
- How does the relationship regarding group dynamics, power and leadership between the director and actors work? Between actors? Between other staff?
- How does the relationship regarding group dynamics, power and leadership between the *production company* and director, actors and other staff?
- Does the relationship regarding group dynamics, power and leadership differ in film production, which often is managed through short projects, from more stable long-term commitments?  
Does the short projects, and therefore increased job uncertainty, lead to increased worry and unrest?  
Does this affect work?
- Does the relationship regarding group dynamics, power and leadership in film/culture producing organizations, where both the environment and people in the environment are very creative, differ from the relationships in permanent companies?



## ***Power***

- Who has the final word in film production?  
How does the power distribution between for example the director, the actors and the production company present itself?
- Does the relationship change if more than one production company is involved?
- Do you find that film production is open-minded where people can speak their mind?
- Is film production generally very flat or more steep hierarchically, meaning are there few or many levels of middle management and can lower level employees speak directly with the top manager?
- Do you feel as you are being surveilled or are micromanaged in your work? If yes, by who and in what way? Is this an expression of power according to you?
- Do you feel as you exercise any type of surveillance or micromanaging in your work, or is there much delegating of responsibilities?
- If you feel as you have power, how does this power present itself? On who and in what way is this power exercised?

## **Student specific questions**

- Tell us about your education.
- In your studies, have you encountered or ever discussed terms such as group dynamics, power and leadership?  
Is leadership and management something that is taught or discussed in your education?  
If yes, what have been said about these discourses?
- Are group dynamics, power and leadership something that you have thought of as your future position as a film worker?