

Isomorfismo mimético no cinema brasileiro: o modelo norte-americano de governança e a frustração da indústria nacional

Mimetic isomorphism in Brazilian cinema: the US governance model and the frustration of the national film industry

Debora Regina Taño¹

Ana Lúcia Vitale Torkomian²

Resumo: *A ideia da industrialização do cinema no Brasil passou a ser pauta constante a partir da década de 1920 tanto de críticos quanto de realizadores. As discussões acerca do que deveria ser feito e o que seria o cinema brasileiro por excelência sempre encontravam o modelo norte-americano como referência. A tentativa de seguir tal modelo, no entanto, não abriu espaço para a adoção de outras lógicas e estruturas de governança que existiam, mas não eram valorizadas pelo meio. A partir das teorias institucionais e das diferentes estruturas de governança das organizações, propõem-se examinar as tentativas de industrialização do cinema brasileiro entre os anos 1920 e 1960, identificando as práticas de legitimação do cinema nacional diante de um pensamento artístico do que seria qualidade e, sobretudo, de um modelo de produção institucionalmente mimetizado do modelo hollywoodiano clássico.*

Palavras-chave: *indústria cinematográfica; neoinstitucionalismo; mimetismo.*

Abstract: *The idea of the industrialization of cinema in Brazil became a constant theme from the 1920s, both critics and directors. Discussions about what should be done and what would be Brazilian cinema par excellence always found*

- 1 Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar). São Carlos, SP, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5815-8773> E-mail: debora.tano@gmail.com
- 2 Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar). São Carlos, SP, Brasil.
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8090-9526> E-mail: torkomia@ufscar.br

the North American model as a reference. The attempt to follow such a model, however, did not make room for the adoption of other existing logics and governance structures that were not valued by the environment. From the institutional theories and the different governance structures of the organizations, we propose to examine the attempts of industrialization of Brazilian cinema between the 1920s and 1960s, identifying the legitimation practices of national cinema in the face of an artistic thought of what quality and above all, an institutionalized mimetism production model of the classic Hollywood model.

Keywords: *film industry; neoinstitutionalism; mimetism.*

Introduction

There is no cinema industry in Brazil. This categoric statement is repeated in different studies of the cinematographic area of the country throughout decades (AUTRAN, 2004; BERNARDET, 2009). This comes from researchers, intellectuals and professionals of cinema who defend the impossibility of the country to have a film industry and are consolidated by academic studies of the area. Such statement, however, presupposes a very idealized concept of industry generally associated to a specific type of productive arrangement.

Given the complexity associated to the cinematographic production, as well as its distribution and exhibition, involving high costs and a large number of people, it is understood that cinema only really exists through elaborated industrial formal structures. These structures, however, can have different shapes, with significant variations in the relation between organizations, types of governance and development of activities. Since one specific productive shape is defined as the correct one, any other activity, as more or less effective as it is, is delegitimated and, therefore, understood as invalid.

The construction of such reference of structures begins in the decade of 1910, when the American cinematographic industry was consolidated not only in the internal market, but also as an aesthetic and productive reference throughout the world. The dominance of a cohesive and transparent narrative form and the practically uninterrupted production, in addition to the guaranteed domestic exhibition due to the verticalization of companies made the American cinema, only focused in Hollywood at that time, the main reference of cinema in the world after World War I (COSTA, 2005).

In Brazil, from 1920's onwards, the idea of industrialization of the cinema became a constant subject in critics and directors minds. The discussions around what should be done, what type of film, what would be Brazilian cinema par excellence and how to do it always ended up having the North American model as reference. Some attempts of verticalization of the production occurred, varying their time of existence

and the themes of films. All of them, however, did not satisfy the urge to see Brazil as a consolidated industry, guaranteeing constant production of films and reach of at least the domestic audience (GALVÃO; SOUZA, 1987). The focus on the physical structure of studios and in the Hollywood model did not consider the characteristics of the national economy and industry, nor the audience and how to get to them.

From that, the proposition of this article is to discuss the possibility that the issue of industrialization of cinema in the country is not only a lack of organization of film directors, the initial participation of the State or the market occupied by foreign film (AUTRAN, 2004), but an issue of adopting a model coming from a completely different context. As oscillating as it has been, film production in the country followed a considerable path, especially in the period analyzed in this study, from 1920 to 1960. Production that in some moments was made by studios and in others by independent directors with their own resources or with the support of businessmen. The discussion about what should be cinema and how could it be done, however, ended up focusing efforts towards production, leaving distribution and exhibition aside in the adopted hierarchic mode.

The attempt of following the North American model, however, did not open a space for the adoption of other logics and structures of governance that existed, but weren't valued by the field. Institutional theories explain such behavior through isomorphism and the need of organizations to be legitimized in their field (DIMAGGIO; POWELL, 2005). Such legitimacy often happens through the imitation of practices understood as correct, even if they are not thought for that context where they are being applied. Therefore, a detachment happens between the institutionalized practice and the real activity, between legitimation in the field and efficiency of organization (MEYER; ROWAN, 1977).

Therefore, we intend to understand the relationship between the industrial process of Brazilian cinema and the classic model of American cinema. Having the idea of one only correct way of industrialization, we see the Brazilian activity as a practice of institutional isomorphism. To

do so, we have as a base, in addition to concepts such as isomorphism (DIMAGGIO; POWELL, 2005) and institutionalized structures and practices (MEYER; ROWAN, 1977; SCOTT, 1995), the different forms of governance, of verticalization of contracts (COASE, 1937) and plural forms (MÉNARD, 2014). In another sphere, we identified the respective trajectories of the cinematographic production in the United States and in Brazil, comprising key moments from 1910 to 1960 in order to clarify in which ways the model was adopted and the results and discussions around it.

Governance, institutionalization and isomorphism

To think about the different types of possible arrangements for the cinematographic industry, it is necessary to understand which are the factors that influence the determination of these arrangements. Each organization, regardless of the productive sector it is, has characteristics that must be taken into account both internally and externally.

According to institutionalist theories, economy works through three institutions: market, company and contract (SCOTT, 1995). To get to this stage, the forms of production were changing, changing the focus from economic action - and, consequently, the study - of the productive function based on the vertical specialization of companies, to the structure of oligopolies and the establishment of the market through competition, until networks of firms and contracts established between them (TIGRE, 2005).

Coming from, therefore, three main fundamental institutions, the analysis of the economic activity has its center in the company, on how it puts itself in the market and in what way their contracts are related with other companies. The choice, however, between a small or big number of contracts and the form is given by the presence of the company in the market is related to the reactions of existence of the firm and the logic for its internal organization. According to Coase (1937), the determination of structure of the firm and its boundaries is in the question if it's more efficient to buy or produce a certain component. Through that,

it is possible to understand the nature of the established relationships. In other words, the option for verticalization of operations, in which the company produces everything that's necessary for its activity and existence, or for the purchase of other company's components, based in contracts and in the market is done through which of the structures of governance is more efficient for that context. Thus, it is through this choice it is limited as far as the activities of the firm goes and where it begins to cooperatively relate with others (COASE, 1937).

To Ménard (2014), however, the forms of governance do not need to be fixed, depending of the activity of the organization. For one transaction it is possible to, at the same time, hierarchize the activity and recur to the market, in hybrid arrangements, such as outsourcing. As well as the verticalization and competition of the market are choices according to the efficiency of the firm, hybrid forms can be fairly useful in situations that require technological diversity, solutions oriented towards innovation, financial issues, specific knowledge, among others (MÉNARD, 2014).

In this moment, with the combination of governances in order to expand opportunities, horizontal relations between organizations are established and, thus, created networks of exchange (PAULILLO; SACOMANO; GARCIA, 2016). Unlike contractual relations, networks have as base the agreement, norms of reciprocity that can be broken at any moment. Its goal is also through strategic alliances and partnerships to eliminate weaknesses and absence of processes in one or another organization (POWELL, 1990).

To their existence and growth, organizations need to define their limits and the forms of their activities aiming efficiency. At the same time, however, they belong to a context in which they need recognition and legitimacy. In some contexts, legitimacy is given through the competition between organizations, in which they have an internal structure according to the necessary activities and the desired results. In others, this recognition is made through the adoption of certain practices and

structures understood as correct and valid on their own, seen as myths to be applied.

According to Meyer and Rowan (1977), myths generated by particular organizational practices and diffused in relational networks acquire their legitimacy both by the supposition that they are efficient and based on legal mandates. They are called institutionalized practices, since in a broader sense institutionalization refers to a process of crystallization of norms, meanings, values or knowledges, becoming social norms or status orders.

In societies where the network of relations is dense, the number of myths grow, and as much as they can be generated in a specific context they are diffused and applied in others. With that, the institutionalized rules have a high degree of generalization, often not fitting the needs of specific activities of each organization or their field, causing a detachment between the structures imposed and the activities performed (MEYER; ROWAN, 1977).

According to Scott (1995), institutions are structures and activities that enable stability and meaning to the social behavior, delimiting behaviors and formatting actions. They are based, especially, in the cognitive, normative and regulatory pillars, defined by the way they are adopted and their social origins. In the case of practices institutionalized by organizations, dealt by Meyer and Rowan (1977), they have a strong base in cognitive institutions, since legitimacy comes from the adoption of a board of reference or an orthodox structure. In addition, the cognitive perspective is manifested through isomorphic practices, generally mimetic, through common beliefs and shared logics of action (SCOTT, 1995).

Mimetic isomorphism is one of the forms of institutional isomorphism studied by DiMaggio and Powell (2005) in the intention of understanding the processes that make the organizational field homogenized. For the authors, organizations tend to become similar and that is given in a coercive normative or mimetic form; forms related to the institutional perspectives proposed by Scott (1995).

In the case of mimesis, the similarity happens when an organization is surrounded with uncertainties and needs to guarantee their safety among other companies. As we've seen, in institutionalized environments, safety does not come through efficiency and competition, but through imitation of practices of organizations considered referential (DIMAGGIO; POWELL, 2005). Therefore, even if the efficacy of the organization in relation to their internal goals is not assured, it will have the easiness of exchange with other organizations and the legitimacy with relation to the actors of the field.

North American industry and the cinema in Brazil

Classic Hollywood cinema

The industrialization of cinema in the United States begins around 1910. The long film, until then almost nonexistent, started to be the most produced product, gaining space in movie theatres. At this time, a good part of the films exhibited in the United States was European, mainly Italian and French, at the same time the producers were being intensified in the North American territory. Through the creation of Motion Picture Patents Company (MPPC) and its distributor General Film Company (GFC), cinema in the country organized itself in a more standardized manner, through budget delimitations, forms of production and releases. The trust, led by Thomas Edison, had the goal of controlling the national market, impeding the formation of new companies and, mostly, the entrance of European product in the domestic market. With the First World War, European production dropped significantly, which helped not only to expand MPPC in its own country, but also the opening of a space in a new market. Therefore, the raise in production started to demand a specialized system, with intense rationalization and division of labor (COSTA, 2005).

Still in the 1910's, little by little, MPPC lost its importance, especially after the government action against practices that harmed competition in the sector. At the same time, different independent producers were

getting organized and would become the big companies in the country. The first to create a physical structure for simultaneous recordings was Universal, in a city next to Hollywood. Therefore, from 1912 to 1928, the known and strong cinematographic industry was established in shape and market dominance (THOMPSON; BORDWELL, 2003).

Known as factories, Hollywood studios, in fact, had the physical and organizational structure necessary to adapt themselves to every new movie, since each project had different demands. To do so, the separation into clear roles and departments is fundamental. The creation of closed studios allowed a bigger control of lighting - and, later, sound - replacing old studios with glass walls. In addition to recording structures, the companies also started to invest in the purchase and construction of rooms that would guarantee the exhibition of their films. Thus, the vertical integration of companies would no longer be restricted to the production of the film, but it would also be related to the other parts of the chain, including product distribution and exhibition. Until the 1940's, there were the so-called "five big and three smalls", respectively Paramount, MGM, 20th Century Fox, Warner Bros., RKO, Universal, Columbia and United Artists (THOMPSON; BORDWELL, 2003).

It is important to highlight that both the extinction of MPPC and the later verticalization of activities and all the cinematographic chain centralized into few and big companies followed the logic of functioning of the North American industry as a whole, even with a certain delay. Cinema was consolidated as an industrial art in the period in which North American organizations of different sectors also went through a restructuring, from predatory practices in cartels to the formation oligopolies and big specialized companies. As in other sectors, the cinematographic industry also was a target of a reactive action of the State that aimed to regulate activities, always guaranteeing the existence of competition. The different conceptions of control (FLIGSTEIN, 1990) can also be observed in this context.

Therefore, the assembly line type of production was also adopted in the cinematographic production, separating the roles in departments

such as direction, costume, electrical engineers, machinists, film labs, advertisement, administration, finance, among others, all physically disposed in a way to maximize results, making processes easier between them. In addition to these roles, actors in this moment formed the star system of each company and were a fundamental piece for sale and repercussion of films. In addition, it is important to point out that every worker was an employee of the company and worked in more than one project at once, in order to guarantee continuity of production. The search for the best quality product, in which the viewer would not perceive the technologic and productive apparatus involved, would justify both the enormous recording structures and the changes in film style. Lighting, development of a more precise script, types of framing and camera movement, invisible editing and other techniques were elaborated creating the popular classic Hollywood style based on continuity, vraisemblance and narrative clarity (BORDWELL; STAIGER; THOMPSON, 1997).

The sectors of exhibition, until then still belonging to big companies, created a spectacle for each film exhibited, through the division of which movies would be released in which rooms, according to the quality of the film, varying, thus, the price of the ticket and the type of audience. Such spectacles were supported by the strong advertisement that would use the room where the film would be projected and mainly the stars of the film. Therefore, “in order to control stability and long-term planning, the company should expand, ensuring, therefore, regular supplies of raw material, reservations of capital and minimization of risks” (BORDWELL; STAIGER; THOMPSON, 1997, p. 353). Therefore, with a well-defined structure and standardized practices, North American cinematographic companies had a constant production, filling internal and external market, and a narrative style that guaranteed both a quality product and audience reach

Brazilian production

With relation to its own production the history of Brazilian cinema is divided into different periods or according to the regions. Until early 1910's, the Belle Epoque of Brazilian cinema reflects the period in which the country discovered cinema as entertainment and started to produce their own films, with landscapes, important personalities, family movies and small comedies – all of them with a short length. Between 1910 and 1920, the favorable scenario had changed. While cinema in the world began to be organized as an industry, artisanal productions of the country did not hold, with the exception of places where the so-called regional cycles established themselves with strength for some time, outside the Rio-São Paulo region. During the 1920's, the film production was sparse, spreading throughout the different regions of the country, with different forms of production, sources of financing and teams. The activities did not follow a pattern, nor used a lot of the previous production, with each new initiative being considered as a new beginning (GALVÃO; SOUZA, 1987).

In addition to the regional cycles, the production was limited to news cinema or movies made under commission, which were not considered proper cinema. It was in this context and with the repercussion of cinema magazines that the search for true Brazilian cinema began. Between late 1920's, early 1940's, the Cinearte magazine, edited by Adhemar Gonzaga and Pedro Lima was the journalistic reference about national cinema, not only following events, but discussing how and what should the national cinema look like, in addition to boasting the national star system. For the editors, Hollywood cinema was clearly the reference of well-made cinema, both regarding content and the means of production. It was through their texts that the discussion of the Brazilian cinema industry began to grow and define the North American production as base for the subject that did not develop for decades (AUTRAN, 2004). The reference to Hollywood is not random, however. As we've seen, since 1910's, the North American cinema dominated the international cinematographic market, intensifying its position in the 1920's with the

consolidation of their verticalized system from production to exhibition (BAKKER, 2008).

From the 1920's until early 1960's, the so-called attempts of industrialization were many. In different contexts and moments, they had in common the objective to create a quality Brazilian cinema, based on the big production studios, with known actors and experienced technicians. In the 1930's, along with the first protectionist laws in the Vargas presidency, there were the first cinematographic companies in Rio de Janeiro with their studios and a big staff. Throughout this period, in addition to independent productions that kept occurring in an atomized manner, there were the companies Cinédia, Maristela, Brasil Vita Filme, Sonofilmes, Multifilmes, Kino Filmes, Atlântida and Vera Cruz. Some of them had only a few years of production. Initial investments for construction and equipping the studios and contracting technical staff and actors, in addition to the huge concern towards aesthetic and the lack of contact with the audience, were a few of the reasons they were unsuccessful (AUTRAN, 2004; VIEIRA, 2018). In each new attempt, the hope for consolidating the industry was reinforced, as well as the discussion on what should be done after each new bankruptcy. Questions about the form of production, State participation, investors or lack thereof, audience taste and what was lacking to reach the North American model came to the surface and generally did not get any conclusion. Even the idea of one film distributor responsible for such productions was hypothesized, but with no results (GATTI, 2007). "The decay of the industrialist thought stuck to the Hollywood productive mode is so grand that it is hard to understand if the industry had existed or if it was a stillborn entity that never came into effect (AUTRAN, 2004, p. 149).

Among the initiatives, two existed for a longer period of time: Cinédia, by Adhemar Gonzaga, and Atlântida. Both had in common the goal of investing little by little, creating the structure of studios as films got any revenue (needing, of course, complementary investments) and with a concern with the audience's taste. Initiated by Cinédia and with an apex in the 1950's with films by Atlântida, films of Carnival comedy, later

called chanchadas, seized the taste for sound films and singers and songs known in the radio to attract the audience. It was with chanchadas that both producers reached what was the closest to a cinema with continuous production and with a real feedback from the audience. In addition to the genre, there is the verticalization promoted by the exhibitor Luiz Severiano Ribeiro, owner of a group of cinemas that became an Atlântida associate in 1947. Even guaranteeing all the steps of the chain, the company, however, close their activities in early 1960's, due to unclear finance issues. The genre "got old", being overly repetitive, competing with television and with North American film, and not earning enough to keep the structure that a large studio needed (VIEIRA, 2018). Their movies, as much as they were popular and had a guaranteed exhibition, did not please the critics and were seen as overly popular, unlike what Brazilian cinema should be.

Beyond the studios, any other form of production was seen as incorrect. When some directors made movies with smaller budgets and sought financing for that, they were seen as "adventurers", who only wanted to get money from their movies.

We see here a type of prejudice against those individuals which, one way or another, sought and/or obtained some economic profitability in the activity to the point they remained in it. (...) It is necessary to exist some type of moral stamp – which could be given by aesthetics, by party politics, by intelligence or any other requisite. (AUTRAN, 2004, p. 23)

Such thought strongly differs from the beginning of the North American industrial process, in which the main worry of the enterprisers was to minimize their expenditures and generate income, since cinematographic production involved high investments (BAKKER, 2008). With this model, noticing similar practices in some points, but very different in others, makes us question how the model was applied and which other characteristics of the context helped or impede such adoption, such as local economy and the understanding of what cinema should be.

Institutionalization of the myth in a different context

Through the two landscapes presented, it is possible to see some similarities and differences, but, generally, a relation between the cinematographic productions of both countries. The questions about Brazilian cinema and its forms of production began precisely in the period in which North American cinema is established in its internal market and started to reach in a very incisive manner foreign market. Seeing that movies could be made with certain narrative characteristics and techniques understood at the time as ideal to the cinema, Brazilian directors and critics incorporated the notion that in order to have that it was necessary to perform exactly the same way, proposing, through *Cinearte* magazine,

(...) A real transplantation of these ideals, legitimating the universality of a specific form of production, molded in Hollywood. The magazine incites the classic cinema of continuity, fluency and narrative clarity, supported into two strong structures of the hegemonic system, the star system and studio cinema. (...) The magazine suggested, numerous times, that the creation of good cinema in Brazil would be an act of purifying our social reality, with a careful selection of what should or shouldn't be shown in screen... (VIEIRA, 2018, p. 349)

What happens, however, is that as much as studios have been created in the country and reached some of their aesthetic and narrative goals, such as a certain technical quality, narrative fluency and continuity and a thorough selection of actors and locations, some details were left aside. The first one of them is related to the verticalization of the whole chain, not only production. As we previously commented, North American cinema gained strength from the moment businessmen invested in movie theaters, and it only happened in Brazil at Cinédia. The national concern was in producing films and not in the rest of the chain. That, however, is something perceived since the beginning of the *Cinearte* magazine and it remains in debate (AUTRAN, 2004).

Other important aspects to be highlighted: Even with the simultaneity of studios in some moments and even of some forms of production

that weren't consolidated, but existed, Brazilian cinema did not establish a competitive market between their own films. The dispute was between the national and North American film. Thus, what DiMaggio and Powell (2005) call competitive isomorphism, in which organizations are similar to compete in the same market, did not occur, becoming necessary another type of legitimacy, institutional legitimacy, in this case, through mimesis. Still according to the authors,

The smaller the number of alternative organizational models possible in a field was, the faster will be the rhythm of isomorphism in this field; (...) The more uncertain were the technologies or ambiguous were the goals, within a field, the bigger will be the rhythm of isomorphic change. (DIMAGGIO; POWELL, 2005, p. 84)

Once the international cinematographic field did not have big models at that moment, due to the decrease of European production during the war, Hollywood cinema became the reference. Even within the country, the possibility of an isomorphism between national companies was not possible due to the lack of consensus regarding national cinema, what was the quality desired and which stories should be told (AUTRAN, 2004). Thus, once more the search for a perfect model considered as a reference was made necessary.

Once found such an ideal model, it becomes institutionalized as the correct practice. "As institutional rules rationalized in certain dominions of work activities arise, organizations are formed and expanded incorporating the rules as structural elements" (MEYER; ROWAN, 1977, p. 345, our translation). Incorporating these institutionalized rules as structural elements disregarded the own context, which, in the case of a Brazilian mimesis coming from the North American context, are very distinct.

Brazilian economy was consolidated based in the agricultural production and exportation, with a highlight for the coffee sector. The strength of the internal market, the migration towards the cities, the manufacture production of non-durable goods for domestic consumption and the immigration were factors that contributed for the formation of the

industry sector since late 19th century. With the first Vargas presidency, in 1930's, the first economic laws and policies were created, directing Brazilian production towards industrialization. However, it was only in 1960's that the industry sector surpassed export agriculture in economic terms, with external investments and the attempt of accelerating the country's growth through industry (ALDRIGHI; COLISTETE, 2015).

Relating the industry history of the country with the urge for a cinema industry, there is an incredibly significant contextual mismatch. While the country was economically structured based on agricultural export and with a small manufacturing production until 1950's, the idea of the cinema industry started in the 1920's, being the last big attempt of creating studios, with Vera Cruz, precisely in 1950, and with the end of Atlântida in the beginning of the next decade. It is possible to understand, thus, that the desire of a verticalized productive structuration does not come from the functioning of a national industry, since that was in its early stages, but rather in the North American economic example. However, the attempt of a hierarchized governance for the cinema in a context where the other sectors of the economy did not have it makes visible the intent of adopting an "imported" model, not for the real possibility of application, but for the need of legitimacy.

The country did not go through the different phases of conception of control that generated the strong competition between companies, the later creation of oligopolies, or even the ramification of big organizations in different activity sectors like the United States (FLIGSTEIN, 1990). The moment the national industry had their big ramified organizations, as the case of companies of the Matarazzo family, and among them, Cinédia with Luiz Severiano Ribeiro, cinema was only one of the investment activities of businessmen, not the main one. When it was the main activity of small groups, the efforts were not in commanding a market, but in producing, because this was the parameter of legitimacy of the field, instead of audience reach and financial feedback. That is seen in the case of Atlântida, that had a recurring audience and remained for a relevant time in a minimally self-sufficient productive system. However,

due to the constant idea of quality in films, its action was invalidated based in a search for artistic, not economic, legitimacy. According to Baker and Faulkner (1991), one of the forms of legitimacy of the cinematographic industry happens through the role played, in which occurs the dispute of position. While in classic Hollywood the focus was in the function of production and its power in guaranteeing the execution of films and function of studios, in Brazil, the image of the director, the artist, was valued and the economic interest was understood as smaller, as exposed in Autran (2004)'s quotation.

Therefore, at the same time that a verticalized production that the audience in mind was not artistically legitimated, other forms of governance were formed, as something less hierarchical and closer to relations established through contract, or even close to networks, were not legitimated because of isomorphic practices. Such initiatives, as the ones occurred in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro in the 1950's onwards, show the technical and economic viability of cheaper and more popular productions, called independent (COSTA; CÁNEPA, 2018; MELO, 2018). In the case of Rio, the image of independent producers became vital, since it was their role to articulate the necessary to perform the film, including raising funds and negotiating for the exhibition. In this context, it was fundamental to see the strong bond of cinematographic associations with the state, which, for the first protectionist measures of Vargas, begins the interventionist logic in the national cinema (MELO, 2018). It is through the State policies that São Paulo's independent production will be structured. Associating the nationalist discussion with the Italian neorealism of 1940's, São Paulo's cinema received public support in the 1950's from structures that were demolished from studios (such as borrowed equipment or bought with a smaller price), dispersed professionals and low budgets to produce films of different genres. Each small group was articulated in a possible manner for their context, in order to tell the stories they thought were closer to the national reality, through adventure films or documentaries (COSTA; CÁNEPA, 2018).

ARTIGO

These practices, however, as much as they had audience outreach and longevity, did not enter the industry radar nor were considered as “national cinema”, still being seen as parallel attempts. It is through this type of governance structure that since 1990’s it is understood as the main form of creative industries, through forming networks, circulation of professionals between companies and projects and relationships established between them and the public support, especially in countries under development (POWELL, 1990). Therefore, we see that the idealization of an industry formatted according to a specific standard did not enable the view of other possible industry formations and that ended up being established decades later.

We can understand, through what was exposed, that the search and attempt of the Brazilian industry cinema was not necessarily an issue of producing films for their market in a self-sufficient manner, but legitimating the national cinema through an artistic prism of what would be of quality, and, most of all, a model of production institutionally mimicked of the Hollywood classic format. The adoption of such model in a historic, social and industrial context completely diverse does not find forms of sustenance. As much as in some moments, Brazilian studios have reached their goals, little by little, the difference between institutionalized practices and real activities became clear, and the maintenance of structure, became unfeasible, ruining each one of the attempts.

Final considerations

Through the institutional theories of mimesis and the different structures of governance of organizations, we had proposed to examine the attempts of industrialization of the Brazilian cinema between 1920 and 1960. With the presentation of a brief history about the period in the country and about the consolidation of the cinema industry in the United States, it was possible to see some considerable contextual differences and similarities in production that were understood as activities of mimetic isomorphism.

The search for a quality national cinema – technically and artistically – and the need for a legitimation of such cinema made Brazilian directors to look in the North American model the structure needed for its success. Then, through the institutionalization of mimetic practices of another context, without considering them completely nor adapting them to their own reality, the attempts of industrialization as people understood as correct did not succeed. The detachment between the structure imposed and the activities performed became apparent, even if socially the legitimacy was reached.

The present study is set as a movement towards studying Brazilian cinema through institutional and organizational theories, in order to find new views and paths for analysis. As the work of Costa and Cánepa (2018) and Melo (2018), among others, that evidence different forms of production apart from the ones deemed legitimate and that belong to the industrialist bias, it is necessary to look at the national cinema through other points of view.

The mimetic adoption of a model established in another context ended up delaying the understanding of national cinema in its own scenario. At the same time it was intended to create one only cinema for the country in terms of theme, the industry did not consider the productive structure in this attempt. When the government support came into play, even if in a very initial manner, independent practices became more viable. The State participation, which would become fundamental for the Brazilian cinema in 1990's onwards, at that moment, however, was not included in the institutionalized model. The legitimacy of cinema went through the logic of studios, of classic narrative and Hollywood's star system and any other form was not even seen as cinema.

Thus, understanding the relationships between directors, governments, institutionalized structures and activities open a horizon to be investigated more deeply in future studies. Having a wider and more diverse understanding about the national cinema can help us deepen its development, both in relation to “what didn't work” or “wasn't

constituted”, such as this industry view, and in relation to what was effective, in other words, what cinema industry we really have.

References

- ALDRIGHI, D. M.; COLISTETE, R. P. Industrial Growth and Structural Change Brazil in a Long-run Perspective. In: NAUDÉ, W.; SZIRMAI, A.; HARAGUCHI, N. *Structural Change and Industrial Development in the BRICS*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. p. 162-198.
- AUTRAN, A. *O pensamento industrial cinematográfico brasileiro*. 2004. 283 f. Tese (Doutorado em Multimeios) – Instituto de Artes, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2004.
- BAKER, W. E.; FAULKNER, R. R. Role as Resource in the Hollywood Film Industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, v. 97, n. 2, p. 279-309, 1991.
- BAKKER, G. *Entertainment Industrialised: The Emergence of the International Film Industry, 1890-1940*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- BERNARDET, J.C. *Cinema brasileiro: propostas para uma história*. São Paulo: Cia. das Letras, 2009.
- BORDWELL, D.; STAIGER, J.; THOMPSON, K. *El cine clásico de Hollywood: Estilo cinematográfico y modo de producción hasta 1960*. Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós Ibérica, 1997.
- COASE, R. H. The nature of the firm. *Economica*, v. 4, n. 16, p. 386-405, 1937.
- COSTA, F. C. *O Primeiro Cinema: espetáculo, narração, domesticação* Rio de Janeiro: Azougue Editorial, 2005.
- COSTA, F. C.; CÁNENA, L. L. O cinema paulista para além dos estúdios. In: RAMOS, F. P.; SCHVARZMAN, S. *Nova história do cinema brasileiro*. v. 1. Sesc: São Paulo, 2018. p. 454-487.
- DIMAGGIO, P. J.; POWELL, W. A gaiola de ferro revisitada: isomorfismo institucional e racionalidade coletiva nos campos organizacionais. *RAE – Revista de Administração de Empresas*, v. 45, n. 2, p. 74-89, 2005.
- FLIGSTEIN, N. *The Transformation of Corporate Control*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- GALVÃO, M. R. E.; SOUZA, C. R. *Cinema brasileiro: 1930/1960*. Lisboa: Cinemateca Portuguesa; 1987.
- GATTI, André Piero. *A distribuição comercial cinematográfica*. São Paulo: Centro Cultural São Paulo, 2007
- MELO, L. A. R. O Cinema independente no Rio de Janeiro. In: RAMOS, F.; SCHVARZMAN, S. (Eds.). *Nova história do cinema brasileiro*. São Paulo: Sesc, 2018. p. 392-431.
- MÉNARD, C. Formas plurais de organização: onde estamos? In: MÉNARD, C.; SAES, M. S.; SILVA, V. L.; RAYNAUD, E. (Orgs.). *Economia das Organizações: formas plurais e desafios*. São Paulo: Atlas, 2014. p. 52-70

- MEYER, J. W.; ROWAN, B. Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, v. 83, n. 2, p. 340-363, 1977.
- PAULILLO, L. F.; SACOMANO, M.; GARCIA, L. M. *Governanças de Redes: economia, política e sociedade*. São Paulo: Elsevier, 2016.
- POWELL, W. Neither Market nor Hierarchy: Network Forms of Organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, v. 12, n. March, p. 295-336, 1990.
- SCOTT, W. R. *Institutions and organizations*. California: SAGE Publications, 1995.
- THOMPSON, K.; BORDWELL, D. *Film history: an introduction*. 2. ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2003.
- TIGRE, P. B. Paradigmas Tecnológicos e Teorias Econômicas da Firma. *Revista Brasileira de Inovação*, v. 4, p. 187-223, 2005.
- VIEIRA, J. L. A chanchada e o cinema carioca (1930-1950). In: RAMOS, F. P.; SCHVARZMAN, S. *Nova história do cinema brasileiro*. v. 1. Sesc: São Paulo, 2018. p. 344-391.

On the authors

Debora Regina Taño – PhD student at the Graduate Program in Production Engineering (PPGEP-UFSCar). Master's in Image and Sound (PPGIS-UFSCar). In the present article, the author was responsible for the conceptualization and theoretical-methodological approach, analysis of data and typing the manuscript.

Ana Lúcia Vitale Torkomian – PhD in Business (FEA/USP). Full professor at the Production Engineering Department (DEP-UFSCar). In the present article, the author participated in the conceptualization, in the theoretical-methodological approach, typing the manuscript and the final proofreading of the text.

Date of submission: 25/09/2019

Date of acceptance: 28/04/2020