Creativity at Work:

City branding and film festivals: the case of Copenhagen

By Can-Seng Ooi & Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen

October 2009

Copenhagen
Business School
HANDELSHØJSKOLEN

imagine..

Abstract

The stakeholder and bottom up approach is advocated by many researchers in the place branding literature. In order for a place brand to be successful, it must be supported by the various stakeholders. Moreover, it is an ethical issue. While studies have shown how place brands fail because of the lack of consultation with stakeholders, building up consensus amongst stakeholders is easier said than done. Models are plentiful but the practice can be a different story. How should these models translate into actual practices? We looked at the Copenhagen International Film Festival and the branding of Copenhagen.

Ideally at the broader level, the film festival increases the vibrancy of the city by hosting events. The festival enhances the "happening'" image of a place. A well-established and famous film festival – like in Cannes, Venice and Sundance – increases the profile of the city through media exposure. The authorities in the city must offer the infrastructure and support for the film festivals. Residents also welcome the film festival. The relationship between the film festival, the place brand and the community are intertwined. Different stakeholders should – ideally – collaborate and cooperate to bring about common good for the community and enhance their own interests.

But the organizers of the film festival and promoters of the city have different agendas. This paper shows that their relationships are only loosely complementary, rather than symbiotic. The loose relationships are embedded in several circumstances. One, CIFF is geared towards the film industry. Its significant target audiences are within that industry. The branding of Copenhagen is not directed specifically at CIFF's targeted audiences. CIFF attempts to legitimize itself in the field, and the legitimacy does not entail being involved in place branding, on the contrary, if it emphasizes on branding Copenhagen, its credibility may be eroded. Two, the local authorities, Wonderful Copenhagen and Copenhagen Capacity do find value in promoting

and supporting the CIFF not only because the festivals enliven the city, the festivals have the potential to become a major global player in the future. The screening of movies is also popular with residents. The branding authorities however do not have the resources to dictate how the festivals should fit into the branding of the city.

Keyword

legitimacy, city branding, stakeholders

Authors

Can-Seng Ooi

Associate Professor
Copenhagen Business School
Porcelænshaven 24, DK-2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark
ooi@cbs.dk

Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen

Professor
Copenhagen Business School
Kilevej 14A, DK-2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark
jsp.ioa@cbs.dk

CITY BRANDING AND FILM FESTIVALS: THE CASE OF COPENHAGEN

Can-Seng Ooi and **Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen**

Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Introduction

A video clip – *Danish mother seeking* – could be found on YouTube. It shows a young beautiful Dane, Karen, without regret or anger, seeking to find the foreign father of her baby, August (VisitDenmark 2009). The baby was an outcome of a one-night fling. Karen wants to let her sex partner know that he has August. The two-and-a-half-minute video was viewed more than 800 000 times before it was revealed that the appeal was staged. It was part of a social media and viral marketing stunt by VisitDenmark, the tourism promotion board of the country (Politiken 2009a).

The then-Chief Executive of VisitDemark, Dorte Kiilerich, said that "Karen's story shows that Denmark is a broad-minded country where you can do what you want. The film is a good example of independent, dignified, Danish women who dare to make their own choices" (Politiken 2009b). Views in Denmark were divided; many were upset and offended that Danish women were portrayed as sluts and loose. The tourism promotion authorities removed the clip soon after.

The images of Denmark in the world, as in all other places, are heterogeneous. Danish society is at times seen as liberal, open-minded and tolerant (in the sense of sex, drugs, rock n roll). Another set of images points to an old kingdom

with many historical churches and castles (Ooi 2004). The various trade and tourism authorities in Denmark want to promote a modern, trendy and vibrant image for the country. What does a modern, trendy and vibrant image mean? While Karen's story is not unheard of in the country, the story does not send the right message, according to many Danes. The angry Danes are stakeholders in the tourism business. Their views have to be respected. Eventually, Chief Executive Dorte Killerich took responsibility for the uproar and resigned.

In the place branding literature, many researchers noticed how place branding authorities have often neglected stakeholders in branding processes. There are various stakeholders in a place branding exercise, including residents, industry players, local government, central government and the branding authorities. For example, Ryan and Zahra (2004) examined the political challenges in branding New Zealand as a tourism destination. They observed that tourism is economically important but is politically weak because the industry comprises of many small concerns, not all of which are economically motivated. Some local interest groups may want to maintain their idyll, while others want more tourism development. Regional and local governments across the country could not agree on a national strategy. Tourist businesses pursue their own interests. The cash strap tourism promotion authorities could provide a direction but not the resources to draw all parties in the same direction. Such a situation is known in many places, including Australia (Crockett & Wood 2004), Denmark (Ooi 2004) and Slovakia (Ooi, Kristensen, & Pedersen 2004).

Respecting stakeholders is not only necessary to ensure the success of a branding campaign, it is also ethical. Consultation shows respect and courtesy. Surely, place brands must reflect the different interests of various groups in society. The brand must be developed and promoted from the grassroots. Thus studies of place branding have moved beyond treating place branding as merely marketing exercises and into aspects of place management. The branding process requires mobilizing and garnering local support, enhancing

public-private collaboration and engaging with audiences around the world (Mossberg & Getz 2006; Nilsson 2007; Therkelsen & Halkier 2008; Tatevossian 2008; Vasudevan 2008). Cities, for instance, are not only enhancing their images through advertising, they are also increasing more activities and events for visitors and residents. Besides beautifying the city through urban planning, city authorities are also enlivening their cities' cultural scenes, nightlife and the celebration of diversity. The enlivening processes would benefit both residents and visitors. Various stakeholders benefit from these strategies (Brown et al. 2002; Florida 2003; Harmaakorpi, Kari, & Parjanen 2008; Smith 2004).

The *specific* relationships between stakeholders in the place branding literature however remain scantily researched. There is an agreement among scholars that various stakeholders – industry, government, local communities, branding agencies – must cooperate and coordinate for the campaign to function. But how should the consensus be reached? With conflicting interests, whose concerns should be considered more primary? The democratic emergence of a consensus can be tedious. In the case of Singapore, while the authorities agree for the need to develop a widely accepted brand identity for the country, the solution is eventually top-down. The branding authorities develop a brand identity and sell it to the residents while providing incentives for industry to adopt the official brand (Ooi 2007). In contrast, in observing the messy place branding situation in Denmark, Therkelsen and Halkier (2008) argue for cross-sectoral branding collaboration, such as between the investment and the tourism sectors, for the country. They propose that VisitDenmark and Invest in Denmark (the agency attracting investments into the country) work together, so that their different place branding experiences can complement each other; these agencies can also challenge each other's ideas and assumptions to bring about a more broadly accepted place brand for the country. Just as importantly, these agencies should cooperate to get more political attention and to attract resources.

In this paper, we look at the challenges of bringing contrasting stakeholders in the place branding exercise. To stay focused, we examine the relationship between place branding and film festivals. At the outset, it seems that organizers of film festivals are not much interested in branding the city, although the festival can be used to promote the city. The branding of Copenhagen and the Copenhagen International Film Festival (CIFF) will be used as a case to examine the relationships between branding the city and promoting film. Copenhagen is not very well known for its film. But from 1995 to 2005, the Danes introduced a new genre of movies. Dogma movies, in wanting to accentuate the story in the movie, are made without special effects, with only given lightings and in seemingly primitive ways, were introduced to the world. The first movie, *The Celebration* by director Thomas Vinterberg, won Cannes' Palme D'Or. Subsequently a number of Dogma movies were made around the world, drawing interests from famous directors such as Steven Spielberg. But apparently, Danish Dogma films did not generate much place branding capital for the country. Movies with shaky cameras, often with tragic endings, do not build place branding capital. Such films contrast to what *Lord of the Rings* did for New Zealand and *Braveheart* for Scotland in attracting tourists, or even Borat for Kazakhstan (Piggott, Morgan, & Pritchard 2004; Stock 2009). Certain contents in movies – particularly beautiful scenery, exotic social practices and exciting cultural life – do promote and brand places. As a result, for example, the Australian government sponsored the production of the epic movie *Australia*, starring Hugh Goodman and Nicole Kidman to promote the continent in 2008. In wanting to repeat the success of *Crocodile Dundee*, *Australia* features beautiful Australian nature and the star-studded cast.

Related to movies, do film festivals brand places? As part of city branding, film festivals are increasingly being used in city promotion. Cannes is the ultimate example of a place being identified with its film festival. Film festivals, like many other events, add to the economic development and vibrancy of the city

(e.g. see Ooi 2008; Smith 2004). But what is the specific relationship between film festivals and place branding?

Film festival research has in the tradition of film and media research first and foremost been concerned with historical account on a single film festival (e.g. Jacobsen 2000 and his very thorough study on the Berlin film festival in relation to their 50 years anniversary) or comparative studies of selected film festivals (e.g. Turan 2002 in his extensive study of more than ten film festivals with different purposes and agendas) and their role in the global network of film festivals (e.g. de Valck 2006) while others have studied the connection between art and business (e.g. Mezias et al. 2008 in their study of international film festival's ability to mediate between and convert artistic recognition in the form of awards into commercial output in the form of admissions). The relationship with place branding is barely discussed although most film festivals are promoted in place branding campaigns.

Events and awards ceremonies have become increasingly fashionable and widespread across industries in the form of trade fairs, professional conferences, technology contests and so forth (Anand & Watson 2004; Lampel & Meyer 2008). Well-established and broadly publicized events and awards in culture industries, including for example the Oscar (motion pictures), Grammy (music), Tony (theatre) and Emmy (television) events and awards, have become global cultural icons, signifying popular and critical success (Caves 2000; Anand & Watson, 2004). Events and award ceremonies are occasions for the industry to meet and celebrate themselves, their products, building identity and creating distinctions and classifications (DiMaggio 1987; Strandgaard Pedersen, & Dobbin, 1997; Mezias et al. 2008) through nominations and awards giving. With these aims in mind, these ceremonies still take place in particular cities – e.g. Cannes, Moscow, Sundance and Berlin. Film festivals are seen as a specific type of events and award ceremonies, operating as a meeting place for art and

business and identity building. How does the place of the festival contribute to the place brand-identity building exercise?

From the perspective of local authorities and city branding officials, film festivals are popular. They entertain residents and tourists. It attracts film businesses to the country and city, it portrays the city as a cultural place, film businesses are conducted, the city becomes glamorous when stars come visiting and journalists publicize the city, especially when stories of movies and stars develop in the city. In this context, other events, such as the Olympics, World Bank and IMF annual meetings or Formula One races serve similar functions of attracting tourists, boosting the local economy and enhancing the image of the city (Florida 2003; Harmaakorpi, Kari, & Parjanen 2008; Ooi 2008).

As mentioned above, studies on place branding have highlighted the need for the various stakeholders to cooperate and collaborate, so that all parties can get the most of the place branding exercise. We present the case of Copenhagen, and examine how the film industry and the city branding authorities co-exist. This paper is organized into a few sections. The next section discusses briefly our data collection. Subsequently, we review the purposes of city branding, in relation to film festivals. To contextualize the institutional framework CIFF is embedded, a history of film festivals is also presented. Subsequently, we present the branding of Copenhagen and the CIFF. We discuss how stakeholders in Copenhagen the brand and the film festival work together and what lessons can be learned, in relation to the stakeholder perspective to place branding.

CREATIVE ENCOUNTERS

Data and Methods

Our case of branding Copenhagen and CIFF is based on a business ethnographical approach (Moeran, 2005) and build on data collected from archival sources and generated through field observations and interviews.

Data from the festival were collected from 2003-2006 from the website (www.copenhagenfilmfestival.com) for information on the festival organization, program, rules and regulations, awards, key-figures from previous festivals and so forth. Official publications (festival programs, festival news papers etc.) issued by the festival organization were also gathered and analyzed. Newspaper articles on the festival were collected by an extensive database search on the Info media database including all Danish newspapers. This search resulted in 139 articles covering the years (2002-2007), which provided background information on the founding context, history, changes and critical incidents in the life of the festival. Two interviews were conducted with festival experts and participants on the perceived role and profile of the CIFF film festival. In 2007, Jesper Strandgaard visited the festival in order to have a first hand experience of the festival, its operations and physical presence.

Data for the branding of Copenhagen were collected since 1996 by Can-Seng Ooi. As the branding campaign evolves, documents and articles were collected. Interviews were also conducted over the years, and more recently, information were updated through more casual meetings with officials and through news stories.

Purposes of City Branding and Relations to Film Festivals

"Malaysia Truly Asia" is a tourism destination brand. It tells the story of Malaysia, highlighting the blend of different Asian cultures located in one country. It is also a country that embraces the traditional and the modern. Many place branding campaigns come with brand stories. These stories frame and

assert the brand identity of the place. It also helps people understand the society. But place brands are also known to be commercial campaigns; any messages they send are often taken with a pinch of salt (Waller & Lea 1999). So, in dealing with the issue of authenticity, the place brand must be shown to reflect the actual place. So, for instance, cities such as Sidney and Copenhagen hosted the World Outgames because they would like to communicate and indicate that they are tolerant, open-minded and socially progressive. Such accreditation is important.

There are many ways to accredit the brand stories. Depending on what is promoted, indicators must be given to substantiate the claims. For example, in promoting Singapore as an exotic destination, the Singapore Tourism Board highlights and shows where people can find locals worshipping in various temples, taste spicy Singaporean dishes and enjoy traditional cultural performances (Ooi 2002). Copenhagen Capacity – the inward investment agency – boasts that Copenhagen is a pleasant, exciting and trendy place to live, and such a claim is validated by the title "Most Livable City" by *Monocle,* an internationally renowned lifestyle magazine, in 2008. Berlin accentuated its cultural industry credentials by pointing out that MTV and many media giants have established their regional headquarters in the city. Big and popular events such as the Olympics, MTV music awards, and World Bank and International Monetary Fund annual meetings are much sought after by city authorities because these events attract global attention. By holding these events, a city will not only attract visitors, increase its profile in the global media, the city also demonstrates that it is efficient in handling big events, is culturally vibrant and is respected internationally. How about playing host to film festivals?

We will answer this question by looking at the functions of place, or in our case, city branding. Cities are branded for several reasons, including to sell more products, attract investments, woo talented workers and draw in tourists (Jaffe

& Nebenzahl 2001; Olins 2002). There are at least four inter-related functions for branding cities.

One purpose of branding a place is to shape the public image of the location (Kleppe, Iversen, & Stensaker 2002; McCleary & Whitney 1994; Richards 1992). Explicitly, a branding campaign is part of the "image modification process" (Andersen, Prentice, & Guerin 1997: 463). A city brand is not expected to communicate a complete picture but aim to create positive images in the minds of audiences. A successful and popular film festival can contribute to the place brand by generating awareness of the place and showcasing its ability to successfully stage events. The festival will also give the city a "film identity", for example, Sundance is known as the independent film festival. In many countries, a film festival suggests that there is a – fledging or mature – film industry in the city; a celebration of local movies is also a celebration and reminder of the movie industry in the city.

A second related purpose of place branding is to frame the location selectively and aesthetically. As a cohering force, the brand draws people's attention to positive images of the place. There are many aspects of the place – e.g. organized crime, unemployment and high cost of living – that are ignored in the brand because they are not considered attractive or interesting by the branding authorities. Branding inadvertently frames and packages the place into a relatively well-defined and commercially attractive product, which focuses on images, attractions and activities that are considered significant and relevant to the brand values (Ashworth & Voogd 1994). So, highlighting the glamour and excitement of a film festival, gossips about celebrities and the screening of new exciting movies will not only draw attention to the city, it also suggests that it is an (exciting enough) playground for the famous and rich. The active night life and city attractions are backdrops to the stars.

A third and related function of branding a place is to create an image of the location that stands out in the global place-product market. Inherently, the

brand asserts the place's uniqueness. Places in wanting to attract investments, talented workers and tourists are becoming more globalized and alike in their offerings and infrastructure (Lanfant 1995; Morgan & Pritchard 2004; Richards & Wilson 2007; Teo & Li 2003). The assertion of place uniqueness has become an institutionalized global practice for celebrating place identity (Kavaratzis & Ashworth 2005). A brand inevitably becomes a visionary exercise for the place branding authorities to imagine and reflect on how different they are different from others. The crystallized public image is also often introduced to the native population for it to recognize itself (Lanfant 1995; Leonard 1997; Oakes 1993). A popular and well established film festival, like Cannes, can set to define the city. But an accepted brand identity of a place can generate a self-fulfilling prophecy by encouraging, even creating, attractions to support the brand identity. For example, as mentioned earlier, Copenhagen successfully bided for the World Outgames 2009 because such an event would affirm the locally-accepted city's open and tolerant brand identity. So, for a film festival, certain types of films would be more warmly welcomed because they are seen to fit well with the city, as portrayed through the city brand identity. The Copenhagen Gay and Lesbian Film Festival, with its homosexual theme, is another example.

The last function of place branding is to shape people's experiences of the location by first shaping their preconceptions. The brand story provides a framework for locals and foreigners to imagine. For example, in tourism, studies have shown that people approach a foreign place with their own pre-visit interpretations, and this process enriches their experiences (Moscardo 1996; Prentice & Andersen 2007; Waller & Lea 1999). Accurate or otherwise preconceived ideas and pre-visit images will not only form the bases for outsiders to understand the place but will also form the bases for a more engaged and experiential consumption of place products. The brand helps foreigners to develop a coherent, consistent and meaningful sense of place, and offers a "brand experience" (Olins 2000). Creativity and Danish design is very much of the Copenhagen brand story. The brand, insidiously or otherwise,

encourage people to affirm the creative image of Copenhagen by noticing Danish design, for example, from furniture to traffic lights, gourmet food to Dogma movies. Films and film festivals, in the case of Copenhagen, is part of the creative city brand story. Promotion and getting people to pay closer attention to experimental and independent movies would affirm the brand story of a creative Copenhagen.

While film festivals are used in city branding, film festivals are not invented to promote and brand places; they are to promote films and the film industry. Such is the institutionalized context behind CIFF's existence. The institutionalization and diffusion of organizational forms and practices has been a significant object of analysis for many institutional theorists for the last two decades from several theoretical perspectives. Instrumental (Dowling and Pfeffer, 1975), social and cognitive (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, 1991; Scott 1995, 2008; Greenwood et al. 2008) arguments have been developed to understand why certain forms and practices are adopted by organizations; e.g. why have film festivals become similar in organization and practices. Greenwood, Hinings and Suddaby, (2002) have made an attempt to define the several stages leading towards institutionalization and diffusion of practices. All these theoretical contributions end up emphasizing the role of the external environment and of social norms in enhancing the diffusion within the organizational fields by means of isomorphic pressures. They also mean that there are resistance to introducing new organizational practices, such as giving priority to a city branding agenda in organizing a film festival.

Tolbert and Zucker (1983) whose seminal paper on the adoption of Civil Service reforms in US cities in the early 20th century, first raised the issue the presence of different logics behind the adoption of institutionalized practices. In particular, Tolbert and Zucker (1983) outline how timing affects the rationale of adoption. By envisioning a two-stage model, they distinguished early adopters, the organization's decision depending on "the degree to which the change

improves internal process" (Tolbert & Zucker 1983: 26), from late adopters, which adopt certain practices "because of their societal legitimacy" (Tolbert & Zucker 1983: 26). Hence, this two-stage model brought legitimacy and history back as main determinants of diffusion patterns[1]. Late adopters are seen to be inclined to conform to institutionalized labels so displaying symbolic alignment to taken for granted practices paying less attention to substantial impacts on effectiveness and overall performance. In this sense, late adopters can be seen as prone to conservative strategic responses (Oliver 1991) in order to minimize the potential conflicts with the external environment. Liability of newness would suggest that late adopters choose a conformity profile since acquiescence may reduce the risk of sanctions. Power dependence would suggest that alignment with the external environment could help attracting the needed resources by reproducing the existing dependency patterns with suppliers. In both cases, late adopters' rationales are driven by symbolic and rhetoric (Green 2004) alignment rather than by the expectation of performance improvement. Late adopter film festivals, like CIFF, are subjected to pressures to ape established film festivals. To film festival organizers, place branding is often not an important consideration.

Late adopters or new film festivals, in which an organization enters in a new field, have to search legitimacy by adopting given practices. Legitimacy makes certain forms and practices desirable as they are congruent with existing social norms and values (Dowling & Pfeffer 1975). Legitimacy also makes organizations themselves understandable as their existence is explained by established cultural accounts. Finally, legitimacy makes organizations themselves taken for granted so that deviance from socially constructed patterns – such as economic profitability and performance – can go unnoticed and survival ensured despite economic failures (Meyer & Zucker 1988).

---

[1] Mazza, Sahlin-Andersson and Strandgaard Pedersen (2005) have provided further descriptions of the different rationales inspiring early and late adopters of management practices by studying the diffusion of MBA educations in Europe.

Legitimacy is "a perception or assumption in that it represents a reaction of observers to organization as they see it" (Suchman 1995: 574). In this sense, it can be sustained that legitimacy, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder. Legitimacy is therefore a key element for late adopters/new comers' rationalization and theorization of their courses of action in an organizational field.

In the case of international film festivals (IFFs), Harbord (2002) links the creation of European film festivals (as well as other post-war festivals) to European post-war regeneration and rebuilding and she argues that the origins of such major film festivals are marked by two different discourses:

> One is a broad historical project of rebuilding Europe, a rebuilding of the social infrastructure ravaged by the Second World War, and a consolidation of Europe as a significant player in a global economy. Importantly, by the post-war period, culture has become a means of representing the status of place and facilitating local economies through cultural events. The other discourse, from film societies and guilds, is concerned with the definition of film as a form, with the aim of broadening categories of definition in contrast to the studio format of Hollywood film. Here, the opposition of national cultures, and of aesthetics practices, align in opposition to a mainstream American film product. The festival then presents an attempt to separate out national cultures, to distinguish certain practices, and in so doing, places a critical emphasis on the value of the text. (Harbord 2002: 64).

To contextualise CIFF as part of the film festival industry, a short history of film festivals is provided here. [2] Europe appears to be the cradle of the film festival phenomenon (de Valck 2006) born in the context of the particular geopolitical

---

[2] When we in the following use the concept film festivals we base our definition and data on The International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF) 2008.

situation in Europe the 1930s leading up to World War II and the new political order in Europe, during the late 1940s and early 1950s, in the wake of World War II. It took, thus, almost forty years from the first public screening in December 1895 by the Lumiere brothers to the worlds first major film festival was founded.

The world's first major film festival was founded in Italy under the Fascist government and held in Venice in 1932. The way the Venice festival was run soon gave rise to criticism that films from Italy and Germany was favoured even though the first editions have hosted films from several countries. According to Turan (2002) and supported by Mazdon (2007),

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

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

Another early adaptor or 'first mover' within the film festival field is the Moscow International film festival (MIFF) that was founded in 1935 and, thus, is the second oldest film festival in the world, after the Venice film festival. MIFF was, however, not continued until 1959, and has been redesigned several times – in 1959, 1969 and 1989 – and from 1959 to 1995 it was held every second year in July alternating between Karlovy Vary and Moscow. Since 1995 it has been held annually. This means that up to World War II only three film festivals

were established, respectively Venice (1932), Moscow (1935) and Cannes (1939). The other major international film festivals - like Locarno, Karlovy Vary, and Berlin and so forth - are a post-war phenomenon dating back to the late 1940s and 1950s (for an overview of early adopters of film festivals see table 1).

Table 1. Overview of early adopters of film festivals[3]

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

Film festivals, thus, started out as a European phenomenon, but soon proliferated and diffused to other parts of the world (India-Asia, 1952; Sydney-Australia, 1954; Argentina-South America, 1954). Nobody knows exactly how many IFFs exist today, as the number keeps changing every day, but an estimated figure is around 3.500 IFFs on a global scale. The founding of CIFF must also entail its search for recognition as an "international film festival". The evolution of such film festivals has a history and institutionalized practices have been established. City branding, as we will discuss later, is not a significant consideration when running an international film festival.

---

[3] This list is based on film festivals accredited by FIAPF (2008). This means, for example, that The Edinburgh International Film Festival in Scotland, established in 1947 and the longest continually running film festival in the world, is not included as it is not accredited by FIAPF.

Brand C<u>open</u>hagen

Branding a city goes beyond attracting tourists, it also means attracting investments, skilled workers and trade. Tourism authorities around the world however often ended up being the "marketing department" for their respective cities or countries. Denmark is no different. VisitDenmark markets at the country-level, Wonderful Copenhagen markets the capital city. Recently Wonderful Copenhagen and Copenhagen Capacity have become the lead agencies behind the branding of Copenhagen. Wonderful Copenhagen or WoCo, founded in 1992 but claim roots to 1887, is the tourism promotion agency. Copenhagen Capacity or CopCap, founded at about the same time, is the official inward investment agency for the city. CopCap aims to attract businesses and making the environment attractive for business people. It has been tasked to promote desired industries, including film-making, life-sciences and information technology. In relation to the film industry, CopCap is given the job by the government of transforming the film industry into the wider entertainment industry. This vision comes from the observation of technology convergence. The convergence of movies and computer games, for instance, also means that the film industry must widen their scope of business activities (CopCap 2009a) In cooperation with Swedish authorities, CopCap jointly promotes the Øresund region, which includes Copenhagen and Scania (the southern region of Sweden). WoCo and CopCap are in the process of rebranding Copenhagen and the region. In April 2009, these organizations organized a conference titled, *Copenhagen Redefined v 2.0*, to discuss the new branding direction for the capital (CopCap and WoCo 2009). It is also to launch a search for a new brand. It was then acknowledged that the current branding of Copenhagen is unclear. "Wonderful Copenhagen" as a brand slogan for tourism has been in used since the 1950s. Wanting to learn from IAMsterdam and Stockholm, Capital of Scandinavia, the authorities want Copenhagen to become more visible with a clearer message. By wanting to present the city as tolerant, it celebrates diversity. The historical and the post-modern, modern

technology and human emotions, welfare state and a thriving capitalist system are blended into a stable and open city.

The message is currently communicated through C*open*hagen (see figure 1). The logo is used to highlight the city as open and tolerant, particularly when it was used in World Outgames 2009. On Copcap's website – www.copcap.dk – it is tagged as "Open for business", alluding to a welcoming, modern and efficient business environment.

Figure 1: C*open*hagen (source: CopCap's website www.copcap.dk)

C OPEN HAGEN
Open for Business

While WoCo and CopCap have the responsibilities to promote the capital city, its main tool of garnering support and cooperation from the various industries and the community is through persuasion. One third of the money comes from the state, another third comes from membership and the final third is through selling their services. As a result, for instance, the attempt at downplaying the historical image of Copenhagen was flatly rejected by many tourism operators who organize tours. Images of historical Copenhagen – the Little Mermaid, Amalienborg (the palace where the royal family lives), the neo-classical Marble Church – remain salient and strongly promoted in tourism publications and promotional materials by the private sector (Ooi 2004). The youthful, trendy and vibrant images of Copenhagen – Danish design, a lively night scene and a tolerant society – are found on the official websites. As a result, when one visits the official website of WoCo, there is a smorgasbord of images and impressions, ranging from romantic Copenhagen to gay Copenhagen, green Copenhagen to "wellness in Copenhagen". Different events and activities are featured at different times of the year, ranging from Kopenhagen Contemporary (a festival

for contemporary art in the city) to Golden Days in Copenhagen (a biennale on romantic art), dancing in cool clubs to shopping in flea markets. The Copenhagen International Film Festival is also listed in official marketing materials (www.visitcopenhagen.com).

CopCap sticks to the modern, creative and efficient image of Copenhagen in the branding of the capital; modern infrastructure, tax holidays, quality of life for expatriates and a positive business environment are highlighted. From the "Why Copenhagen" page of CopCap's, the city is said to offer (CopCap 2009b):

> **A unique, secure and flexible labour market**
> The Danish labour market is very flexible, and at the same time it offers a unique social security system that safeguards and supports employees.
>
> **A balanced lifestyle**
> The work and leisure balance in Copenhagen create an incredible quality of life that you don't find elsewhere.
>
> **A productive and innovative workforce**
> How can you benefit from the Danish work culture, which is characterised by a lean, efficient work style?
>
> **Strongholds**
> Copenhagen is exceptionally strong within industries such as
>
> **>** Life science
> **>** ICT
> **>** Creative and entertainment
> **>** Cleantech

The film industry is featured in the "Creative and entertainment" industry. In December 2009, Copenhagen will assert its environment credentials by hosting the world summit of leaders on the environment, as global leaders find a replacement for the Kyoto Protocol.

A modern, trendy and human-friendly image of Copenhagen is the main brand story. So, Karen, the single mother, highlights the open-mindedness of the society, for instance. Modern contemporary images of Copenhagen are said to

appeal to investors and businessmen, as well as to younger and trendy visitors and expatriates. C*open*hagen points to a society with a high quality of life – a cozy and charming city that respects diversity and welcomes everyone.

Copenhagen International Film Festival (CIFF)

The first CIFF kicked off in August 2003. The idea for the festival was conceived in 2002. One of the prime drivers behind the initiative was 'Hovedstadens Udviklingsråd' (The Development Council for the Wider Copenhagen Area), who in the wake of the international success for Danish film, decided to donate money for two purposes. First, they donated money (Euro 70.000) for a regional film commission for the 'Öresund region' to attract international production of film, TV and commercials to the Öresund region. Second, they donated money (Euro 70.000) to support the new CIFF and money (Euro 35.000) for a film festival for children's films ('Buster') (Politiken, 20.12.2002). CIFF also received money (Euro 65.000) from the Danish Film Institute (DFI) and were promised another Euro 70.000 on top of this amount of money. Apart from this financial support CIFF also received money from the municipality of Copenhagen (main contributor with Euro 500.000) and the Ministry of Culture (donating a yearly amount of Euro 150.000 for a four year period), so that the festival altogether received approximately Euro 900.000. On top of this financial support CIFF was also met with moral and political support from prominent politicians in Copenhagen (JP, 19.21.2002). With the support of the local authorities, CIFF is tacitly expected to cooperate in the enlivening and branding of the city.

Right from the beginning CIFF was, however, also met with some criticism. In particular the Manager of the Odense Short and Documentary film festival was unhappy because CIFF had placed itself at the same time as the Odense Short

and Documentary film festival was taking place and the festival manager was afraid that CIFF would take focus from the other Danish film festival (Politiken, 20.12.2002). Apart from this critical voice, other parties in the film industry doubted if Denmark needed yet another film festival as Copenhagen already had its Gay & Lesbian Film Festival (founded in 1985, the 'NatFilmfestival' (The Night Film Festival') founded in 1990, 'Buster' (Children's films) founded in 2000 and CPH:DOX (on documentary films) also founded in 2003 (Berlingske Tidende, 01.11.2004).

On the other hand, CIFF also received tremendous support from various prominent stakeholders in the Danish film industry as well as industrialists and politicians (Politiken Weekly, 18.12.2002). CIFF was established as a foundation and hired festival director, Janne Giese, who had also been one of the prime drivers behind the initiative. With regard to positioning CIFF on one hand was 'inspired by the large international film festivals like Berlin, Cannes and Venice', but on the other did not want to compete with these festivals, but instead collaborate with the existing Danish film festivals (Ekstra Bladet, 17.12.2002). And in response to the criticism raised and the legitimation of yet another film festival, CIFF organizers argued that,

> [...] the Odense festival shows some films that different from the one we show. And NatFilmfestivalen is directed towards the audience, whereas our festival is rather a feast for both audience and filmmakers. CIFF is going to be a place where, in particular directors can meet and exchange ideas and meanings. (Festival director Valeria Richter in Ekstra Bladet, 17.12.2002).

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

> When we are good at doing something, as we are in the case of filmmaking, we should not be afraid to boast and show it. The

festival will create experiences and provide energy to the city and expand the international pulse already existing in Copenhagen. […] The goal is to make it the best Scandinavian film festival and a major international event (Politiken, 17.12.2002).

With regard to the profile and positioning of the film festival, Henning Camre, former director of the Danish Film Institute, finds that,

the new Danish film festival has a chance as they have decided to focus very strongly on European film. No other film festival has done that. (Politiken, 17.12.2002).

The first CIFF ran 10 series and more than 150 films (from Spanish Western comedies to Dutch musicals), a large competition with 14 international films and an international jury of five members, headed by the Greek film director Theo Angelopulos and together with film directors Jan Troell, Jutta Brückner, Marion Hänsel and Danish director Bille August[4], awarding the 'Golden Swan' designed by Line Utzon[5]. Apart from the European focus a special series on African films was shown. The festival director, Janne Giese, commented the opening this way:

Any major city with self respect ought to have a film festival. I cannot understand, why we have not already had one long time ago. (Ritzau, 13.08.2003)

In the first festival, no real film market was established (JP,30.06.2003). Apart from the public money CIFF was also to attract private money but failed in getting a main sponsor and had to cut down on some of the activities among other activities the film market (Fyens Stiftstidende, 01.07.2003). The Danish

---

[4] Bille August had to cancel last minute and was substituted by Danish film director Ole Roos.
[5] Apart from the 'Golden Swan', a Lifetime Achievement Award was handed out to Liv Ullmann, and two Honorary awards to Theo Angelopulos and Lars Von Trier.

Film Institute had to come up with yet another Euro150.000 in support and guarantee in the case of a deficit (Berlingske Tidende, 04.08.2002).

CIFF started out with a goal of about 30.000 spectators, then adjusted it to 20.000, but finally ended up with only around 15-16.000 tickets of which approximately 5.000 were handed out for free. The blame for the lack of attention from audience was given to the weather. Janne Giese, festival director, estimated that the festival lost about 10-15.000 tickets because of the heat wave in August (JP, 27.09.2003). Concerning key figures for CIFF see table 2 below.

TABLE 2. Copenhagen International Film Festival (2003-2006)[6]

	2003	2004	2005	2006
Number of films	153	111	117	148
EU ratio	75%	74%	100%	93%
No. of Screenings	269	240	235	300
No. of features	no info	102	113	141
No. of documentaries	3	5	4	4
Series	no info	12	12	14
No. of Accredited	290	364	400	no info
Tickets	16.688	23.814	22.571	25.273

After the first festival, CIFF was moved as to avoid the overlap with Odense film festival (Berlingske Tidende, 05.08.2003). It was, however, not easy to agree on scheduling a new date for CIFF as several conflicting interests were raised. The festival program in general leaves little room in the busy calendar and the

---

[6] Source: CIFF website

cinema theatre owners wanted to fill their theatres during the low summer season, whereas CIFF wanted to get away from the warm and low season (Ritzau, 18.08.2003; BT, 21.08.2003). Also changes occurred in the composition of the board of CIFF, where Peter Aalbæk Jensen, CEO of Zentropa and Kenneth Plummer, CEO of Nordisk Film entered the board of CIFF in order to strengthen the relation to the Danish film industry, but also to co-opt one of the strongest critics of CIFF, Peter Aalbæk Jensen. The head of the program was also changed several times. Since 2004, Jacob Neiiendam has been in charge of the program (Ritzau, 23.11.2004) and, in 2005 he strengthened the European profile of CIFF (Ritzau, 25.05.2005).

From very early on, and in particular articulated by CEO of Zentropa, Peter Aalbæk Jensen, it was suggested to merge CIFF and the NatFilmfestival (Berlingske Tidende, 28.01.2004). CIFF organizers declare they were positive, whereas Natfilmfestival organizers were more sceptical concerning this suggestion. Nothing happens, however, with regard to merging the two festivals and, CIFF and NatFilmfestival (as well as Buster and CPH: DOX) continue their business as usual. Every year the politicians bring up the suggestion about merging the two film festivals, but very little happens.

In spring 2005, CIFF, however, embarks on collaboration with 'Buster', in particular on the sponsoring and marketing of the two festivals (Berlingske Tidende, 28.10.2005). Another initiative, 'Copenhagen Screenings' is launched in July 2005. Copenhagen Screenings is an initiative that invites 170 foreign film buyers to Copenhagen, creating a kind of local film market, however promoting Danish films. The initiative is carried out in collaboration with The Danish Film Institute, Trust Film Sales and Nordisk Film International Sales (JP, 11.07.2005).

In 2006 CIFF changes its schedule and moves from August to September in the hope of attracting more festival-goers (Berlingske Tidende 30.11.2005). Apart from the weather, Janne Giese also argues that now when CIFF is placed after Venice, Toronto and San Sebastian better quality films are likely to be given free

for CIFF and other festivals (Berlingske Tidende 30.11.2005). In 2006, CIFF also embarks on a new sponsor strategy and manages to attract three main sponsors (Irma, Café Noir and Nokia Nseries) together with a media partner (Politiken) (Markedsføring, 05.09.2006) and Lars Von Trier's film 'The Boss of Everything' is the opening film.

In spring 2007 the collaboration previously mentioned between CIFF and 'Buster' is extended in the way that CIFF takes over the responsibility for 'Buster' and it seems in reality to be a merger between the two festivals. (Børsen, 16.03.2007). The 2007 edition of CIFF looks now like one of the international film festivals with large posters in town, a big screen on square in front of the city hall, red carpet in front of the central festival theatre ('Imperial'), press, lots of films, sponsors, visiting filmmakers, local (Danish) stars, a permanent staff of around 25-30 people and around 80 volunteers. But there were still too few tickets sold and too little attention from the audience. Again that year, the yearly suggestion from politicians about merging the two major festivals was launched and, this time apparently with much more success than the previous years. During fall, 2007 it was announced that the politicians want to merge all four film festivals taking place in Copenhagen (CIFF, NatFilmfestival, Buster and CPH: DOX). The two foundations ('Natsværmerfonden' and 'Fonden Copenhagen International Film Festival') behind the two festivals are merged into a new foundation ('Fonden de Købehavnske filmfestivaler') responsible for three festivals. The four festivals are merged into three festivals -'Buster' (Children's films) is taking place in September, CPH-DOX stays in its current position in November and CIFF and NatFilmfestival are going to be merged into one festival named 'CPH:PIX, taking place in April. Head of the Royal Danish Theatre, Michael Christiansen was appointed chairman of the foundation. A managing director was found, former head of actors at the Royal Danish Theatre, Mikkel Harder Munck-Hansen and his job is to lead the three festivals and create a new profile for the

newly merged festival. In Spring 2009, Mikkel Harder Munck-Hansen resigned and was replaced by Jørgen Ramskov, June 1, 2009.

Discussion

The CIFF has changed over the years. While it aims to highlight Copenhagen and the region as a film-making place, the practicalities of running the series of festivals are embroiled in politics, conflicting interests and the competition for resources. While WoCo and CopCap are and were not directly involved in the intrigues of when the festival should run or what movies should be screened, the local governments in Copenhagen and other parties have vested interests, for instance, officials in Odense were not pleased with the "monopolization" of Copenhagen. In the whole debate, CIFF was more concerned with itself seeking legitimization from the film industry, ironing out the kinks amongst organizers of film festivals in Denmark and getting acceptance from various parties in the local film industry. Place branding is not a primary concern by the organizers, even though local authorities support the project. There are a number of issues that have to be addressed when we examine the primary interests of the organizers of CIFF and the promoters of C*open*hagen.

As discussed earlier there are a number of functions for the branding of places. The place branding exercise aims to modify the global image of Copenhagen, it selectively frames the city, it asserts a unique identity for the place and it provides a set of lenses for people to understand and interpret the city. How would an event like CIFF contribute to the Copenhagen brand? A series of events like CIFF contributes to the branding of the city at various levels.

One, it enlivens the city. The city is framed as lively and vibrant, CIFF contributes to the city by running the events. Two, CIFF creates and maintains international awareness of the city, especially when the festival is internationally recognized and popular. Cannes film festival is an example of how a film festival attracts attention to the city every year. Three, it asserts

Copenhagen as a movie city, which complements the film industry promoted by the government.

The CIFF is however not very successful in comparison to some other events. For example, the 2009 International Olympic Council congress, during which Rio de Janeiro was selected for the 2016 games, was held in Copenhagen. Because of the significance of the event and also because of the many famous personalities from competing candidate cities came to the capital, which included entertainer Opera Winfrey, US President Barack Obama, Brazil President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, King Juan Carlos of Spain and footballer Pele, hundreds of journalists descended into Copenhagen. The announcement of the result was telecasted "live" to more than a billion people, during which a promotional clip of Copenhagen was presented. Subsequently after the event, non-Olympic features and stories of Copenhagen were published, broadcasted and telecasted as journalists return home with a new collection of stories. For instance, Opera Winfrey made a feature on why Danes are the happiest people in the world, using Copenhagen as the backdrop during her visit to support Chicago's bid. CIFF has not attracted such attention.

Established and famous international film festivals attract not only industry people but also press people and media attention (e.g. IFFs like Cannes, Venice and Berlin accredit between 3-4.000 media people for their events). Stories of celebrities visiting the city and gossips add to the glamour of the place. Visual images of the city would be presented to the world when news stories break. The yearly events ensure that journalists renew their stories as they report from the scene, thus disseminating information and images of the host cities.

The organizers of CIFF are not opposed to being used in the branding of Denmark. They however are not giving the branding of the city priority. As seen in our discussion earlier, they are trapped in their concerns of how and when to run the festival. Regardless, CIFF takes on the city's name. While the image of the city is generally positive, the audiences of the festivals are mainly

residents. Film trading is remains a primary concern. What is important for the film industry is how friendly the city is to the film business, in terms of access to financial support, resources and facilities. And much of the CIFF events and activities are directed towards the European film industry rather than to building up a good name for the city. To many film buffs and industry players, a made-in-Denmark film invokes certain impressions; the Dogma movies are, for example, associated with the country. But from the discussion above, again, the concerns of CIFF are geared towards legitimacy and recognition in the global film industry.

As mentioned, organizers of the CIFF would be proud to let WoCo and CopCap to associate the film festival with the city; the festival however must not be seen primarily as a city branding exercise. Else, the legitimacy of the festival would be diminished. The branding of Copenhagen is beneficial for CIFF because the festival is located in the city, and a city known for its creativity and innovation would imply that the film industry is also exciting. Furthermore, Copenhagen as an attractive city – safe, secure and stable – will not hinder industry players from wanting to participate in the festival. The film festival can tap into the benefits of the Copenhagen brand, and it may also contribute but CIFF must not be seen to serve the marketing of the city, more than it serves the film industry.

The relationships between CIFF and the branding authorities are loosely complementary, rather than symbiotic. The loose relationships are embedded in several circumstances. One, CIFF is geared towards the film industry. Its significant target audiences are within that industry. The branding of Copenhagen is not directed specifically at CIFF's targeted audiences. CIFF attempts to legitimize itself in the field, and the legitimacy does not entail being involved in place branding, on the contrary, if it emphasizes on branding Copenhagen, its credibility may be eroded. Two, the local authorities, WoCo and CopCap do find value in promoting and supporting the CIFF not only because the festivals enliven the city, the festivals have the potential to become

a major global player in the future. The screening of movies is also popular with residents. While, the branding authorities do not have the resources to dictate how the festivals should be run nor have the resources to jumpstart CIFF into a major film festival, they can only hope that the CIFF will become a big player in the film festival markets. When that happens, CIFF will become even more central in the Copenhagen brand story.

As a result, organizers of CIFF and the city branding authorities in Copenhagen keep each other informed and support each other in a loose manner. Their relationships remain relatively simple, in the sense that they support each other but without stepping into setting either one's agenda. The potential to couple CIFF with brand Copenhagen is promising but the nature of their activities and the limited resources available mean that each party concentrates on what each is good at and collaborate when it is convenient.

Conclusions

The stakeholder and bottom up approach is advocated by many researchers in the place branding literature. In order for a place brand to be successful, it must be supported by the various stakeholders. Moreover, it is an ethical issue. While studies have shown how place brands fail because of the lack of consultation with stakeholders, building up consensus amongst stakeholders is easier said than done. Models are plentiful but the practice can be different story. How should these models translate into actual practices? We looked at CIFF and the branding of Copenhagen.

Ideally at the broader level, the film festival increases the vibrancy of the city by hosting events. The festival enhances the image of a place that is happening. A well-established and famous film festival – like Cannes, Venice and Sundance – increases the profile of the city through media exposure. The authorities in the city must offer the infrastructure and support for the film festivals. Residents also welcome the film festival. The relationship between the film festival, the

place brand and the community are intertwined. Different stakeholders should – ideally – collaborate and cooperate to bring about common good for the community and enhance their own interests.

In this paper, we stay focused on two groups of stakeholders that are involved in the branding of Copenhagen and the organization of CIFF. From the outset, their relationship is far from ideal because they have different agendas. Upon closer examination, we identify the different interests of CIFF and the Copenhagen branding campaign. Do their interests overlap? Only to a limited manner and in some ways, conflicting. For instance, CIFF should not give any impression that they are engaged in the place branding agenda to maintain credibility of the festival series. Their collaboration is limited. In the literature, suggestions are made that these stakeholders must work more closely to bring about more effective results in the place branding campaign. We wonder if that is wise and needed.

This paper starts with the fictitious character, Karen. Her story however is not unfounded in this country. Nonetheless, the public do not want her attitude to tarnish the image of Denmark. VisitDenmark thought it would enhance the image of the country. Behind the commercial goals of place branding, there is the issue of authenticity and respecting the needs of the grassroots. Stakeholders should be respected. From the example of Karen, the local stakeholders may not want to present an image of their own society that they do not like. As in the case CIFF, the cooperation is at arm's length and it works, albeit not in a closely entwined manner. So, in response to the body of literature on the importance of stakeholder cooperation, how deeply must the place branding authorities engage with various stakeholders? The collaboration between organizers behind CIFF and authorities behind brand C*open*hagen is relatively successful, not because they collaborate deeply but because they engage only when it is convenient.

References

Alvarez, J. L., Mazza, C., Strandgaard Pedersen, J., and Svejenova, S. 2005, "Shielding Idiosyncrasy from Isomorphic Pressures: Towards Optimal Distinctiveness in European Filmmaking", *Organization,* 12: 863-888.

Alvarez, J.L., Mazza, C., and Strandgaard Pedersen, J. 2005, "Editorial: The Role of Mass Media in the Consumption of Management Knowledge", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 21(2): 127-132.

Anand, N. and M.R. Watson 2004, "Tournament Rituals in the evolution of fields: the case of the Grammy Awards", *Academy of Management Journal,* 47: 59-80.

Andersen, V., Prentice, R., & Guerin, S. 1997, "Imagery of Denmark among visitors to Danish fine arts exhibitions in Scotland", *Tourism Management*, 18(7): 453-464.

Ashworth, G. J. & Voogd, H. 1994, "Marketing of tourism places: What are we doing?," in *Global Tourist Behavior*, M. Uysal, ed., International Business Press, New York): 5-19.

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

Brown, G., Chalip, L., Jago, L., & Mules, T. 2002, "The Sydney Olympics and Brand Australia," in *Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*, N. Morgan, A. Pritchard, & R. Pride, eds., Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford): 163-185.

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

CopCap and WoCo. 2009, "Copenhagen Redefined v. 2.0" (available at URL http://www.wonderfulcopenhagen.dk/media(394,1030)/Redefined_fil1 .pdf; accessed on 13 October 2009)

CopCap. 2009a, "From film to entertainment industry" (available at URL http://www.copcap.com/content/us/doing_business/industries/creati ve_and_entertainment/from_film_to_entertainment_industry; accessed on 13 October 2009)

CopCap. 2009b, "Why Copenhagen" (available at URL http://www.copcap.com/content/us/doing_business/why_copenhagen; accessed on 13 October 2009)

Crockett, S. R. & Wood, L. J. 2004, "Western Australia: building a state brand," in *Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*, 2nd edn, N. Morgan, A. Pritchard, & R. Pride, eds., Elsevier Butterworth Heinemann, Amsterdam): 185-206.

De Valck, M. 2006, *Film Festivals. History and Theory of a European Phenomenon That Became a Global Network*. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation. University of Amsterdam.

DiMaggio, P. 1987, "Classification in Art", American Sociological Review, 52 (4): 440-455.

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

DiMaggio, P. J. and Powell, W. W. 1983, "The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields.", *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147-160.

DiMaggio, P. J. and Powell, W. W. 1991, "Introduction", in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, W. W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio, eds., Chicago. University of Chicago Press. 1-38.

Dowling, J. and Pfeffer, J. 1975, "Organizational Legitimacy: Social Values and Organizational Behavior", *Pacific Sociological Review*, 18: 122-136.

Florida, R. 2003, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, new edn, Basic Books, New York.

Green, S. E. 2004, "A Rhetorical Theory of Diffusion", *Academy of Management Review*, 29: 653-669.

Greenwood, R., Hinings, C., and Suddaby, R. 2002, "Theorizing Change: the Role of Professional Associations in the Transformation of Institutionalized Fields", *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 58-80.

Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., and Suddaby, R. 2008. "Introduction", in *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 1-46.

Harbord, J. 2002, *Film Cultures*. Sage Publications. London.

Harmaakorpi, V., Kari, K., & Parjanen, S. 2008, "City design management as a local competitiveness factor", *Place Brand and Public Diplomacy*, 4(2): 169-181.

Jacobsen, W. 2000, *50 Years International Filmfestspiele Berlin.* Filmmuseum Berlin-Deutsche Kinematek and Nicolaische Verlagsbuchhandlung Beuermann GmbH, Berlin.

Jaffe, E. D. & Nebenzahl, I. D. 2001, *National Image and Competitive Advantage* Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen.

Kavaratzis, M. & Ashworth, G. J. 2005, "City branding: An effective assertion of identity or a transitory marketing trick?", *tijdschrift voor Economische en Scoial Geografie*, 96(5): 506-514.

Kleppe, I. A., Iversen, N. M., & Stensaker, I. G. 2002, "Country images in marketing strategies: Conceptual issues and an empirical Asian illustration", *Brand Management*, 10(1): 61-74.

Lampel, J. and Meyer, A.D. 2008, "Guest Editors' Introduction. Field Configuring Events as Structuring Mechanisms: How Conferences, Ceremonies, and Trade Shows Constitute New Technologies, Industries, and Markets", *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(6): 1025-1035.

Lanfant, M.-F. 1995, "International tourism, internalization and the challenge to identity," in *International Tourism: Identity and Change*, M.-F. Lanfant, J. B. Allcock, & E. M. Bruner, eds., SAGE Publications, London): 24-43.

Lawrence, T.B., and Suddaby, R. 2006, "Institutions and Institutional Work", in *Handbook of Organization Studies,* 2nd edn, S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T.B.Lawrence and W.R. Nord, eds., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 215-254.

Leonard, M. 1997, *Britain ™ Renewing Our Identity* Demos, London.

Mazdon, L. 2007, "Transnational 'French' Cinema: The Cannes Film Festival", *Modern and Contemporary France*, 15 (1):9-20.

Mazza, C., Sahlin-Andersson, K., and Strandgaard Pedersen, J. 2005, "European Constructions of an American Model", *Management Learning* 36(4): 471-491.

McCleary, K. W. & Whitney, D. L. 1994, "Projecting Western consumer attitudes toward travel to six Eastern European countries," in *Global Tourist Behaviour*, M. Uysal, ed., International Business Press, New York. 239-256.

Meyer, M. and Zucker, L. G. 1988, *Permanently Failing Organizations*. Huntington Park, Calif.: Sage Publications Inc.

Mezias, S., Strandgaard Pedersen, J., Svejenova, S. and Mazza, C. 2008, *Much Ado About Nothing? Untangling the Impact of European Premier Film Festivals.* Creative Encounters Research Paper Series, Copenhagen Business School.

Moeran, B.D. 2005, *The Business of Ethnography*. Berg Publishers. London.

Morgan, N. & Pritchard, A. 2004, "Meeting the Destination Branding Challenge," in *Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*, 2nd edn, N. Morgan, A. Pritchard, & R. Pride, eds., Elsevier Butterworth Heinemann, London. 59-78.

Moscardo, G. 1996, "Mindful visitors : Heritage and tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2): 376-397.

Mossberg, L. & Getz, D. 2006, "Stakeholder Influences on the Ownership and Management of Festival Brands", *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 6(4): 308-326.

Nilsson, P. Å. 2007, "Stakeholder Theory: The Need for a Convenor. The Case of Billund", *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 7(2): 171-184.

Oakes, T. S. 1993, "The cultural space of modernity: Ethnic tourism and place identity in China", *Society and Space*, 11): 47-66.

Olins, W. 2000, "How brands are taking over the corporation," in *The Expressive Organization*, M. Schultz, M. J. Hatch, & M. H. Larsen, eds., Oxford University Press, Oxford): 51-65.

Olins, W. 2002, "Branding the nation - the historical context", *Brand Management*, 9(4-5): 241-248.

Oliver, C. 1991, "Strategic responses to institutional processes", *Academy of Management Review* 16: 145-179.

Ooi, C.-S. 2002, *Cultural Tourism and Tourism Cultures: The Business of Mediating Experiences in Copenhagen and Singapore* Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen.

Ooi, C.-S. 2004, "Poetics and politics of destination branding: Denmark", *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 4(2.

Ooi, C.-S. 2007, "The creative industries and tourism in Singapore," in *Tourism, Creativity and Development*, G. Richards & J. Wilson, eds., Routledge, London): 240-251.

Ooi, C.-S. 2008, "Reimagining Singapore as a creative nation: The politics of place branding", *Place Branding and And Public Diplomacyomacy*, 4(4): 287-302.

Ooi, C.-S., Kristensen, T. P., & Pedersen, Z. L. 2004, "Re-Imag(in)ing Place: From Czechoslovakia to the Czech Republic and Slovakia", *Tourism*, 52(2): 151-163.

Piggott, R., Morgan, N., & Pritchard, A. 2004, "New Zealand and The Lord of the Rings: leveraging public and media relations," in *Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*, 2nd edn, N. Morgan, A. Pritchard, & R. Pride, eds., Elsevier, London): 207-225.

Politiken. 2009a, "VisitDenmark removes bogus video", 14 September (available at URL http://politiken.dk/newsinenglish/article788476.ece; accessed on 13 October 2009).

Politiken. 2009b, "Denmark: Selling a lie", 14 September (available at URL http://politiken.dk/newsinenglish/article788087.ece; accessed on 13 October 2009)

Powell, W. W., and DiMaggio, P. J. eds., 1991, *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Prentice, R. & Andersen, V. 2007, "Interpreting heritage essentialisms: Familiarity and felt history", *Tourism Management*, 28(3): 661-676.

Richards, B. 1992, *How To Market Tourist Attractions, Festivals and Special Events* Longman, Essex.

Richards, G. & Wilson, J. 2007, *Tourism, Creativity and Development* Routlege, London.

Ryan, C. & Zahra, A. 2004, "The political challenge: the case of New Zealand's tourism organizations," in *Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*, 2nd edn, N. Morgan, A. Pritchard, & R. Pride, eds., Elsevier, London): 79-110.

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

Scott, W.R. 1995, 2001, 2008, *Institutions and Organizations* [1st, 2nd, 3rd Ed.]. London: Sage Publications

Smith, M. F. 2004, "Brand Philadelphia: the power of spotlight events," in *Destination Branding: Creating the Unique Destination Proposition*, 2nd edn, N. Morgan, A. Pritchard, & R. Pride, eds., Elsevier, London. 261-278.

Stock, F. 2009, "The Borat Effect", *Place Brand And Public Diplomacy*, 5(3): 180-191.

Strandgaard Pedersen, J., and Dobbin, F. 1997, "The Social Invention of Collective Actors: One the Rise of the Organization", *American Behavioral Scientist,* 40: 431-443.

Strandgaard Pedersen, J., and Dobbin, F. 2006, "In Search of Identity and Legitimation – Bridging Organizational Culture and Neoinstitutinalism", *American Behavioral Scientist,* 49: 897-907.

Suchman, M. C. 1995, "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches", *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 571-610.

Svejenova, S., Mazza, C. and Planellas, M. 2007, "Cooking up change in haute cuisine: Ferran Adrià as an institutional entrepreneur", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28: 539-561.

Tatevossian, A. R. 2008, "Domestic society's (often-neglected) role in nation branding", *Place Brand And Public Diplomacy*, 4(2): 182-190.

Teo, P. & Li, L. H. 2003, "Global and local interactions in tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(2): 287-306.

Therkelsen, A. & Halkier, H. 2008, "Contemplating Place Branding Umbrellas. The Case of Coordinated National Tourism and Business Promotion in Denmark", *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 8(2): 159-175.

Tolbert, P. S. and Zucker, L. G. 1983, "Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880-1935", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28: 22-39.

Turan, K. 2002, *Sundance to Sarajevo – Film Festivals and the World they Made*. University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA.

Vasudevan, S. 2008, "The role of internal stakeholders in destination branding: Observations from Kerala Tourism", *Place Brand And Public Diplomacy*, 4(4): 331-335.

VisitDenmark. 2009. "Danish mother seeking" (available at URL
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aeBg1raqCYM; accessed on 13
October 2009).

Waller, J. & Lea, S. E. G. 1999, "Seeking the real Spain? Authenticity in
Motivation", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(1): 110-129.

Zucker, L. G. 1983, Organizations as Institutions", in *Research in the Sociology of
Organizations*, S. B. Bacharach, ed. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press. 1-42.

Creativity at Work, Creative Encounters Working Papers Series

Working Papers List:

#1   **Making Scents of Smell:**
        Manufacturing Incense in Japan
        By: Brian Moeran
        June 2007

#2   **From Participant Observation to Observant Participation:**
        Anthropology, Fieldwork and Organizational Ethnography
        By: Brian Moeran
        July 2007

#3   **Creative Encounters in the Film Industry:**
        Content, Cost, Chance, and Collection
        By: Mark Lorenzen
        August 2007

#4   **Hvilke kulturtilbud bruger den kreative klasse?**
        By: Trine Bille
        August 2007

#5   **Chinese Tourists in Denmark**
        By: Can-Seng Ooi
        October 2007

#6   **Authenticity-in-Context: Embedding the Arts and Culture in**
        Branding Berlin and Singapore
        By: Can-Seng Ooi and Birgit Stöber
        January 2008

#7   **Credibility of a Creative Image: The Singaporean Approach**
        By: Can-Seng Ooi
        January 2008

#8   **On the Globalization of the Film Industry**
        By: Mark Lorenzen
        February 2008

#9   **A methodology for studying design cognition in the real world**
By: Bo Christensen
February 2008

#10   **Embedded Structural Tensions in the Organization of Japanese Advertising Production**
By: Brian Moeran
February 2008

#11   **The simultaneous success and disappearance of Hong Kong martial arts film, analysed through costume and movement in 'Crouching Tiger, Hidden Dragon'**
By: Lise Skov
February 2008

#12   **An Anthropological Analysis of Book Fairs**
By: Brian Moeran
September 2008

#13   **The Art of Selling Art**
By: Nina Poulsen
March 2008

#14   **Much Ado about Nothing? Untangling the Impact of European Premier Film Festivals**
By: Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen
September 2008

#15   **Redefining luxury: A review essay**
By: Fabian Faurholt Csaba
November 2008

#16   **Who's Last? Challenges and Advantages for Late Adopters in the International Film Festival Field**
By: Carmelo Mazza and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen
November 2008

#17   **Labor market and education for artists and the creative industries - some descriptive results from Denmark**
By: Trine Bille
November 2008

#18   **Ethics and the fashion industry in West Europe**
By Lise Skov
November 2008

#19   Research Approaches to the Study of Dress and Fashion
By: Lise Skov and Marie Riegels Melchior
November 2008

#20   Music and Dress in West Europe
By: Else Skjold 2008
November 2008

#21   Dress and Fashion in Denmark
Marie Riegels Melchior
November 2008

#22   The apparel industry in West Europe
By: Jan Hilger
November 2008

#23   Fragrance and Perfume in West Europe
By: Brian Moeran
November 2008

#24   Industrialismens Pels
By: Lise Skov
April 2009

#25   Go West: The Growth of Bollywood
By: Mark Lorenzen
April 2009

#26   Advertising and the Technology of Enchantment
By Brian Moeran
June 2009

**#27   What kind of 'market' is the film labor markets a prospective
literature review**
By: Chris Mathieu
January 2009

#28   City branding and film festivals: the case of Copenhagen
By: Can-Seng Ooi and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen
October 2009

***#29*   Antecedents and consequences of creativity and beauty judgements in
consumer products**
By: Bo Christensen, Tore Kristensen and Rolf Reber
October 2009