

This file was downloaded from BI Open Archive, the institutional repository at BI Norwegian Business School <http://brage.bibsys.no/bi>.

It contains the accepted and peer reviewed manuscript to the article cited below. It may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version.

Stjerne, I. S., & Svejenova, S. (2016). Connecting Temporary and Permanent Organizing: Tensions and Boundary Work in Sequential Film Projects. *Organization Studies*, 37(12), 1771-1792. doi:10.1177/0170840616655492

Copyright policy of *SAGE*, the publisher of this journal:

Authors "may post the accepted version of the article on their own personal website, their department's website or the repository of their institution without any restrictions."

<https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/journal-author-archiving-policies-and-re-use>

**Connecting temporary and permanent organizing:
Tensions and boundary work in sequential film projects**

Iben Sandal Stjerne¹
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Silviya Svejenova
Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
& BI Norwegian Business School, Norway

¹ Corresponding author:

Iben Sandal Stjerne, Department of Organization, Copenhagen Business School.
Kilevej 14A, 2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark
Email: isst.ioa@cbs.dk; sandstjerne@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper investigates the relationship between a permanent organization and a series of temporary organizations. It draws on an in-depth study of the process through which a Danish film production company, seeking to balance innovation and persistence in a troubled industry, struggles to realize a novel children's film and its sequels. The study reveals tensions at different levels as well as boundary work and boundary roles that address them, bringing in shadows of past and future projects. The study extends the understanding of the dialectic between temporary and permanent organizing by emphasizing how ongoing work at different boundaries affects the permanent and temporary organizing's connectedness and outcomes. It also challenges the overly bracketed view of temporary organizations, suggesting a temporality perspective on temporariness.

Key words: temporary organizing, permanent organizing, projects, field, innovation, persistence, boundaries, boundary work, temporality

**Connecting temporary and permanent organizing:
Tensions and boundary work in sequential film projects**

[W]e are the projects. We are nothing, we don't exist if the projects are not there, we are a production company, you see. So when the wheels don't spin, then there is no company! ... I don't see them [the projects] as separate; they are an integrated part of this [Nimbus]. *Birgitte Hald, co-founder and CEO of Nimbus Film and executive producer of Antboy (Interview, 2015)*

Introduction

How are temporary organizations integrated into, or separated from, the permanent organizations in which they are embedded? What tensions does that connectedness entail and what outcomes does it lead to? What boundary work and boundary roles are involved in the process? A growing number of scholars of temporary organizing have acknowledged that “[n]o project is an island”

(Engwall, 2003), emphasizing the complexity of the contextual embeddedness of temporary forms in their permanent environments (Windeler & Sydow 2001; Sydow & Staber, 2002; Grabher, 2002a,b, 2004; Sydow, Lindkvist & DeFillippi, 2004; Manning, 2008). This “multicontextuality” of temporary systems (Lampel, 2011) has been examined in relation to project-based firms or organizations that host or initiate them (Whitley, 2006; Hobday, 2000), project networks of which they are a part (Manning & Sydow, 2011), localities and institutional fields in which they operate (Grabher, 2002a; Maoret, Massa & Jones, 2011), and professional communities whose shared role systems help coordinate their work (Bechky, 2006). It also involves latent organizations, quasi-firms and other more lasting routines and inter-personal collaborations (Eccles, 1981; Jones, 1996; Wittel, 2001; Blair, 2003; Starkey, Barnatt & Tempest, 2000; Manning & Sydow, 2011; Sydow, 2009; DeFillippi, 2015), as well as prior, present, and future projects and project ecologies that carry “shadows” of past exchanges and future possibilities (Engwall, 2003; Grabher, 2002b, 2004).

In conceiving temporary organizing in the context of permanent organizations, questions arise surrounding the nature of their connection and the tensions inherent in it. In some cases, project-based enterprises are “hollow” (Whitley, 2006), i.e. they are primarily legal vehicles or means for administrative convenience in realizing projects (DeFillippi & Arthur, 1998). In other cases, however, they support their projects with abilities and networks for accessing resources, as well as with knowledge and experience of defining work processes (Modig, 2007), depending on projects’ conformity with the parent organization’s strategic intent (Engwall, 2003). Projects, in turn, allow their “parent” organizations to experiment, learn, undertake change initiatives, engage in renewal, or enable cross-functional integration (Ford & Randolph, 1992; Engwall, 2003; Johansson, Lofström & Ohlsson, 2007; Sydow et al., 2004). For example, scholars have shown how creative projects, those offering a projective alternative to iterative organizational routines (Obstfeld, 2012), are a means for permanent organizations to undertake novel courses of action without fixed resource commitments (DeFillippi, 2002). Overall, project organizations’ impermanence and open-endedness have been considered

attractive for “circumvent[ing] traditional barriers to organizational change and innovation” (Sydow et al., 2004: 1475) and helping transform organizations and institutions (Cattani, Ferriani, Frederiksen & Täube, 2011).

The temporary-permanent connection, while potentially mutualistic, is marked by some important demarcations, such as time, task, team, and transition (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995). Project entrepreneurs and managers “more or less reflexively tend to couple or decouple the project with or from its context” (Sydow et al., 2004, p. 1477). This leads to variations in projects’ detachment from the permanent organization (Johansson et al., 2007) and to potentially difficult-to-manage attachment-detachment dilemmas (Sahlin-Andersson & Söderholm, 2002). While a lot has been done to connect temporary and permanent forms of organizing, further work on the dialectic between them is needed, accounting for temporality, i.e. “the ongoing relationships between past, present, and future” (Schultz & Hernes, 2013, p. 1) in sequential temporary systems (Bakker, 2010). Traditionally, temporary organizations have been depicted as “sheltered from the past, present,

and future” (Bakker & Janowicz-Panjaitan, 2009, p. 126). Bringing in temporality and an agentic view of time (Reinecke & Ansari, 2015) could expand the understanding of temporariness, revealing what makes projects amenable to different types of boundaries and boundary work.

Notions, such as boundaries and boundary work, are particularly useful for investigating the temporary-permanent dialectic, as they allow us to capture relationality between the temporary and the permanent as a fundamentally social process (Lamont & Molnár, 2002). However, while various studies have hinted on aspects of project boundaries and boundary work (Long Lingo & O’Mahony, 2010), a critical synthesis of the connection between temporary and permanent organizing is yet to emerge. There is a need for a “systematic cataloguing of the key mechanisms associated with the activation, maintenance, transposition or the dispute, bridging, crossing and dissolution of boundaries” (Lamont & Molnár, 2002, p. 187) at those junctions where temporary and permanent organizing meet.

This also calls for multi-dimensional and multi-level theorizing (Sydow et al., 2004).

This paper addresses the void by examining connections between temporary organizing (a sequence of related projects) and permanent context (project-based firm and field). It draws on an in-depth, multi-method study of the process through which a Danish film production company struggles to realize a novel children's film and its two sequels. Developing the project into a series increases the temporary and the permanent organization's time horizons, yet poses challenges for innovation. Tensions appear at a project's boundaries with other projects, the film company, and the field. Boundary work and roles bring in shadows of past and future projects to address the tensions, balancing persistence and innovation.

The study makes two main contributions to existing literature. First, by unravelling tensions and how they are resolved through boundary work, it extends the

understanding of the dialectic between temporary and permanent organizing. In doing so, it responds to calls for multi-dimensional and multi-level research (Sydow et al., 2004) and for more work on the dialectic between temporary and permanent organizing (Bakker, 2010). Second, by showing how shadows of past and future projects come into play in present projects, creating and spanning boundaries, it broadens the notion of temporariness with that of temporality, challenging the overly “bracketed”, “closed time” depiction of temporary organizations as “protective bubbles” (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995; Bakker & Janowicz-Panjaitan, 2009). A temporal perspective allows the viewing of the temporary-permanent connection as an ongoing accomplishment, shaped by reinterpretations of the past and updated future ambitions (Schultz & Hernes, 2013).

The paper proceeds as follows. First, we provide a theoretical background for our study, focusing on boundaries and boundary work in temporary organizing.

Second, we outline the study’s methodology, overviewing the Danish film

industry as empirical context, the film production company Nimbus as an empirical setting, and Antboy as an innovative series of projects. Next, we detail the main balancing act for Nimbus in terms of persistence and innovation and discuss the tensions experienced in the film projects' realization and how these are resolved through their connections with the project-based firm and field funding institution, including temporality. The paper concludes with contributions and opportunities for further research.

Boundaries and Boundary Work in Temporary Organizing

Boundaries are borders or demarcation lines that distinguish actors into insiders and outsiders (Giyerin, 1999). They emerge, are constituted, modified, and reproduced as “subtle and complex products of action” (White, 1992, p. 127) and may lead to discontinuity in, or exclusion from, decisions, actions, and interactions (Long Lingo & O'Mahony, 2010; Akkerman & Bakker, 2011). Boundaries, as an intrinsic element of organizing, are unstable, ambiguous, multi-faceted, and

composite, and subject to ongoing definition and modification at an organization's margins (Hernes, 2004). Scholars have differentiated between different boundaries, e.g. social and symbolic boundaries (Lamont & Molnár, 2002), or mental, social, and physical boundaries (Hernes, 2004). Boundaries delimit temporary organizing to make it more manageable and exploit its benefits through boundary work (Sahlin-Anderssen, 2002).

The setting of a project's boundaries can take place at its "bracketing", when its starting-point is defined, with the purpose "to decouple the temporary organization from its general surroundings", providing it with special "place in history and its own identity" (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995, p. 446). Detachment can also happen in the production or execution stage, as for example with film sets as total institutions, cut off from their external context for their duration (Bechky, 2006). The final stage in a project trajectory, its formal termination, or other form of conclusion, may involve re-attachment to a more permanent system (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995), removing a previous boundary. Boundaries in creativity-driven,

project-based fields, such as film, are also visible in practices, norms, routines, or status differences among professionals based on their experience, competence, recognition, and productivity (Faulkner & Andersen, 1987). A frequent demarcation in creative fields is the art-commerce one (Hirsch, 1972; Becker, 1982; Caves, 2000), which poses challenges for connecting creative and commercial communities, practices, and mind-sets (Lampel, Lant & Shamsie, 2000).

Boundaries come to life through boundary work, which consists of negotiating, establishing, managing, challenging, or removing demarcations. Just as there are different kinds of boundaries, there are diverse types of boundary-work. For example, Gieryn (1999) has noted expulsion, expansion, and protection of autonomy as forms of boundary work among scientists engaged in credibility contests. Others have investigated boundary crossing which involves “enter[ing] onto territory in which we are unfamiliar and to some significant extent therefore unqualified” (Suchman, 1994, p. 25). The categories’ literature has been extensively preoccupied with boundary work in the creation of (novel) output, e.g. borrowing

across categories (Rao, Monin & Durand, 2005), or category expansion in which rivaling versions of a “de novo” category are embraced (Jones, Maoret, Massa & Svejenova, 2012).

Boundary work requires cooperation and coordination (Kellogg, Orlikowski & Yates, 2006), particularly when those involved are separated by professional, disciplinary and/or other divides (Bechky, 2003) and lack consensus (Star, 2010).

These actions may entail actors playing specific boundary roles, which facilitate or block interaction across boundaries, such as boundary spanners, translators, brokers, mediators, or gatekeepers (Tushman, 1977; Aldrich & Herker, 1977; Kellogg et al., 2006; Long Lingo & O’Mahony, 2010; Foster, Borgatti & Jones, 2011).

For example, Powell and Sandholtz (2012) show how ‘amphibious’ scientists imported ideas from the academic world into their venture capital-funded start-ups, creating from this combination a new form, that of the dedicated biotech firm. Long Lingo and O’Mahony (2010) detail how producers engaged in crafting project and role boundaries to make creative collaboration manageable.

Despite the importance of boundary work and boundary roles for temporary organizing, the literature on the former has developed rather independently from that of the latter. There are, however, some notable exceptions. For example, Long Lingo and O'Mahony's (2010) notion of "nexus work" in creative projects, which implies producers' brokerage for collaboration, involves definition of project boundaries. Further, extending Gieryn's (1983; 1999) boundary-work notion to projects, Sahlin-Andersson (2002) introduced the term "project boundary work" and distinguishes task, temporal, and institutional types. While the first two build on issues discussed elsewhere (e.g. Lundin & Söderholm, 1995), the third, which is about motivating projects by a zeal to break with, develop or renew certain institutions (Sahlin-Andersson, 2002), has received less attention.

Project boundary work is, by and large, a rhetorical activity. It depends on intertwined interpretations of a wider group of project facilitators and entrepreneurs, who engage discursively with different audiences to shape the

project (Svejenova, Strandgaard Pedersen & Vives, 2011). It is also an instrumental activity that reflects multiple actors' goals and interests and, as such, constitutes "strategic practical action" (Gieryn, 1999, p. 23). Overall, it concerns a project's identity and determines its institutional framing: for example, by defining a project as "new and extraordinary", a permanent organization "opens it up for adventure" and signals experimentation with, and detachment from, organizational routines and institutional orders (Sahlin-Andersson, 2002, p. 259).

Research Context, Site, and Methods

This paper examines interactions at the boundaries between a *permanent organization* - Nimbus Film - and a *sequence of temporary organizations* initiated and managed by it for the realization of a superhero children's film and its two sequels, titled Antboy and embedded in a *field context* of a financially pressured and unstable Danish film industry. In response to these pressures, since 2008 Nimbus Film, known for the artistic quality and "edgy" style of its feature films, has

undertaken projects with a longer time horizon, such as an original film followed by sequels, e.g. *Antboy*, or TV series with famed Scandinavian crime themes, such as *The Bridge*, currently in its third season. Geared towards a wider audience and often, as a consequence, associated with commercial, rather than artistic, values and interests, these longer-term projects nonetheless “attempt to break new ground” (Nimbus Film website). For example, *Antboy* is an innovative project from two reference points (Castañer & Campos, 2002): Nimbus’ own past (self-referentially), as it is its first sequel and superhero film, and the Danish film industry (the local field), as it is the first children’s film that borrows across the superhero and realism genre boundaries, providing an artistic quality alternative to the family-comedy style, commercial children films. Being a sequel, *Antboy* challenges Nimbus’ art-house project methods and abilities, as well as its experimental variation and procedural continuity routines (DeFillippi, 2015), which are geared towards making distinctive feature films. Below, we briefly outline research context, site, and methods for data collection and analysis.

Research Context

Denmark's film industry makes innovative artistic films of international renown, alongside commercial films for the local market. The 1990s witnessed the most significant experimentation, marked by the birth of Dogme 95, the avant-garde film movement, which introduced an alternative set of film making principles and conventions that sought to preserve purity and freedom from special effects and other technical modifications. The first Dogme-certified film was Thomas Vinterberg's *Festen*, *The Celebration*, produced by Nimbus Film. The latter and Zentropa were the movement's most influential film production companies (Stevenson, 2003).

Danish film making is supported by state subsidies through the DFI's (Danish Film Institute) dual system of art and market funds. The former is earmarked for artistic films with cultural novelty and value, which enrich the filmic language, while the latter supports films with expected box office success. Funding for artistic films is provided through consultants who are industry insiders, often former film

directors and editors. A board with industry representatives grants funding to films with the highest commercial potential. Like other European film industries, in 1989 a new film law was implemented to support films with commercial appeal, which led to the making of popular films and sequels that built on prior methods, films, and ideas. It also deepened the Danish film industry's divide into art-house and commercial domains with distinctive taste, values, work practices, and professional communities.

With the appearance and growing popularity of new online distribution channels and streaming services, and the industry's inability to come up with successful new business models, in the 2000s the film market shrank significantly and film investments became a riskier business than it had previously been. The first serious crisis in the Danish film industry was felt in 2007, when films supported by the DFI art fund experienced significant losses; this was less of a case for those films backed by the market fund (Deloitte, 2013). As a result, even the biggest Danish art-house production companies could not continue working in their customary

ways. Zentropa was sold to a bigger player, Nordic Film, while Nimbus laid off a third of its employees and received sizable bank loans with its owners' private property as collateral (Rottbøll, 2008). Overall, art-house film production companies began looking for new platforms and projects of a longer duration to ensure a more stable income. They turned their creativity towards TV series and sequels that had so far been characteristic of the industry's commercial domain. As a result, highly popular political drama and crime TV series were created, such as *The Killing*, *The Castle*, or *The Bridge*, collectively known as "Nordic Noir".

Research Site

Nimbus Film is the third biggest, and one of the most prolific, production companies in the Danish film industry, with over 40 projects - feature films, short films, and documentaries - realized since its inception in 1993. Having won awards and received nominations at important international film festivals, it is also highly regarded among Danish media and film professionals who are eager to get involved in its projects. Established by Birgitte Hald and Bo Ehrhardt, Nimbus

started with a vision of making films of high artistic quality. Its productions differed greatly from the dominant genre within the Danish film industry of family comedies, as well as from sequels, TV series, war films and other commercial genres. In the first decade of the company's existence, the founders' vision and their belonging to the Dogme95 film movement led to a domination of the artistic focus and established Nimbus Films as an art-house. Over time, and particularly since 2008, the company has become more open to films with a wider audience appeal.

We examine interactions between Nimbus, a permanent organization, and its longer-term, novel project sequence *Antboy* as a critical case of a temporary-permanent relationship. *Antboy* was inspired by a 2007 book trilogy, the rights of which were acquired by Nimbus Film, enabling the possibility for sequels to be made. The story is about 12-year-old Pelle who is bitten by a genetically modified ant and as a consequence develops super powers and a secret superhero identity, albeit experiencing failure as he explores their limits. The original project's

distinctiveness and complexity resides not only in combining a Hollywood-style superhero genre with characteristic Danish humour and social realism for a children's audience, but also in its being followed by sequels, which challenges the temporary-permanent relationship in film, providing more stability and a longer time horizon to the project.

Methods for Data Collection and Analysis

We followed longitudinally the process of interaction between the permanent organization and the sequence of connected projects. Process research is particularly appropriate for addressing temporally evolving phenomena, as it unravels not only dynamic patterns in activities, but also the underlying mechanisms that help explain them (Langley, 2009). We distinguished three critical periods with distinctive connection between the permanent organization (Nimbus) and the respective temporary forms: initiation and abandonment (Antboy 0), revival and realization (Antboy I), and exploitation and renewal (Antboy II and III). For analytical purposes we considered the two sequel films together, as they

had some similarities in terms of project routinization. Data on the first and larger part of the second period is retrospective, based on documentation and interviews with key participants. In the third period, the first sequel was followed ethnographically by the first author at the premises of Nimbus Film from August to November 2013, as it was in development, and in January and February 2014, as it was being prepared for production. At the start of the ethnographic study, the original film had not yet premiered in Denmark.

During the ethnographic work, the first author interviewed and interacted informally with key members of the permanent and temporary organizations, as they engaged in developing ideas for the sequel, assembling the team, applying for funding, and preparing for production. The authors conducted follow up interviews in September 2015 to gain an insight into the sequels' development, Nimbus' strategic direction, and the connection to its other projects. A total of 30 interviews were conducted with 22 informants, who were relatively evenly distributed among the permanent organization, the projects, and the Danish film

industry (see Appendix 1 for a list). The interviews amounted to 39.3 hours with an average duration of 1 hour and 20 minutes. They were transcribed and subjected to initial analysis in their original language (Danish or English).

Observations took place at different locations on the company premises, which provided exposure to, and enabled the collection of, impressions from different project domains, from the “upper office” where the creative triangle (Director-Writer-Producer) was working on the project concept, to the “basement” where production designer and other production staff were “grounding” and materializing the project’s ‘filmic universe’ (a term used by our informants to denote the ensemble of beings, things, events, and phenomena that inhabit a spatio-temporal frame in a film – see Souriau, in Branigan & Buckland, 2013, p. 133). Further, the first author kept a diary, which complemented the interviews with observations and impressions, facilitating data interpretations. As the research evolved, it became clear that the projects’ sequence provided a different connection to the permanent organization than the single projects, which

contributed to Nimbus' persistence, yet challenged its ability for artistic innovation, representing a persistence-innovation balancing act.

In analysing the data, we used a grounded-theory approach (Charmaz, 2006), travelling back and forth between data and theory until main themes emerged. Coding began during the data collection phase, allowing the exploration of insights and subsequently relating them to different theoretical categories (Charmaz, 2006), as well as prompting interviewees on emerging issues. In the process, the two authors read through the gathered material, discussing extensively on numerous occasions potential concepts for theorizing and their relationships, as well as further data needed to unravel emerging patterns. Data was associated with the following main themes: (1) selection of talent and career practices, (2) envisioning and materializing an idea, (3) defining and managing boundaries between the temporary and the permanent, and (4) defining and managing boundaries among a sequence of temporary organizations. For the purposes of this study we focused on and delved deeper in the latter two themes.

In unravelling themes, our interest was in connections, challenges, tensions, and boundary work between permanent and temporary organizing, as well as in temporality expressed in shadows of past and future projects. This analytical approach was followed through a focused coding process (Charmaz, 2006), informed by theories from the embeddedness perspective of temporary organization and boundary roles and work. Coding was done according to an incident-by-incident method for the observations (Charmaz, 2006). For the interview transcriptions, codes were given to units of meaning, which ranged from a sentence to a paragraph. If in Danish, relevant excerpts of the interviews were translated into English after main themes had emerged. Visual data and materials were used selectively, as complementary clues on the spaces in which boundary work and permanent-temporary interaction unfolded. Finally, we made conceptual leaps based on abduction (Klag & Langley, 2013).

Findings

Our study revealed a complex and dynamic relationship between the permanent organization and the sequence of temporary organizations, characterized by challenges, tensions, and boundary work. We relate their relationship in two parts. Part I discusses temporary organizing as a permanent organization's balancing act between persistence and innovation. Part II delves into key stages in the process through which persistence and innovation are balanced in the projects' sequence.

Part I. Temporary Organizing as a Permanent Organization's Persistence-Innovation Balancing Act

Nimbus' main balancing act, as an independent company in a film field in crisis, was about enhancing its persistence by ensuring sufficient audience appeal on selected films, while preserving its art-house's innovative profile, i.e. making "artistic movies with an edge, leaving room for the broader audience appeal" (company homepage), "something that is fun ... while bringing in money". Such movies, the CEO explained (2014), ensure visibility at major festivals and access to financing and network, which "makes us interesting/attractive to directors, actors,

and manuscript writers". Nimbus' co-founder and company executive (2015²)

clarified further:

there is no room anymore for artistic films...the market is under so much pressure... if we make a feature film, ... we have to be very, very focused on making the films that we can see have an audience. We can make a limited audience movie if it can be realized with a limited financial investment aligned with the learning potential.

Thus, producers employed at Nimbus are given leeway to carry out projects if they can convince the team of their artistic merits and market viability. This presupposes stronger project integration in the company, compared to earlier years when film directors had ownership of both idea and project. Despite this strengthened attachment between projects and company, a gap remains that producers, through boundary work and roles, aim to close via their dual attachment to project and company: "[T]here is often a huge boundary between the

² Quotes come from interviews unless otherwise indicated.

production and the house [Nimbus]. ... We are the link, the producer and the producer assistant.... it's special being split between two domains" (Producer Assistant, 2015). Discussions related to Nimbus' project portfolio take place at the "Thursday meeting", a strategic gathering that happens in the company's lunch room, whereby CEO, executives, permanent producers, and head of administration, discuss topics such as the potential of new ideas to become projects, who to hire on projects, as well as how to solve problems with projects in progress. CEO and executive producer, as company partners have the final say on the initiation and continuation of projects. An idea formally becomes a project once it has been assigned with a project number.

Nimbus experienced a strong need for a persistence-innovation balancing act in 2007, when the industry faced a crisis and the films it had made did not attract the expected audience. As a result, the initiation of new projects and company survival were at stake. Despite the 2008 box office success with the film *Flame and Citron*, Nimbus was barely enduring and thus changed strategic direction, moving

towards a 50:50 investment in feature films and TV series. As explained by Nimbus' CEO (2015), opening up to longer-term projects had several benefits:

That we now want to make sequels and ... more business of it, that is because it has become very difficult living on those art house movies...it's the same film people we use The big difference for us is the length of the projects and the economy in it. ...it gets much easier for us to predict things and adapt the organization. We can also invest in equipment that we can use ourselves and it gives a possibility for long range planning.

Within this longer-term company orientation, developing Antboy into a film and two sequels “was the plan from the beginning. We wanted to have a format that we could build on, not having to start over each time” (Company Executive, Nimbus, 2015). However, while increasing predictability, Antboy also brought Nimbus into the unknown territory of superhero-realism children films and sequels. Because of the boundary crossing and borrowing across genres, tensions appeared and required ongoing boundary work and roles.

Part II. Boundary Work and Roles in Connecting Temporary and Permanent

Organizing

We identified three stages in the process of connecting temporary and permanent organizing: (1) initiation and abandonment, (2) revival and realization, and (3) exploitation and renewal, each discussed along main challenges, tensions, boundary work and roles, shadows of past and future projects, and outcomes (see Table 1 for an overview).

Insert Table 1 about here

Stage 1 Initiation and abandonment. Traditionally, Danish children's films are commercial, without an ambition for artistic quality. Nimbus' CEO expressed her dissatisfaction with that in a manifesto and discussed it at the Thursday meetings and in informal conversations. The manifesto carried a vision to improve these

films, making them more complex and attuned to a contemporary children's audience. It connected well with the superhero-realism theme of the Antboy book trilogy, the rights of which Nimbus had acquired. The main challenge at this stage was the lack of alignment between permanent and temporary organizations on how the project should develop. The manifesto and trilogy created expectations in the permanent organization for the superhero-realism genre bridging in the project. However, the screenplay developed by the project team closely followed the bullying theme from the original book, toning down the superhero story.

Tensions. The biggest problem was finding an experienced project team for the creation of a new kind of children's film and novel filmic universe. Experience with the genre was important: "you can play with people's expectations and to do so it is necessary to be specialized in the field (genre) you work with" (Producer, 2013). However, it is difficult to fund and produce Hollywood-style films in Denmark (even if mixed with social realism), as the production of films in this style was uncommon to the DFI and local film professionals. Most of the talent had

worked either within family comedy or social realism. Only a few team members had made genre films and those who had, found children's films less attractive.

Boundary work and roles. Nimbus sought to enrol participation in the project and waited for extended periods of time, to no avail, for possible team members to show interest or become available. As the permanent organization had a rather vague idea of what the project could become, it was difficult to define and convey project boundaries to sceptical or busy professionals. At last Nimbus settled for an inexperienced team that was willing to work on the project. Nimbus's CEO, the project initiator and champion, detached herself from the temporary organization, not taking on a formal role in it and giving the hired team leeway to define the story line within the loose boundaries of her manifesto and the book:

I will never say "you can't do that", otherwise it's not fun to be here. Most of the time it shows afterwards if it was a good or a bad idea. Then I can disagree but often it's about working with the idea and then seeing if it becomes sustainable. It's a long process where you test the ideas ... I try to stay open towards it, well okay I

question it until they become insecure and if then they still insist, then we run with it, unless it's really obviously underdeveloped.

This gave the temporary team ownership and freedom to develop the project in a desired direction. However, the absence of boundary work and boundary spanning roles to connect temporary and permanent organizations, as well as the shadows from previous and future projects drawn on by the team, led to the development of a screenplay that did not meet expectations.

Outcomes. The idea was developed into a project, a team was recruited, and a story line developed. However, the new frontier in children's films envisioned in the manifesto was not reached. Nimbus' CEO was dissatisfied with the direction taken by the project and disengaged from it. Public funding from the DFI art fund fell through due to the project's lack of innovation and artistic merits. At that point, Nimbus CEO redrew the boundaries between temporary and permanent

organization, reattaching the project idea back to Nimbus and dismissing the team. The project continued a latent existence in the permanent organization.

Stage 2 Revival and realization. Interest in the project was revived, driven also by book rights' time pressure: "It's important for both the publisher and the author that the book is not locked in a company unrealized", Nimbus' executive (2015) explained, as "that's a way for us to ensure that, if we want a book, we can get it ... for a reasonable price". A new project team was sought for its realization. The director and junior producer were enrolled proactively from another Nimbus project (a low budget horror short film on which both had worked), with the approval of Nimbus' CEO. The director *in spe* had discovered the opportunity to work on the project from the one-page "pitches" of active projects at Nimbus, some of which were still "orphans", i.e. they did not have a director. The junior producer's recollected (2013):

I can still remember the day when he (the director) was sitting in the canteen and looking at this piece of paper and he was sitting like this (wide open eyes and an

overly excited facial expression) and then he ... said, "It says that it needs a director. Is nobody making this one?" Then I told him "well, that one, I think you should of course be doing it". "YES! Shouldn't I!", and then we asked for permission, because he had never made a feature film before.

Once the director and junior producer had been engaged, a writer and a cinematographer interested in genre films that had worked previously with the director joined the core team. The project gained in commitment, passion for the superhero genre, shared references, and trust. However, the main challenge was experience, as writer, director, and producer had not made feature films before. In addition, both they and Nimbus, as a company, had never made a superhero genre film with special effects and stunts; this ultimately led to tensions within the project.

Tensions. Tensions resided at different levels of organizing and at different boundaries. The *first tension (within the temporary organization)* involved authority.

The core team's filmic vision was inspired by the American superhero genre and style, while cast and crew were mainly embedded in Danish social realism's practices. The latter reverted back to old habits, insisting that something could not be done; this questioned the director's authority and vision and led to disagreements on set. Overall, the team did not collaborate with and support the director as defined by the field's role boundaries. His lack of feature film experience made it difficult to resolve these conflicts effectively.

The *second tension (between temporary and permanent organizations)* revolved around the ability to make an innovative, superhero style film on a limited budget. As both temporary and permanent organizations had no superhero genre experience, it was difficult to translate the screenplay into filmic scenes and use it to guide action, as well as to work with expensive special effects and stunts. Scenes had to be shot ad-hoc, without pre-planning, coming up with solutions to problems, or replacing and inventing scenes on the spot, with the result that filming was more expensive than initially envisioned. The budget did not allow much

experimentation with special effects. As the director (2013) put it, “you can have 3 shootings of that... [yet] the scene only works with four ...if you remove one, it doesn’t work, but we cannot afford four”.

The *third tension (between project team and DFI as the field’s funding institution)* involved funding expectations. DFI subsidized “first and foremost film projects with film directors who have previously made a feature film” (DFI website, 2014). The DFI consultant saw potential in the book trilogy and an opportunity for innovation in children’s films, yet was uncertain as to how (well) an inexperienced team of unknown quality could take the project in the desired direction.

Boundary actions and roles. At this stage, the project’s budget, time, and task boundaries had been defined. Simultaneously, the permanent organization subsumed and coupled tightly the project within its boundaries, aligning visions, ensuring budget, and offering other project support to address tensions. The permanent organization did not intervene directly to resolve the *authority tension*,

yet it did show support for the director. Regarding the *budget tension*, Nimbus exercised control over the project, its CEO approving major decisions made by the project team, yet also accepting some additional production costs incurred in the creation of a credible and innovative filmic universe. The *funding expectations' tension* was managed by mediation from the permanent organization's CEO who took on a formal role on the project to enhance its credibility, bringing in the "shadows" of past projects realized by Nimbus and by her as an executive producer. DFI became a common external "enemy" for temporary and permanent organizations alike, thus strengthening their attachment to one another in a "common front".

Two *boundary roles* helped address tensions: the boundary spanner and the boundary challenger. The director acted as an essential boundary spanner for the project, borrowing across superhero and social realism genre boundaries, and connecting artistic and commercial demands. He was artistic enough, holding a Master's degree in fine arts, while interested in and specialized in genre films. As a

team member put it: “He grew up in a time with all the big references and you can feel that he really wants the American bigness, big brass bands and all his references are big movies and in a super great nerdy manner”. However, the lack of experience, status, and shared language with the rest of the crew made it difficult for the director to perform his role. As he explained (2013): “... that’s my mistake, I should have followed my intuition much more and said, ...we shoot it from over here, then we just have to make it work. It depends on experience and how courageous you are when you stand there and everyone is watching you”.

To legitimate the project and to connect it to the permanent organization, Nimbus’ CEO became its executive producer, acknowledging (2015), “I was on Antboy because it’s my darling. Bo normally does that, he is executive [producer] on all films but he was making The Bridge [TV series] at that time”. In this role, she participated in the meetings between the core project team and DFI consultants, acting as a boundary challenger. In her words:

I knew that I had to be on the meeting at the film institute (DFI), otherwise they would have just crushed the three people [director, writer, producer] who had no experience and none of them has made a feature film before, it would have never made it through... and it was as expected a long fight... and finally we got the money.

The “fighting” for the project was grounded in the shadows of past achievements, e.g. reputation and track record of Nimbus and its CEO, and expectations for the future, e.g. that the film will have sequels. As the CEO was also a project entrepreneur, she stated that “we are making this film no matter what... we will go to some other funding system if (the DFI consultant) is not in on it” (2014). When they were initially rejected by DFI, Nimbus started the project with its own resources and applied for funding again at a later date.

Outcomes. Antboy I received DFI funding and was realized. As explained by a DFI consultant (2014), there was a gain for the industry in taking the risk:

[W]hen the movie was recommended [for funding] at the DFI's leadership meeting, I said: Antboy is a movie that we meet while it is still up in the air, let's see what happens. It's a high risk that needs to be taken... saying no for the sake of security is just silly! We have much more to win by giving it a go.

It achieved audience appeal comparable to that of traditional commercial children films; yet it was of a higher artistic value. It drew festival attention and international distribution interest (e.g., it was screened in the US, and dubbed in English), and critics appreciated it for its charm, humanity, sense of adventure, and its “elegant balance between action, comic, and Danish family film tradition”, being “possibly the greatest “little” superhero from Denmark to date”.

Stage 3 Exploitation and Renewal. Antboy II and III were sequels based on the Antboy I film. As such, their main challenge was to be optimally distinctive, exploiting and renewing the filmic universe, improving its quality, and resolving previous tensions.

Tensions. The *first tension* concerned timing. It involved working under time pressure, while ensuring a timely engagement in the process of all relevant parties. Time pressure was high for the sequels, as the children actors were quickly turning into teenagers. Speed was also necessary to ensure that the film's universe and brand remained fresh in the audience's memory. To keep up the pace, Nimbus' CEO initiated the screenplay's writing, meeting the producer and writer without the director, who was finalizing *Antboy I's* production. The screenplay became severely delayed, as mistakes from the original film had to be fixed; this obstacle further impeded the project's progression and planning. Furthermore, this created tensions within institutionalized project role boundaries. In the auteur tradition, the director expected ownership from the project's idea initiation, and not just to execute someone else's vision (screenplay) in order to be credited for making an artistic film.

The *second tension* concerned collaboration in the temporary organization. This centred on project routines through retaining the same project team for the sequels and the need for continuous innovation within Antboy's filmic universe. As a producer put it: "the [filmic] universe has already met the audience ...it got its own life that we ... are in dialogue with when we create the third [movie]". Thus, it was more difficult to experiment within a frame defined not only by time and budget, but also by audience expectation (the shadow cast by Antboy I on its two sequels), in order to achieve sufficient aesthetic coherence, as explained by the director (2013):

...the format it has been shot in, it is American letterbox, which is a 1980s format...we keep that format on the second movie because we think that if you want to watch the first and the second, then it needs to be the same. Then there is no point all of a sudden making something that is in scope and looks like a western, well that just doesn't work.

Furthermore, there were both expectations for rehiring the original project team on the sequels, given their experience with story, vision and filmic universe, as well as

the shared artistic language and reference frame, and the need for team renewal to achieve optimal distinctiveness, i.e. the sequels to be similar enough to the original film, yet sufficiently different from it and from each other.

The *third tension* was a budget one, between the permanent organization's expectations for higher returns (as it had invested its own resources in the films) and the project team's hopes for bigger budgets as a result of Antboy I's box office success and the need to sustain some innovation. As Nimbus' CEO (2014) explained:

That's what I fight a bit about with Eva, Lea [Antboy producers] and Ask [Antboy director], that it [the movie] should become ... a better business. Yes, but now it [Antboy I] is successful, the investment in it [sequel] should be bigger (voicing Ask, Lea and Eva's argument). ... It shouldn't! ... it becomes pointless ... if it always just breaks even.

The *final tension* was about public funding. Antboy I's box office performance meant that Antboy II would in theory qualify for support from the DFI market

fund. However, its own performance did not fulfil those requirements, and DFI refused to support the second sequel, which led to the need for the permanent organization to step into the breach.

Boundary actions and roles. Boundary work helped to address the tensions. The producers in collaboration with the director made decisions as to who should – or should not – be rehired on the sequels, based on informal discussions with and on expressions of opinion by key Antboy I professionals. Decisions had to be well justified, especially as links between professionals and project team, consisting of close collaborators and even relatives, would have to be broken. For example, team members who had challenged the director were not rehired, thus giving him the opportunity to make a fresh start, as he was already more experienced and had the potential to make an exceptional film. Further, co-producing with a German company on the sequels redrew the boundaries for what roles could be rehired, as a percentage of the film budget had to be spent on location in the co-producer's home country. This allowed the hiring of more experienced companies in the

domains of visual effects and other technical areas, thereby enhancing the superhero universe's quality and credibility.

To sustain novelty and artistic quality, despite the commercial character of the sequel, attention on *Antboy II* was devoted to what could be changed or introduced to give the project team new expressive opportunities. The story was "moved" to winter and made more international, enhancing the American "larger than life look" that had already been initiated in *Antboy I*. This was achieved by shooting on location in Hamburg, Germany, for a week, where streets and houses were bigger than in Denmark. Based on feedback on previous films, *Antboy III* was set in the summer, "bringing back the light and the humour". Hiring a star cast and investing in more stunts, however, led to the budget being exceeded. As a result, the producer and director cut three days of production to save costs and improve quality. To save time, they adapted their art-house working methods to those in the commercial film domain, which proved to be a challenge. As expressed by the cinematographer: "In TV you say OK, we just take this scene in

one picture... it's not easy to do that being true to our story-telling method... our concept and the way we cover the scenes". He and the director shot fewer scenes and followed fewer and simpler filmic grips: "it was a style we developed. If you do it a few times, at least three, the 'thematic three'", you can ensure an aesthetically coherent expression, appreciated in the art-house domain.

Nimbus' CEO performed nexus work, influencing role boundaries of the project participants and acting as boundary spanner between the temporary and the permanent organizations, thus serving the interests of both. In response to the DFI commercial fund's reluctance to support Antboy III, because of Antboy II's lack of success at the box office, she sent a "*pralebog*" (from Danish, a "bragging book"), which used the shadows of previous successful projects to make the case for the funding of a second sequel. She also got endorsements by influential actors, such as directors of leading Danish cinemas who affirmed that they believed in the new film. An external consultant was invited as a project mediator in the creation of a screenplay as a common ground for all parties involved, seeking to prevent

previous tensions. Cinematographer, director, writer, and location manager proactively blurred their role boundaries to ensure collaboration in the realization of a coherent filmic universe within budget. The cinematographer, being the most experienced core team's member, crossed institutionalized role boundaries, by getting involved in pre-production and unofficially becoming a "co-author", and playing an active role in solving potentially problematic (for production) screenplay elements.

Outcomes. The two sequels were funded by the DFI market fund and related to the original film. As a result, Antboy I, II, and III had clear boundaries set between them to ensure their optimal distinctiveness, yet also sufficient connections that carried forward the filmic universe and some unresolved tensions. As Antboy III progressed through post-production, another Nimbus team was working on translating the Antboy story and brand into an animated series, which was inspired by and connected to Antboy's filmic universe. In this way, its longer-term

conception would open up yet another path to support Nimbus' persistence and innovation.

Discussion

This study provided a longitudinal account of the connection between permanent and temporary organizing, the latter involving a series of related projects in a field with a distinctive art-commerce boundary and strong genre conventions. Our vantage point was the permanent organization and how, in a volatile industry, it created attachments to, and detachments from, its projects. We showed how the permanent organization was strategically driven by a persistence-innovation balancing act. It brought in shadows of past and future projects as part of its boundary work to resolve tensions. Below we detail the multi-level and, at times, contentious meaning of these temporary-permanent connections as a way for advancing the understanding of projects in context and enriching the embeddedness perspective of temporary organizing with a more dialectic and

long-term view (Sydow et al., 2004; Bakker, 2010), which is also attentive to temporality (Hernes & Schultz, 2013).

Connection between temporary and permanent organizations. Our study showed how the permanent organization changed its attachment to the projects in the series, drawing and redrawing boundaries and, in that way, influencing projects' outcomes. For example, in the first stage, the company was detached from the initiated project, providing its team with leeway to develop it, albeit within unclear boundaries. The project's evolving in a direction that did not fit to the company's vision, led to its abandonment, especially as it also failed to gain support from the field's funding institution due to a lack of novel artistic value. As Engwall (2003) has noted, which project ideas survive depend on how relevant they are to the permanent organization and how they are aligned with the norms and values of the organization.

We extend Engwall's (2003) strategic view of projects in two ways. First, our case study shows that choices related to temporary organizing involve not only a permanent organization's strategic considerations, but also its balancing acts. The need to combine persistence with innovation determined a longer time horizon for some projects and stronger connectedness among them (e.g., sequels). Second, depending on the nature of the balancing act, challenging an organization's routines could be precisely what projects are needed for. For example, the abandoned project Antboy 0 was no less strategic for the company than Antboy I, which was then realized. However, the former did not defy institutional norms and values enough, failing to borrow across genre boundaries and fulfil its envisioned innovation potential. Third, the relationship between company strategy and project support could also work reversely, i.e. the closer the project's attachment to the permanent organization, due to who its champion is or where in the organization it is affiliated, the more likely it is that the project is better aligned with the parent organization's strategic priorities and has more opportunities for survival, given the longer past and future and which shadows the company can

bring in. For example, Antboy 0 had little attachment to Nimbus, its team failing to understand and align sufficiently with the production company's strategic vision. Thus, we extend Engwall's (2003) insights, suggesting that to understand a project's likely survival, it is important not only to acknowledge its strategic importance for the company, but also to account for the boundary work in which the latter engages in realizing the project's strategic potential, creating or removing boundaries through shadows of past and future. Such boundary work allows for better adjustment of expectations between temporary and permanent organizations.

Connections among past, present, and future temporary organizations. Examining a project sequence challenges affirmations about temporary organizations as 'left-bracketed', without a common history (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995) and allows an insight into their connectedness and the nature of their boundaries. Antboy I was a creative project (Obstfeld, 2012), borrowing from a superhero genre, with which temporary and permanent organization had no experience or shadows from the

past to bring in. That challenged film-making routines, creating tensions due to a lack of past practices to inform present decisions. However, the lack of past shadows also allowed for experimentation that made *Antboy I* an innovative film with a distinctive filmic universe. For *Nimbus*, *Antboy I* was an investment in the future and thus exceeding budget was acceptable, due to shadows from future gains, i.e. expected future income from the sequels.

Antboy II was also a rather creative project, as *Nimbus* had not previously made a sequel and had no routines for it. However, *Antboy I*'s filmic universe, the learning experience and the feedback from critics provided shadows of the past that fed practices and expectations into the sequel. *Antboy II* had to surpass *Antboy I* in mastering the hero genre and universe, in order to keep the artistic reputation of the project crew and film production company intact. Furthermore, shadows of past tensions were eliminated through boundary work, e.g. by not rehiring certain professionals. Shadows from *Antboy I* provided a story of success, which both ensured funding from the DFI market fund and posed the need for *Antboy II* to

surpass the preceding film, thus making *Antboy II* more expensive. That, in turn, challenged Nimbus' future expectations for returns from *Antboy I*.

Antboy III, as a second sequel, involved routinization (Sydow, 2009), benefitting from and being constrained by the preceding projects. On *Antboy III*, many past shadows provided cues for present actions and limited experimentation, which made it difficult to create an innovative film. The need to further professionalize the project in the superhero genre posed further challenges to the normal Danish commercial feature film budget. As a result, innovation happened in the practice of cutting the number of production days.

Overall, temporary organizations conceived in a connected sequence are expected to have an optimal distinctiveness (Zuckerman, forthcoming) from one another, that is, a degree of similarity with the original project, warranting a recognizable filmic universe, and a degree of difference from it and from one other, bringing in sufficient novelty and ensuring each project's unique identity and place in history (Lundin & Söderland, 1995). Previous projects from the sequence carried a shadow

of the past (including unresolved tensions) over to subsequent projects, while the possibility for subsequent projects (i.e. knowing that sequels will evolve from an initial project) as well as the existence of a book trilogy, on which the film adaptation was based, carried a shadow of the future back to the original project. Thus, our findings challenge affirmations that “[p]roject members operate in a protective bubble, guarded from the shadow of the future and the burdens of the past” (Miles, in Bakker & Janowicz-Panjaitan, 2009). We also address Engwall’s (2003, p. 789) call for increasing research’s temporal scope, “analysing how project practices evolve through history over prior, present, and future projects”. In that, research on alliance portfolios could bring helpful analogies and potential insights (Wassmer, 2008).

Connection between temporary organizations and a field (mediated by a permanent organization). As previously noted in the literature, projects are embedded not only in permanent organizations, but also in institutional fields, whose norms they may occasionally challenge (Sahlin-Andersson, 2002; Cattani et

al., 2011). Institutions provide resources, material, knowledge and practices but also set regulatory restraints and enforce institutional conventions (Sydow & Staber, 2002). While the relationship between a project and a field was not at the heart of our study, it did unravel some aspects of it that have implications for projects' outcomes, especially as the series of projects we followed were motivated by willingness to defy certain institutions (Sahlin-Andersson, 2002), that of Danish children films. The first connection between project and field, in terms of the latter's public funding institution supporting the former, was regularly mediated by the permanent organization due to resulting tensions. The mediation involved creating a joint front with the temporary organization, signalling expertise (Jones, 2002) through the CEO becoming the project's executive producer, bringing in shadows of previous successful projects (e.g. through the bragging book) and using social skills to mobilize support (Fligstein, 1997, 2001) from leaders of core organizations in the field (e.g. the movie theatre directors).

The second connection concerns the malleability of the institutionalized system of project roles that helps coordination (Bechky, 2006), especially when a project has to be managed by a rather inexperienced core team. This malleability does not only involve interventions by the producer as someone who defines role boundaries. It includes a multi-party effort and willingness to blur, contest, or at times even ignore established role boundaries in the project's interest. Similar to Long Lingo and O'Mahony (2010), we found that when there were attempts to challenge the expertise of the director, the production company "stepped in", e.g. it intervened by changing the composition of the sequels' teams (despite expectations for rehiring). Overall, by looking at the connection between projects and aspects of the field, we address Engwall's (2003) call for research on temporary organizing to increase its organizational scope, analysing how project practices connect with long-term institutions.

The study has limitations that invite further research. First, our vantage point was the permanent organization, which influenced our perspective of connections with

temporary organizations. Further research should examine the relationship from a project team's perspective, as that may provide new and diverging insights on potential tensions and boundary work. Second, we investigated the relationship of a single organization with its projects. A comparison across parent companies would provide an opportunity to discern whether the nature of strategic balancing acts pursued has an influence on the attachment to their projects. Third, we advanced a temporality view of temporary organizing, showing how shadows of past and future projects are reinterpreted for the needs of present projects. In this way, we focused on projects that were conceived as connected. Further research into the temporality view of temporariness should look at other manifestations of such reinterpretations of a project's history and future.

Conclusion

This study makes two main contributions to the literature on temporary organizing. First, by revealing how tensions are resolved through boundary work at different levels, and thereby drawing on and reinterpreting past and future

projects, it extends the understanding of the dialectic between temporary and permanent organizing (Bakker, 2010). In this way, it also responds to Sydow et al.'s (2004) calls for multi-dimensional and multi-level research. Second, by bringing in a temporality perspective (Hernes & Schultz, 2013), which captures the interplay of past and future projects' shadows in realizing present projects, it opens up the notion of temporariness and the "bracketed", "closed time" view of temporary organizations (Lundin & Söderholm, 1995; Bakker & Janowicz-Panjaitan, 2009). In further examining the temporality of temporariness, it would be useful to focus on how different actors from the permanent and temporary organizations strategically re-interpret their past and future when shaping projects in the present.

In addition, the study adds a nuance to Sydow et al.'s (2004, p. 1475) acknowledgment that project organizations allow a circumventing of barriers to innovation, showing that they may also allow a circumventing of barriers to persistence by offering possibilities for routinization (Sydow, 2009), in turn

creating barriers to innovation. The balancing of persistence and innovation requires a strategic view of temporality (Reinecke & Ansari, 2015), pro-actively delimiting those shadows of projects that are obstacles and potentiating those that provide clarity for the project's potential and trajectories into the future. This is particularly so in cases of project sequences, in which each project is burdened by numerous shadows from previous and future related projects, and needs to establish its optimal distinctiveness (Zuckerman, forthcoming), despite of – as well as through – those shadows. Further, our study adds to the discussion on boundaries and boundary work in temporary organizing, which has been dominated by a focus on temporal bracketing, as well as on discussions of project delimitations based on budgets, tasks, and teams (Lundin & Söderland, 1995; Sahlin-Andersson, 2002; Bakker, 2010). Instead, we suggest that a project's delimitation is a dynamic process influenced by ongoing boundary work, as well as by the nature and degree of the temporary organization's attachment, not only to the permanent organization and the field but also temporally, to other past and

future projects realized by the members of the permanent and temporary organizations.

Finally, our study has implications for research on creative industries, which has tended to dichotomize individual projects into artistic and commercial or, at best, to emphasize their paradoxical nature and the need for a balancing act (DeFillippi & Arthur, 1998; Lampel et al., 2000). Examining a series of related projects and their connection with permanent organizing allows the revealing of a complex dynamic that unfolds at the art-commerce boundary, which is triggered by changing interests and evolving balancing acts of multiple actors, as they continuously create and/or resolve tensions through boundary work. It also permits the unravelling of processes of stabilization that involve establishing and renewing routines that enable both experimentation and procedural continuity (DeFillippi, 2015). Last but not least, it lends itself to a temporality perspective (Hernes & Schultz, 2013) that is attentive to how past and future are reinterpreted and used resourcefully through temporal brokerage (Reinecke & Ansari, 2015),

thereby creating, crossing, or managing boundaries for creative projects to get realized.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Special Issue Editors and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions and guidance in improving the paper, as well as sub-theme participants at EGOS 2014 for their comments. We are indebted to our informants at Nimbus and the Antboy series of film projects for their generosity and insights, as well as to experts and producers for expanding our understanding of the Danish film industry. We gratefully acknowledge funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement CRE8TV.EU-320203 that enabled us to undertake this research.

References

Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research, 81*, 132-169.

- Aldrich, H. E., & Herker, D. (1977). Boundary spanning roles and organization structure. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(2), 217-230.
- Bakker, R. M. (2010). Taking stock of temporary organizational forms: A systematic review and research agenda. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12, 466-486.
- Bakker, R. M. & Janowicz-Panjaitan, M. (2009). Time matters: the impact of 'temporariness' on the functioning and performance of organizations. In P. Kenis, M. Janowicz-Panjaitan and B. Cambré (eds.), *Temporary organizations: Prevalence, logic and effectiveness* (pp.107-127). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bechky, B. A. (2003). Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, 14(3), 312-330.
- Bechky, B. A. (2006). Gaffers, gofers, and grips: Role-based coordination in temporary organizations. *Organization Science*, 17, 3-21.
- Becker, H. (1982). *Art worlds*. Berkeley and LA, CA: University of California Press.

Blair, H. (2003). Winning and losing in flexible labour markets: The formation and operation of networks of interdependence in the UK Film Industry.

Sociology, 37, 677-694.

Branigan, E. & Buckland, W. (2013). *The Routledge encyclopedia of film theory*.

Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Castañer X. & Campos L. (2002). The determinants of artistic innovation: Bringing the role of organizations. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 26(1), 29-52.

Cattani, G., Ferriani, S., Frederiksen, L. & Taeube, F. (2011). Project-based organizing and strategic management: A long-term research agenda on temporary organizational forms. In G. Cattani, S. Ferriani, L. Frederiksen, & F. Taeube (eds.), *Project-Based Organizing and Strategic Management (Advances in Strategic Management, 28)*. (pp. xv-xxxix). UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Caves, R. (2000). *Creative industries: Contracts between art and commerce*.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative*

analysis. London, UK: SAGE Publications.

DeFillippi, R. (2015). Managing project-based organization in creative industries. In

C. Jones, M. Lorenzen, & J. Sapsed (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of creative industries* (pp. 268-283). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

DeFillippi, R. (2002). Information technology and organizational models for project collaboration in the new economy. *Human Resource Planning*, 25(4), 7-18.

DeFillippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1998). Paradox in project-based enterprise: the case of film making, *California Management Review*, 40(2), 125-139.

Deloitte (2013). *Sundhedstilstanden i dansk spillefilmsproduktion*. Endelig rapport, November. Deloitte Statsautoriseret Revisionspartnerselskab.

Retrieved from http://www.dfi.dk/branche_og_stoette/rapporter-og-artikler.aspx, accessed on Jan 10, 2014.

Eccles, R. G. (1981). The quasi-firm in the construction industry. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 2(4), 335-357.

Engwall, M. (2003). No project is an island: linking projects to history and context. *Research Policy*, 32, 789-808

- Faulkner, R. R. & Andersen, A. B. (1987). Short-term projects and emergent careers: Evidence from Hollywood. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(4), 879-909.
- Fligstein, N. (1997). Social skill and institutional theory. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 397-405.
- Fligstein, N. (2001). Social skill and the theory of fields. *Sociological Theory*, 19(2), 105–125.
- Ford, R. C. & Randolph, A.W. (1992). Cross-functional structures: a review and integration of matrix organization and project management. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 267-294.
- Foster, P., Borgatti, S. P., & Jones, C. (2011). Gatekeeper search and selection strategies: Relational and network governance in a cultural market. *Poetics*, 39, 247-265.
- Gieryn, T. F. (1983). Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: strains and interests in professional ideologies of scientists. *American Sociological Review*, 48(6), 781–795.
- Gieryn, T. F. (1999). *Cultural boundaries of science: credibility on the line*. Chicago,

Ill: University of Chicago Press.

Grabher, G. (2002a). Cool projects, boring institutions: Temporary collaboration in social context. *Regional Studies*, 36(3), 205–214.

Grabher, G. (2002b). The project ecology of advertising: Tasks, talents and teams. *Regional Studies*, 36(3), 245-262.

Grabher, G. (2004). Temporary architectures of learning: Knowledge governance in project ecologies. *Organization Studies*, 25(9), 1491-1514.

Hernes, T. (2004). Studying composite boundaries: A framework of analysis. *Human Relations*, 57(1), 9-29.

Hirsch, P. M. (1972). Processing fads and fashions: An organization-set analysis of cultural industry systems. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 77(4), 639-659.

Hobday, M. (2000). The project-based organization: An ideal form for managing complex products and systems? *Research Policy*, 29, 871-893.

Johansson, S., Löfström, M., & Ohlsson, Ö. (2007). Separation or integration? A dilemma when organizing development projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25, 457-464.

- Jones, C. (1996). Careers in project networks: the case of the film industry. In M. Arthur & D. Rousseau (eds.), *The boundaryless career: a new employment principle for a new organizational era* (pp.58-75). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, C. (2002). Signaling expertise: How signals shape careers in creative industries. In M. Peiperl, M. Arthur, & N. Anand (eds.), *Career creativity: Explorations in the remaking of work* (pp. 209-228). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, C., Maoret, M., Massa, F., & Svejenova, S. (2012). Rebels with a cause: Formation of the de novo category “Modern architecture”. *Organization Science*, 23(6), 1523–1545.
- Kellogg, K. C., Orlikowski, W. J., & Yates, J. (2006). Life in the trading zone: Structuring coordination across boundaries in postbureaucratic organizations. *Organization Science*, 17(1), 22-44.
- Klag, M. & Langley, A. (2013). Approaching the conceptual leap in qualitative research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15, 149-166.

Lamont, M., & Molnár, V. (2002). The study of boundaries in the social sciences.

Annual Review of Sociology, 28, 167-195.

Lampel, J. (2011). Institutional dynamics of project-based creative organizations:

Irving Thalberg and the Hollywood studio system. In G. Cattani, S. Ferriani,

L. Frederiksen, & F. Taeube (eds.), *Project-based organizing and strategic*

management (Advances in strategic management, 28). (pp. 445- 466), UK:

Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Lampel, J., Lant, T., & Shamsie, J. (2000). Balancing act: Learning from organizing

practices in cultural industries. *Organization Science*, 11(3), 263-269.

Langley, A. (2009). Studying processes in and around organizations. In D.

Buchanan & A. Bryman (eds.), *Sage handbook of organizational research methods*

(pp. 409–429). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Long Lingo, E., & O'Mahony, S. (2010). Nexus work: Brokerage on creative

projects. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 47-81.

Lundin, R. A., & Söderholm A. (1995). A Theory of the temporary organization.

Scandinavian Journal of Management, 11(4), 437-455.

- Manning, S. (2008), Embedding projects in multiple contexts – a structuration perspective. *International Journal of Project Management*, 26, 30-37.
- Manning, S., & Sydow, J. (2011). Projects, paths, and practices: Sustaining and leveraging project-based relationships. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 20(5), 1369-1402.
- Maoret, M, Massa, F. G., & Jones, C. (2011). Toward a projects as events perspective. In G. Cattani, S. Ferriani, L. Frederiksen, & F. Taeube (eds.), *Project-based organizing and strategic management (Advances in strategic management, 28)*. (pp. 427-444). UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Modig, N. (2007). A continuum of organizations formed to carry out projects: Temporary and stationary organization forms. *International Journal of Project Management*, 25(8), 807–814.
- Obstfeld, D. (2012). Creative projects: A less routine approach toward getting new things done. *Organization Science*, 23(6), 1571-1592.
- Powell, W. W., & Sandholtz, K. W. (2012). Amphibious entrepreneurs and the

emergence of organizational forms. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(2), 94-115.

Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2005). Border crossing: bricolage and the erosion of categorical boundaries in French gastronomy. *American Sociological Review*, 70(6), 968-991.

Reinecke, J., & Ansari, S. (2015). When times collide: temporal brokerage at the intersection of markets and development. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(2): 618–648.

Rottbøll, E. (2008). Nimbus Film skærer ind til benet. Information, 26th September. Retrieved from <http://www.information.dk/166814>), accessed on Jan 10, 2014.

Sahlin-Andersson, K. (2002). Project management as boundary work: Dilemmas of defining and delimiting. In K. Sahlin-Andersson, & A. Söderholm (eds.), *Beyond project management: New perspective on the temporary - permanent dilemma*. (pp. 241-260) Copenhagen, Denmark: Liber – Abstrakt - Copenhagen Business School Press.

- Schultz, M. & Hernes, T. (2013). A temporal perspective on organizational identity. *Organization Science*, 24(1), 1-21
- Star, S. L. (2010). This is not a boundary object: Reflections on the origin of a concept. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, 35(5), 601-617.
- Starkey, K., Barnatt, C., & Tempest, S. (2000). Beyond networks and hierarchies: Latent organizations in the U.K. television industry. *Organization Science*, 11(3), 30-40.
- Suchman, L. (1994). Working relations of technology production and use. Computer Supported Cooperative Work (CSCW). *The Journal of Collaborative Computing*, 2, 21-39.
- Stevenson, J. (2003). *Dogme uncut: Lars von Trier, Thomas Vinterberg, and the gang that took on Hollywood*. Santa Monica, CA: Santa Monica Press.
- Svejenova, S., Strandgaard, J., & Vives, L. (2011). Projects of passion: Lessons for strategy from temporary art. In G. Cattani, S. Ferriani, L. Frederiksen, & F. Taeube (eds.), *Project-based organizing and strategic management (Advances in strategic management, 28)*. (pp. 505–531). UK: Emerald Group Publishing

Limited.

Sydow, J. (2009). Path dependencies in project-based organizing: Evidence from television production in Germany. *Journal of Media Business Studies*, 6(4), 123-139.

Sydow, J., Lindkvist, L., & DeFillippi, R. (2004). Project-based organizations, embeddedness and repositories of knowledge. Editorial, *Organization Studies*, 25(9), 1475-1489.

Sydow, J., & Staber, U. (2002). The institutional embeddedness of project networks: The case of content production in German television. *Regional Studies*, 36(3), 215–227.

Tushman, M. L. (1977). Special boundary roles in the innovation process. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22(4), 587-605.

Wassmer, U. (2008). Alliance portfolios: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 141-171.

White, H. (1992). *Identity and control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Whitley, R. (2006). Project-based firms: New organizational form or variations on a

theme? *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 15(1), 77-99.

Windeler, A. & Sydow J. (2001). Project networks and changing industry practices-

Collaborative content production in the German television industry.

Organization Studies, 22(6), 1035-1060.

Wittel, A. (2001). Toward a Network Sociality. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18(6), 51-

76.

Zuckerman, E.W. (forthcoming). Optimal distinctiveness revisited: An integrative

framework for understanding the balance between differentiation and

conformity in individual and organizational identities. In M.G. Pratt, M.

Schultz, B.E. Ashforth, & D. Ravasi (Eds.). *Oxford Handbook of Organizational*

Identity. (pp. unknown) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Table 1. Temporary and Permanent Organizing in Antboy’s Film Project Sequence*.

* Abbreviations: temporary organization (TO), permanent organization (PO), field (F)

Stage	Initiation & abandonment	Revival & realization	Exploration & renewal
Organizing			
Sequence of TO & project kind	Antboy 0, a social realism children film	Antboy I, a superhero-realism innovative children film	Antboy II & III, superhero-realism sequels
Film title & timeline (initiation – production – release)	- Spring 2010- discontinued before production in Fall 2010	Antboy Spring 2011 - October 2012 – October 2013	Antboy: Revenge of the Red Fury May 2013 – February 2014 - December 2014 Antboy 3 March 2014 – July 2015 - February 2016
PO-TO connection	Detachment	Strong attachment	Moderate attachment
TO’s main challenge	Alignment	Experience	Optimal distinctiveness
Tensions at boundaries	- <i>TO’s staffing (TO-F): TO’s genre-bridging needs vs field’s limited talent</i>	- <i>Core TO team’s authority (in TO): inexperienced core vs rest of team experienced in social realism</i>	- <i>Timing (across TOs; TO-F): urgency to advance sequels for freshness in audience memory and children actors’ aging vs field norms for core</i>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Budget (PO-TO):</i> PO's resources for project vs superhero genre's demands - <i>Funding (TO-F):</i> core TO team's inexperience vs art-fund's experience requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> team's involvement from start - <i>TO's collaboration (across TOs):</i> renewal vs routinization/(non)rehiring - <i>Budget (PO-TO):</i> PO's surplus expectations vs TO's quality ambitions - <i>Funding (TO-F):</i> first sequel's flopped performance vs market fund requirements
Boundary work/roles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PO gives TO autonomy to develop project without investing in boundary work or roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TO's core team self-selected (trust, shared references, commitment) with PO's approval and crosses genre boundaries to define novel filmic universe - CEO subsumes TO into PO; crosses TO-PO and TO-F 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PO gives TOs more autonomy, yet insists on limited budgets and return on investment - CEO crosses TO-PO and TO-F boundaries (intervening in who/what roles (not) to rehire in the TOs to prevent former tensions and performing nexus work to get sequels

		boundaries (becoming producer, moderating with DFI, ensuring budget) to overcome inexperience	started and funded) - TO's core team blurs and crosses role boundaries to resolve production problems
Shadows of past and future TOs	Past: no similar projects as reference (Danish children and youth films lack artistic ambition and quality) Future: PO's vision for children films (manifesto) shapes project expectations	Past: Antboy 0's experience influences what to avoid for genre innovation to happen; prior TO members' collaborations offer trust and shared references Future: "Pitches" of active projects at Nimbus allow core team to enrol into the TO; PO's vision that film will become a sequel influences TO team's approach and commitment	Past: Antboy I's success legitimizes sequels' funding ("bragging book") and frames audience expectations for filmic universe; Antboy II's box office failure endangers Antboy III's public funding; sequels' theme and team adjusted with feedback from preceding films Future: sequels' theme and team adjusted with vision to protect PO's and TO team's artistic reputation; expectations for PO's return on investment in project series keeps TOs' budget low
Outcomes	- public art fund refuses support	- public art fund supports TO	- public market fund supports TOs

	<p>for lack of novelty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PO dissolves Antboy 0's TO, retaining project idea 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Antboy I over budget, innovation (1st Danish children superhero film), commercial and artistic success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Antboy II improves artistic quality, winning awards and worldwide distribution; falters at box office - Antboy III made on budget
--	---	--	--

Appendix 1 List of Interviews

- I. Informants from the permanent organization: Nimbus Film
 1. CEO, Owner, and Co-founder; Executive Producer (Antboy I, II, III): Birgitte Hald. Mar 21, 2014; Sep 4, 2015
 2. Company Executive, Owner and Co-founder; Executive Producer: Bo Ehrhardt. Sep 9, 2015
 3. Reader at Nimbus: Thilde Dalby. Jan 8, 2014
 4. Producer at Nimbus; (Antboy I, II): Eva Jakobsen (together with Lea Løbger). Nov 6th 2013
 5. Producer at Nimbus; Line Producer (Antboy I); Producer and Line Producer (Antboy II); Producer (Antboy III): Lea Løbger. Nov 6, 2013; Sep 4, 2015
 6. Producer at Nimbus: Lars Bredo Rahbæk. Oct 22, 2013
 7. Producer at Nimbus: Mikkel Jersin. Sep 18, 2013
 8. Producer Assistant at Nimbus (Antboy I, II, III): Janne Nygaard. Sep 9, 2015
 9. Stagier: Anonymous. Nov 5, 2013

II. Informants from temporary organizations: Antboy, Original Film and Sequels

10. Director (Antboy I, II, III): Ask Hasselbalch. Aug 22, 2013; Oct 16, 2013
11. Writer (Antboy I, II, III): Anders Ølholm. Dec 16, 2013
12. Cinematographer (Antboy I, II, III): Niels Reedtz Johansen. Sep 28, 2015
13. Line Producer (Antboy II): Carina Åkerlund. Nov 4, 2013; Nov 26, 2013
14. Costume Designer (Antboy I, II III): Louize Nissen. Jan 15, 2014
15. Production Designer; Art Department Director (Antboy II, III): Sabine Hviid. Jan 9, 2014

III. Informants from the field: Expert and other professionals

16. DFI Consultant (Other Art House films): Steen Bille. Dec 9, 2013
17. DFI Consultant (Children films, incl. Antboy): Rasmus Horskjær. Jan 13, 2014
18. DFI Consultant (Other Art House films): Kim Leona. Aug 14, 2013

19. CEO, Founder; Executive Producer at Fridthjof Film: Ronnie Fridthjof. Aug 13, 2013
20. CEO, Founder; Executive Producer at Grasten Film: Regnar Grasten. Sept 12, 2013
21. Director and Cinematographer: Vibeke Winding. May 16, 2013
22. Researcher at Nimbus in 2007: Per Darmer. April 25, 2014