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ABSTRACT This paper examines the current Japanese film industry, where it is well known that certain directors and production teams repeatedly work together to produce a series of films that often show high economic and artistic performance. Firstly, through historical examination, we describe how these teams shape a stable and long-term community of practice in making unique local films that can hold their own against Hollywood films. Secondly, we explore the collaboration networks of 2443 Japanese filmmakers in 207 films from 1999 to 2004 through social network analysis, and find that closeness, strength and closure of their ties which may shape such communities of practice, function as a special type of social capital for top-performing films with unique and local cinematic taste.
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Many current Japanese filmmakers acquire their ideas and skills by building a career within the closed expert networks that develop in the project-based process of filmmaking. In the wider context of organisational research on cultural industries, it is interesting to note that the special quality, position and structure of the social networks of artists, creators and supporting staff influence their creativity, innovation and performance (Baker & Faulkner, 1991; Cattani & Ferrini,

unique local films, facilitating the acquisition of specific tacit knowledge within a stable community of practice.

SOCIAL CAPITAL FOR UNIQUE CINEMATIC TASTE

Social Networks in the Film Industry

The film business has been transformed from the big studio system into project-based network organisations not only in the United States but also in Europe and Japan. Access to ideas, informal cultures and business opportunities comes with being embedded in expert networks across organisations within the film industry, allowing filmmakers to acquire the knowledge, skills and creativity to develop their professional career (DeFillippi & Arthur, 1998). The formation of networks is essential to the learning process because it provides the necessary resources and structure of creative production and ensures that it reaches audiences in the art world (Becker, 1982). In a wider context, organisational researchers pay considerable attention to the network characteristics that facilitate these processes. In recent studies on organisational learning, Ingram (2002) argues that networks based on mutual trust and the exchange of precise information and knowledge are likely to facilitate learning. In the case of filmmaking, it is also remarkable that the trustworthiness and cohesiveness of the far-reaching networks of filmmakers facilitate the acquisition of ideas, knowledge, skills and career currently demanded.

Lave and Wenger's (1990) "Community of Practice (CoP)" represents one of the potentially most useful concepts in this line of argument as it adequately accounts for learning and career development in filmmaker networks. The community of practice concept is based on two central premises: the activity-based nature of learning, and the group-based characteristic of organisational activity. Lave and Wenger (1990), with their concept of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP), provide one of the best accounts of knowledge acquisition and the constrictive view of the learning community. LPP attempts to account for learning (not teaching), order and instruction, thus it creates the conditions for the learning process rather than just making abstract arguments. In Wenger's (1998) point of view, the CoP concept is essential for explaining learning, which is the knowledge acquisition process. He argues that a CoP is not just a personal network; rather, it concerns something composed by creative professionals. Its identity is defined not just by a task, as it would be for a team, but by an "area" of expertise that needs to be explored and developed. In this point, a CoP is not just a library; it involves professional people who interact and develop relationships that enable them to address problems and share knowledge related to their expertise. The existence of a CoP facilitates the sharing of knowledge within a community, due to both the sense of collective identity and the existence of an important common knowledge base within a professional
research, the film production team is referred to as the “core crew team,” which includes at least eight roles (DeFilippis & Arthur, 1998). We also assume that stable core crew teams within closed networks, with low mobility and highly shared culture are likely to produce a series of films with similar unique taste and ideas and retain regular popularity from mass or segmented audiences. Thus, these network characteristics that shape stable and homogeneous communities of practice may be social capital for making unique local films.

In order to specify this type of social capital, we state four hypotheses, reconsidering previous research on moderate centrality, bridging ties, strength of strong ties, and closeness centrality. Firstly, if filmmakers with many ties are exposed to novel and heterogeneous information, they face an information overload and eventually show low performance. Thus, Cattani and Ferrini (2005) argue that filmmakers with “moderate degree centrality,” which means a moderate number of ties to others, can deal with an appropriate amount of diverse and novel information, and thus show high performance.

H1: If filmmakers have excessive degree centrality, they cannot utilise the high volume of novel and heterogeneous information and thus fail to perform well.

Secondly, following Burt (2004), since filmmakers with bridging ties across many separate groups are likely to encounter many novel and heterogeneous ideas and talent and easily organise them, they are likely to create large-scale, cutting-edge films and show a competitive advantage in the case of Hollywood films. However, such filmmakers tend not to devote themselves to one specific community of practice or commit to one unique cinematic taste. In social network analysis, the bridges can be defined as “cut-points” that separate the groups not located at a bridge.

H2: If filmmakers are located at the cut-points in their networks, they are unlikely to continuously commit to one special group sharing a unique cinematic taste and showing high performance in making a series of similar films.

Thirdly, if filmmakers have strong ties with others, they can build trusting relationships, and easily share tacit knowledge and homogeneous value through frequent exchange (Faulkner & Anderson, 1987). We consider consistent ties to be strong ties, following the argument of Wasserman and Faust (1994).

H3: If filmmakers have frequent contact with each other within a closed network, they are likely to become homogeneous and share their common unique cinematic taste and style of filmmaking.
In the discussion of “closeness centrality” in the social network analysis, the players who are the closest to others must be “the central” because “they can interact best” (Wasserman & Faust, 1994: 183). Fourthly, filmmakers with high closeness centrality tend to be able to access and utilise the knowledge, talent and soft sources within their networks (Cattani & Ferrini, 2000).

**H4: Filmmakers with high closeness centrality in their networks are likely to easily access and utilise soft relational resources, which may enhance their filmmaking performance.**

**REPEATED TEAMS IN TOP-PERFORMING FILMS**

**Decline of Japanese Big Studios**

Since the 1960s, the market share of Japanese films has decreased from nearly 80% to less than 40% over the long-term and that of Hollywood films has increased, based on industry statistics from the Motion Picture Producer Association of Japan. Major Japanese film studios, such as TOHO, SHOCHIKU, and TOEI, have long relied on their nationwide networks of theatres for their long-term survival during this downturn. In parallel, by concentrating their resources on maintaining and strengthening the film distribution networks, they have downsized and outsourced their in-house film production to independent production companies. Outsourcing of film production was found to be the quickest and most effective way of achieving their purpose.

As a result of outsourcing, a number of film creators in major studios were made redundant and transferred to small production firms or given independent status. Film creators in small firms and those with independent status, however, were unable to market their own products unless they were distributed through the national networks of theatres operated by major film studio companies. In the area of domestic (Japanese) movies, 90% of the market share was still held by these “big box” studio firms. Therefore, these film creators had no option other than being dependent on the “big box” studio operators who dominated the copyrights of major films as well as nationwide film distribution networks. This imposed a hardship, both financially and motivationally, on most of the film creators running independently or in small companies. In other words, they had to make dozens of “economically viable movies” in subcontracting deals with major film studios, solely for their survival and forced to ignore their artistic desires.

**Growth of Alliances and Freelancer Networks**

The studios that had dominated the Japanese film industry for decades began losing their power with the increase in the number of cinema complexes that can flexibly distribute films. The solution that the studios took was to form film promotion alliances with major media corporations such as TV companies, publishers, advertisement agencies, and so on, who were respected for their high organisational competence in film production and promotion. This alliance provided financial, technical, human and promotional resources to filmmakers. Since the collapse of the studio system, creative motion picture producers have avoided the film industry, which suffered from a poor production environment, and have instead concentrated on the TV industry and advertising agencies. Wide diffusion of promotion alliances enabled producers in the media companies to shape their creator communities, resulting in more successful film production. The social networks in their communities facilitated the sequential formation of filmmaking projects.

In the face of such a structural change in film production, and hence the increasing influence of large-scale media companies over the creation of mega hit films, local major studios have come to liaise with these media giants. Nowadays, this form of alliance is seen as the most popular approach. In fact, more than 70% of the annual box office revenue in Japan is generated through this approach (Yamashita & Yamada, 2006).

Although the impact of this “mega alliance” in the Japanese film industry could be transitory, it has made it more obscure and difficult for individuals seeking a career in film creation, since the entire film production sector, except the media giants, is now characterised by a substantial level of fragmentation and subcontracted works for “mega own cinema chains. The intermediation of major Japanese trading companies in such transactions contributed to effective sharing in the expansion of Hollywood films.

Nevertheless, the Japanese film industry has witnessed a series of structural changes since the 1990s, with the emergence of “cinema complexes” run by foreign affiliated companies. Major Hollywood studios also independently expanded their direct distribution of their films in the Japanese market. These firms have rapidly increased their market share, embarking on the efficient operation of “multiplex theatres” via-à-via their Japanese counterparts. This has led to a sudden decline of the major local studios in terms of their market presence. At the same time, the new entry by a group of large-scale media firms (such as publishers, broadcasters, and ad agencies) into the film production sector has diminished the overall influence of major local studios over the clusters of independent film creators. Leadership in the film production sector was thus taken over by these large-scale media companies who capitalise on their expertise and vast resources in promotional activities that can often trigger mega hits from the films they subsidise.
make films with unique features, depending on high performance outcomes, as Schweb and Miner (2008) argue. However, the "kumi" focuses on incremental learning of the unique cinematic taste that has appealed to niche segments of the Japanese market in its past films.

The production team of Takeshi Kitano, a Japanese film director whose films such as "Fireworks" and "Brother" are highly acclaimed both domestically and internationally, is a typical case. Since Kitano started his career as a comedian and had little knowledge about filmmaking, he initially had difficulties in realising his unique cinematic ideas while collaborating with experienced production crews. Now, he mainly employs those who are younger than he and willingly follow his filmmaking style. One characteristic of his films is their background sky colour, or "the Kitano blue" as many people call it. This colouring, which is highly regarded by film critics, was created through collaboration between the director and his young crews in various functions who shared the intended image of his films. This exploration and learning process allowed them to discover how Kitano established his original film style. Having discovered a unique position, they continued their exploration by making interesting film projects with shared knowledge and affordable risk. In other words, only a consistent team could reproduce such colouring on several different film themes. If the key members of a production team frequently change, it takes some time to share the image among new members, and it is also difficult to maintain the same style. Director Kitano's artistic films have regular fans, and he is continuously making films for his specific audience with compassion for his artistic value while further pursuing his own style.

NETWORK AND PERFORMANCE OF JAPANESE FILMMAKERS, 1999 TO 2004

Using the data on staff and rank of Japanese films from 1999 to 2004 and conducting a network analysis on the affiliation networks of Japanese filmmakers, we examine the relationship between network characteristics and the corresponding film performance. As a data source, we used the special issues of the Japanese film magazine "Kine no Junpo (Bi-Monthly Report on Japanese Cinema)," which includes information on films from the previous year, such as profiles, staff and ranking by box office sales and annual film reviewer voting conducted every February. The ranking shows two kinds of film performances: economic and artistic. Using this data, we investigated Japanese films nominated in the top-20 box office points ranking and top-20 artistic points ranking from 1999 to 2004. A total of 207 films were selected from the source as some films overlapped in both ranking categories. We found that 2443 filmmaking staff collaborated in these films. In detail, after we made up an affiliation network of Japanese films and filmmakers, we transformed it into an event overlap network.
among Japanese filmmakers, which means their collaboration network. Through the use of a regression model, we examine how the networks affect their commitment to top-performing film projects.

**Dependent Variables: Individual performance**

The commercial and artistic performance variables of each filmmaker are constructed from the average of the total ranking points of all films for each filmmaker. The ranking points are taken from films with top-20 box office ranking and top-20 artistic ranking from 1999 to 2004. Films that are ranked first are given a performance score of 20, whereas films that are ranked 20th at the box office are given a score of 1. We give two kinds of ranking points for each film: box office and artistic. The former indicates the commercial performance score, which is based on the box office sales. The latter shows the artistic performance score, which is decided every year and is based on the total voting points from major Japanese film reviewers. Next, based on these film ranking scores, we make up the performance scores for individual filmmakers in the same two dimensions. For each individual filmmaker, we sum up the total ranking points from his/her films, and average out the total score per film. We also calculate two kinds of individual scores: commercial and artistic. We refer to the former commercial performance score of an individual filmmaker as “Box office ranking points per film” and the artistic score as the “Artistic ranking points per film.” We use these individual ranking scores as the dependent variables, that is, the individual performance score.

**Independent Variables: Network and Filming Experience Variables**

Based on our hypothesis, we use four network variables and four filming experience variables as independent variables. First, using UCINET VI (Borgatti et al., 2002), we calculate four network variables from the collaboration networks among filmmakers: degree centrality, number of repeated ties, cut-points and closeness centrality for the six years. Firstly, while the degree centrality represents the number of ties that each filmmaker has with others, it also implies the number of interacting filmmakers and variety of information and knowledge sources. Secondly, a filmmaker located at a cut-point, or a bridging tie, may have a wider and more open network than one without it; therefore, he or she is likely to access and organise a variety of ideas, knowledge, talent and other relational resources. We count the cut-points of consistent ties because filmmakers shooting more than two top-20 ranked films could, as wokers, have a greater degree of influence on others compared to filmmakers who only have a single top-20 ranked film. Thirdly, the number of repeated ties indicates how many repeated collaborative relationships a filmmaker has with others, which more or less indicates the strength of the ties. We count the number of co-working relationships with others over two films as repeated ties. Where strong ties exist, people communicate more deeply than usual and share specific content with each other. Fourthly, as high close centrality indicates the great extent to which an individual filmmaker is close to others, it also implies that he or she can easily access a variety of resources, ideas or talent that could enhance creativity (Cattani and Ferriani, 2005).

In order to compare career development and network effects, we also use the following four filming experience variables: number of collaborations, number of experienced films, roles per film, ratio of box office ranking films. First, the number of collaborations indicates how many times at a maximum a filmmaker works with others in his or her films in ranking films. Filmmakers with a high score in this category tend to repeat their collaboration with specific persons. Secondly, the number of films counts how many ranking films an individual has created over a six-year career. Thirdly, the number of roles per film indicates how many roles filmmakers take on average per film. In the filmmaking process, filmmakers sometimes take on several roles in the same film, for example director and scriptwriter. This then is a measure of the multiple skills level of an individual filmmaker. Fourth, the ratio of box office ranking films indicates how many box office ranking films account for the total films of an individual filmmaker. We use this ratio as an indicator of the commercial orientation of a filmmaker.

**Filmmaker Network and Performance**

Looking at the data description of network variables in the collaboration network (see Table 1), we find that Japanese filmmakers in the top-20 ranking films collaborate on average with 1.5% of 2443 people. Only 89 filmmakers are located at a bridging position among several groups in repeated ties. They all lie in one collaboration network because several big producers commit to many films and intermediate hundreds of people. Distances within this network are not so different. On average, they have repeated collaboration with 3.96 people. Turning to the overview of their average film experience, we see that they shot on average 1.94 films during these six years and 65.7% of their films were commercial on average. They collaborated with the same filmmakers in 1.6 films. They basically took one role in one film. Additionally, means of dependent variables (box office / artistic ranking points per film) are 6.638 and 4.996, respectively.
### Table 1: Pearson Correlation between Network, Experience Variables and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Degree Centrality</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cut Points</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.422***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Repeated Ties</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>0.811***</td>
<td>0.366***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Closeness Centrality</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.734***</td>
<td>0.289***</td>
<td>0.476***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number of Collaborations</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.820***</td>
<td>0.292***</td>
<td>0.963***</td>
<td>0.543***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Number of Experienced Films</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.699***</td>
<td>0.463***</td>
<td>0.870***</td>
<td>0.607***</td>
<td>0.898***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Roles Per Film</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.050**</td>
<td>-0.013**</td>
<td>-0.014**</td>
<td>-0.063***</td>
<td>0.012**</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Ratio of Box-Office Film Experience</td>
<td>63.71</td>
<td>44.79</td>
<td>0.961***</td>
<td>0.447***</td>
<td>0.845***</td>
<td>0.576***</td>
<td>0.879***</td>
<td>0.613***</td>
<td>0.194***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Box-Office Ranking Point Per Film</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>0.176***</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.118***</td>
<td>0.314***</td>
<td>0.068***</td>
<td>0.069***</td>
<td>-0.064***</td>
<td>0.053***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10Artistic Ranking Point Per Film</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>-0.118***</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.041**</td>
<td>-0.121***</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.071***</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-2.432***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=2334. *p<0.1, **p<0.05, ***p<0.01.

### Table 2: Regression Models of Effects of Network, Film Experience Variables on Commercial Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cut Points</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated Ties</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness Centrality</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Collaborations</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Experienced Films</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles Per Film</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of Box-Office Film Experience</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box-Office Ranking Point Per Film</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Ranking Point Per Film</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Coefficient for independent variables are standardized scores.
opportunities to shoot artistic films from these relationships. Fourthly, the variable of closeness centrality strongly shows an upward trend in both box office and artistic ranking points. This means that those who can more closely access knowledge, ideas, talent and other resources will succeed in filmmaking. Adding to this, we find that the ratio of box office films, which means individual orientation toward commercial success, has a positive effect on box office ranking points and a negative effect on artistic ranking points. This suggests that filmmakers experiencing more commercial films and who are embedded in a commercial filmmaker network tend to join films that perform better commercially. This implies the importance of consistent commitment to special communities of practice in the Japanese filmmaking industry.

Successful "Kumis" in Current Japanese Films

Next, after we transformed the first affiliation network into a network of 207 film projects overlapping over eight members, we analysed it and identified the reappearance of ten successful core crew teams ("Kumis") in the top-20 commercial and artistic films from 1999 to 2004 (See Fig. 1). Since the core crew teams include more than eight persons, as suggested by DeFillippi and Arthur (1998), this film project network actually shows how several successful regular core crew teams including more than eight of the same filmmakers produce a series of films. Identified by clique technique, ten distinguished cohesive ties in it (highlighted in circles in Figure 1) indicate that there are ten successful teams sequentially cooperating in several top-ranking films. In other words, they suggest the reappearance of ten successful teams, "Kumis." Checking the detailed profiles of these successful teams, we classify the ten teams into three types of Japanese team formation: the first type is a famous director leading the teams, the second is Sci-fi movie teams, and the third is a big studio based team. The first includes teams led by famous directors: Yojiro Takita, Yoji Yamada, Nobuhiko Obayashi, Kiyoshi Kurosawa and Takeshi Kitano. For example, one popular team is led by old Yoji Yamada, who directed several series of popular Japanese comedy films such as the old "Terajiro" ("Otoko ha tsuraiyo") with its over 40 films and the more recent "Free and Easy." Both of these two film series have commonly portrayed Japanese human empathy and pathos, attracting an older audience over the long term. The second type includes the production teams of sci-fi movie series such as "Ultraman," the "Masked Rider," and "Godzilla," which are mainly targeted for children. The third includes the "Shochiku Studio" based team.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have identified one special type of social capital that enforces stable and homogenous communities of practice, resulting in the development of a unique local cinematic culture and taste. Many successful Japanese filmmakers have repeatedly formed the same major production teams, "kumi," which often leads to top-performing commercial and/or artistic films in the Japanese context. In response to the rapidly expanding market share of Hollywood movies, Japanese

**Figure 1: Ten Successful Kumis Reappearing in Japanese Film Project Networks.**
filmmakers have sought their own cultural niches. While filmmaker networks entailing the reappearance of the same successful teams are widely observed across Japan, Europe and the United States, the network analysis of a Japanese case revealed that their small number of close, consistent ties facilitate the preservation of a unique film flavour. The networks energise the learning of tacit knowledge and incremental innovation, as special social capital for a stable community of practice. In particular, when filmmakers orientated toward artistic filmmaking show higher closeness centrality or are more embedded in the artistic filmmakers' community, they tend to acquire better job opportunities and higher artistic evaluation. However, bridging and excessive ties are not useful social capital for commercial or artistic filmmaking in Japanese cases. We suppose that filmmakers without bridges or excessive ties can avoid overexposure to novel or heterogeneous information and knowledge so they can retain and improve their unique cinematic taste and style of filmmaking and good reputation. Successful filmmakers making unique films within stable communities of practice such as 'humi' may think that excessive novelty brought by new ties does not necessarily produce excellent films for general audiences or critics and industry professionals.

Hence, this study offers some preliminary insights and new research agenda on the role and impact of repeated team formation in the project-based film industry. Our analysis revealed that cultural integration in project formation has a great impact on success in terms of artistic and commercial value, as a result of shared knowledge. However, further studies should examine the innovation process in exploring dynamic changes of community for longer terms in the industry, given the fact that intermediating networks can promote widespread distribution of new and explicit knowledge, leading to radical innovation. Further research is needed to clarify the true value of closeness, strength and closure of filmmakers' ties as social capital for development of a unique cinematic taste. Such research can be done by widening the period of analysis of networks, cross-industry examining other relevant cases such as the creation of television films, animation programmes and video games, and internationally comparing industrial contexts in film industries.
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ABSTRACT This paper studies the impact of risk project management of film productions on the success of the release of motion picture films. By looking at the production of three Spanish films, the paper analyzes the challenges that producers face throughout the various stages of a film project. It specifically focuses on management's approach to the uncertainty that may arise during the development stage of the project. Four distinct uncertainty types are identified: variation uncertainty, unforeseen uncertainty, unforeseen uncertainty, and chaos. The paper shows how the appearance of different types of uncertainty requires producers to adjust their management style, and how appropriate or inappropriate actions have an impact on the likelihood of an overall successful release of a motion picture.
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Motion picture production and the success of a film at the box office is normally considered to be driven more by the so-called “artistic” considerations and luck than the application of rigorous project management techniques. The objective of this paper is to explore the applicability of project risk management frameworks to the film industry in order to understand how good management of the inherent uncertainty in a film production may increase the likelihood of success of the film's final release. The field is of special interest as, both in the U.S. and Europe, the motion picture industry has evolved into a network of project-based companies. As more and more industries become increasingly project-centric, interest in summarizing the film industry's