

1 Introduction

Studies on cinema have gained greater prominence and relevance, mainly due to the increased participation of the creative industry in general in the 'Gross Domestic Product' of international economies. The Brazilian film industry, for example, is in a moment of expansion of audience and income. According to data from ANCINE (2021), the audience in theaters in 2018 was over 163 million viewers, generating revenue of R \$ 2.458 billion. Between 2009 and 2016, there were successive increases in revenue. However, as of 2017, declines were registered in the collection. In 2018, the drop in revenue compared to the previous year was close to 9.8% in audience presence and in terms of gross income there was 9.5% reduction.

Although studies on cinema in the area of management represent an expressive area in Brazilian production, few come close to the theme proposed in this paper. For example, Gomes, Campos and Pereira (2021), Silveira and Baptista (2020) and Duarte, Teles and Fonseca Filho (2020) deal with the relationship between cinema and tourism. Körössy and Paes (2020) developed bibliometric analysis, guided by academic productions related to film and tourism agenda.

With a complementary approach, Alencar, Santos and Guissoni (2021) link the theme of cinema and tourism with the perspective of the creative economy, and Figueiredo (2019) developed his study within the context of the production system of the film industry in Brazil. Based on the studies presented, although film production is prolific, the approach and scope adopted in this study were not found in the literature, where specific aspects of cinema and tourism related to cinema represent part of the productions, but not with the scope of Brazilian film internationalization in general, and specifically for the European market.

However, this panorama presents significant data due to the international works that had a participation in 2018 of 85.2% of the gross income of the exhibition halls. Foreign films continue to be offered in greater numbers, reaching 61.05% of the total films shown. Coproducing (or even cocreating), a film made with investment by more than one country, has been a mechanism best explored by the Brazilian cinema market as will be presented in this study (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004; Vargo and Lusch, 2004).

Most of these studies have emphasized the internal dynamics or the aesthetic aspect of cinematographic works. With the advancement of globalization, it is imperative to understand how this new reality can influence the cinematographic sector, more specifically the Brazilian industry. This article seeks to identify how the transformations of the national cinematographic field have conditioned or made possible the entry of Brazilian films in the international market (mainly in Europe) since the 1990s, a period of the resumption of cinema in the country.

To serve this purpose, the study will verify the constitution of the field, as well as the identification of dominant and challenging actors and the dynamics of the field. We will seek to understand how the configuration of the field, from the 90s, constrained or made possible the entry of Brazilian films in the international market. Recognition was often attributed to the quality of the works, however the Brazilian cinematographic field shows periods of greater and lesser transit of Brazilian works in foreign markets (regardless of aspects related to quality) signaling the existence of other elements that collaborate in the phenomenon.

From Fligstein's (2001) field perspective, elements can be revealed, whether they are derived from the field of strategic action, dominant actors, challenging actors or governance units as decisive for the commercialization of Brazilian films in other countries. In addition,

the Uppsala School approach was used to understand the dynamics of leaving national works (Brazilian domain) to foreign markets.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Fligstein's Notion of Field

The debate on the field is broad and involves at least three aspects: the approach of Kurt Lewin, the approach of Pierre Bourdieu and the institutional approach, the latter popularized from the work of John Meyer, Walter Powell and Paul DiMaggio. According to Martin (2003, p.16), Kurt Lewin's approach, responsible for bringing the field discussion into social psychology, defines field as “the totality of coexisting facts that are conceived as mutually dependent”. This understanding has Gestalt influence in the sense of totality. In this perspective, behavior is understood as the function of the interaction between personality and environment (one influences the other). Pierre Bourdieu's approach characterizes the field as a kind of dispute arena in which there is (...)

(...) “a network or configuration of objective relationships between positions. These positions are defined objectively, in their existence and in their determination, through the imposition of their occupants, agents or institutions, by the present or potential situation in the distribution of the types of power (or capital) in the structure” (Wacquant and Bourdieu, 1992, p.112).

Wacquant and Bourdieu (1992) treat the field as historical relations between positions anchored in certain forms of power or capital. Both concepts, *habitus* and field, are relational, as they act insofar as they are related to each other. The field cannot be understood as a dead structure or empty space, but as a space at stake that exists as players enter according to what they believe and have to seek a certain reward. According to DiMaggio (1979), although Bourdieu presents a promising approach, some criticisms can be addressed, such as: the type of writing immersed in paradox; denial and controversy (making his work less accessible to the reader and using a less familiar language); central concepts such as *habitus*, capital and relative autonomy are unfinished or ambiguous.

Finally, the institutionalist field approach will define it as "the result of diverse activities by a group of organizations and also as the process of homogenizing these organizations as well as new entrants, once this field is established" and attributed to "organizations together that constitute a recognized area of institutional life: main suppliers, resources and consumers, regulatory agencies and other organizations that produce services or similar products "(DiMaggio and Powell, 1983, p.148).

Fligstein (2001) and Fligstein and MacAdams (2009) will expand the notion of the field by proposing the idea of the market as a field. The authors seek to delimit the market frontier, identify the players and understand how social relationships and cultural understanding create stable fields to solve the problems of competition and uncertainty. Such proposition is characterized by a cultural and political approach, in which a given field is composed of collective actors who seek to establish a system of domination in this space.

For this, it is necessary that there is a local culture that establishes social relations between the actors. This local culture is developed by cognitive elements, which are interpretive pictures of the actors that determine social relationships and contribute to people understanding their own position. The interpretative frames allow the actor to make the movements of the other actors who have some social relationship at a given significant

moment. Thus, the movements in the field become a game, where each group located in this space endowed with a certain power, uses the rules accepted culturally to reproduce their power and sustain their stability of the field.

For Fligstein (2001), certain strategies of the game can be used by dominators or by a coalition of firms to achieve an advantage and stabilize their position. Two reasons are connected with social relations, as it is called control projects and are related to the field constitution. The first refers to the battle for power within the organization and how it is organized and how its product is perceived by the market. The second is attributed to actors in dominant or challenging firms who must distinguish the implications of stabilization in the field between firms in the field.

This understanding of interactions is provided by them through interpretations of the behavior of other firms. On the other hand, the concept of control, another concept introduced by the author, is attributed to the organization's history and how it acts face to face with the main competitor. It is also referred to the interpretative framework used to understand and justify actions against others.

Fligstein's (2001) theoretical field framework includes the following elements: strategic field of action; dominators, challengers and governance units; social skill. Strategic Field of Action (SFA) is understood to mean a social order of meso level, in which actors (both individual or collective) interact with each other's knowledge, through a common set of understandings about the purposes, the relationship (the holder of power and why), the rules of the field and the situation of the field, where the actors have a cognitive framework, allowing an understanding of movement by other actors in the field. Dominators are those actors who wield disproportionate influence within the field and tend to have their interests and views reflected in the SFA domain, while challengers occupy a less privileged location within the field and rarely impose any influence on the operations of a respective market.

The governance unit, in turn, has the purpose of inspecting the rules of the field, ensuring the general functioning of the system. Finally, social skill refers to the cognitive capacity of individual actors and in reading people and the environment, enabling decision-making of the best lines of action and the mobilization of these people at the service of this framework of action in the SFA (Fligstein, 2001).

Wotten and Hoffmann (2008) aiming to give more space to the agency in neo institutionalist studies, they resume the concept of field, performing a rapprochement with the approach of Pierre Bourdieu. Thus, they present the field as a relational space, emphasizing the notion that organizations become connected within the same field when they become aware of another. In this work, we chose, in order to explain the dynamics of a specific market (the cinematographic market) by the approach of Neil Fligstein and his collaborators.

2.2 The Internationalization Process

The concept of internationalization offers plural definitions. According to Welch and Loustarinen (1988) internationalization is the process of involvement in the international operations. The importance of employing a broad concept is due to both sides of the process, in terms of entry and exit, becoming intimately connected with the dynamics of international trade. According to Carneiro and Dib (2007), occurs in several dimensions. It is a process that occurs over time, in which an organization presents a gradual involvement in actions outside the country of origin.

This involvement can include raw materials or finished products of a company or even include phases of its value chain. Tay mentions (2008) that the growth of a specific business

makes it natural to expand to other contexts, markets and countries. Internationalization “can enable the firm to gain competitive advantage” (Osland et al., 2001, p.153).

In order to appreciate the cinema internationalization, the Uppsala Theory was chosen. This approach provides a different analytical tool making it possible to reaffirm or confront different responses. The economic approaches, when treating the social and cultural aspects as residuals to explain the economic action, are insufficient as an explanatory framework to elucidate the aspects that justify the situation of the immersion of Brazilian cinematographic works to the international market. An approach that takes into account the particular factors of cinema is necessary, covering the social and cultural context.

According to Fachinelli et al. (2013), the behavioral approach originates from the Uppsala School. During the 1950s and 1960s, a series of empirical studies enabled the development of this perspective. The Uppsala School admits that the greatest difficulty in the internationalization process is the scarcity of knowledge. Thus, the knowledge assimilated by the company, derived from experience in foreign markets, is a fundamental element for the internationalization.

For Hilal and Hemais (2003) the traditional Uppsala School model understands that in a given saturated domestic market and with lucrative opportunities abbreviated to the point of restricting the company's growth, other places for expansion should be sought. As vertical expansion is disregarded due to high uncertainty and unprofitability, the next step is generally to move towards geographic expansion.

The Uppsala School emphasizes the non-economic aspects in the decision to operate in international markets. Internationalization ends up taking place gradually, with a progressive degree of commitment in each of these markets. The starting point hovers over the uncertainty arising from doing business in foreign markets, due to the lack of knowledge and the lack of resources.

This behavior is conditioned by the “psychic distance”, defined as the sum of factors that hinder the exchange of information to and from the foreign market (language, culture, economy, etc.). Faced with this scenario, companies tend to seek, at the beginning, trade with companies belonging to countries seen as more similar to domestic (with less psychic distance) and, only later, address those in which the economic and cultural conditions are more different from the country of origin, with greater psychic distance (Fachinelli et al., 2013). It is the process of internationalization centered on the acquisition, integration and use of knowledge about foreign markets and operations in a gradual manner, increasing involvement (Johanson and Vahlne, 1977). Foreigner markets are seen as an extension of domestic market operations (one step at a time), entering the foreign market gradually and systematically.

The basic approach of this school follows incremental patterns. Acquired knowledge and acquired circumstantial experience configure what is classified by Johanson and Vahlne (1977) as experiential knowledge, which is acquired through successive performance in the foreign market. Knowledge generated by the experience enables the firm to ‘feel’, in order to understand when it is possible to enter concrete opportunities to act in the foreign market. Knowledge may emerge from the company's national bases of action, but it must be improved in the new market.

The model proposed by the Uppsala School culminates in the analysis of “learning and knowledge development in internationalization processes” (Rezende, 2006, p.3), and deepens the idea of knowledge based on experience, which represents the essence of the process of expansion to foreign markets. There are criticisms of the model, which is considered more

effective for explaining initial internationalization processes, which in turn is not enough in more complex situations, but fits to this study.

3 Research Method

This study is characterized by a qualitative design. The paper has a deductive character, since it does not start from previously formulated hypotheses. The technical procedure of the research is the case study. For Yin (1981), case study does not obtain a single type of evidence, and it can be elaborated from qualitative and quantitative information. Evidence can be obtained from fieldwork, recordings, verbal reports or observations.

For the analysis of this study, secondary data from bodies linked to the cinema were used, specialized sources such as the European Audiovisual Observatory, Film B, ANCINE, as well as specialized literature. This analysis model allows the use of a combination with other research methods. Qualitative studies are elaborated with the use of multiple sources, contributing to the information convergence (Bowen, 2009).

The cut for analysis of the present work is Brazilian cinematographic works or joint productions between Brazil and other countries, shown in Europe from 1996 to 2019. Subsequently, there was a detail of the internationalization of Brazilian cinema from the 1990s from the database of the European Audiovisual Observatory and ANCINE, comprising the general characteristics of the works that had greater penetration in the foreign market. Then the internationalization process is analyzed through the lens of the Uppsala School. Finally, it is pointed out the factors that conditioned and those that made possible the exit of Brazilian cinematographic works.

The Lumière database was used to select the films. This tool provides a systematic compilation of audience data for films released in European cinemas since 1996. This database is the result of collaboration between the European Audiovisual Observatory and several specialized national sources, as well as the European Union Media Program.

4 Configuration of the Brazilian Cinematographic Works and Exhibition Abroad

Through the evolution of the national cinematographic field during the 20th century, the presence of several actors in its structure became evident, which can be divided into representatives of the cinematographic chain and public agents. The first group is made up of producers, distributors, technical industry and exhibitors. In the governmental sphere, when observing the movement of internationalization of national films, ANCINE stands out as the cinema regulator, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as the promoter of bilateral partnerships abroad and APEX as an interlocutor in the promotion of the national cinematographic industry. To understand the dynamics of the representatives of the cinematographic chain, it is essential to understand the main actors in these categories.

Film production is formed by three different stages: pre-production, production and post-production. In pre-production, in addition to writing the script, technical analysis takes place in order to predict the costs of human and technical capital for the execution of the film. It is usually the producer's responsibility to seek resources through financing mechanisms, subsidies or advertising. At this stage, the choice of actors, filming locations, costumes and sets occurs. Production is the phase that accompanies the execution of the film, through the control of the ways necessary to make the work. In the post-production phase, the producer is directed to carry out the copies, promotion and distribution of the finished film nationally and abroad (INFOPEDIA, 2013).

From the mid 1990s, Brazilian cinema regained its importance in the national and international market. This change occurred due to several factors, such as the increase in investments for the national films, the expansion of the production of local films and also the increase in the participation of national films in Brazil. The resumption of activity with a more positive performance in the domestic market creates opportunities for new destinations for national films in international markets.

According to the European Audiovisual Observatory (2021), through a selection of works with an audience of more than 10 thousand spectators, between 1996 and 2019 117 films were shown in Europe. This adopted filter allows the exclusion of films shown at festivals and documentaries for specific purposes. This set of works totaled a spectator audience of 27,389,758 in 36 European countries, representing an average of 234 thousand spectators per film. Among these, had films shown in a single country, while others like "Ad Astra" shown in 32 countries. In addition to this, the films "Me chame pelo seu nome", "Sal da Terra" and "Na estrada" gained significant access in Europe, reaching audiences in 30, 28 and 24 countries, respectively.

Of this sample, 54 works had the majority of investments in Brazil (46.15%), reaching an audience of 7,876,330. Films with minority investment represent 53.84% of the sample and an audience of 19,513,428. On a preliminary check, it can be inferred that the resource amount is not a barrier to display in the European market. However, with regard to performance, when investigating the average attendance of films with minority and majority investment (146,857 and 309,736), it is possible to see that the works that count on investment from more countries tend to have more than twice as much. Highlighting the importance of what Fligstein (2001) conceptualizes as a coalition of firms to obtain an advantage and stabilize their position. In this case, challenging producers have the opportunity to ally themselves with other foreign ones, allowing the opening of opportunities or taking over spaces not occupied by the dominant ones.

The national distribution of the analyzed works had access to only 97 films (out of 117), of which 20 were distributed by majors. Here are considered the major companies Columbia, MGM, Paramount, Sony Pictures, Twenty Century Fox, Universal Warner Bros. and Walt Disney (ie, 20.6% of works with distributor identification). These films were responsible for an audience of 3,818,981 (13.94%) people on the European continent. If we evaluate the average audience of distributing films by majors and the others, we will have respectively 190,949 and 242,997 (including works with unknown producers). Thus, it is understood that the departure of the cinematographic work outside Brazil does not depend on the distributor's origin and can be considered challenging in the field.

Regarding producers, the 117 films analyzed had 84 different producers (six of these films it was not possible to verify this information). In terms of number of works, Videofilmes Produções Artísticas (10), O2 Cinema (6), Guliane (5), Conspiração Filmes (3) and Filmes do Equador (3). These works belonging to these four producers totaled an audience of 5,869,688 in the European market (21.43% of the total audience). The average attendance of films produced by the above companies and the others was 217,395 and 239,111. Therefore, it is possible to infer that the producer is not a link in the chain that guarantees greater assistance in the European market. However, the name of the producer can facilitate or enable a greater number of works. Like distributors, producers are challenging in the dynamics of the cinematographic field.

In the period analyzed, there were 92 different directions for the 117 films. The directors with the most works were Fernando Meirelles (3), José Padilha (2) and Walter Salles (5), totaling an audience of 1,803,332 (6.58% of the total). When evaluating this category, it is

understood that the direction is a factor that can facilitate to run new productions, but not in terms of representing a significant impact on the European box office.

Over the period analyzed, 15 Brazilian films were nominated/or awarded the Oscar awards, Cannes Film Festival, Berlin Festival and Venice International Film Festival (Here, Oscar and Cannes nominations and main category awards were considered at the Berlin and Venice festivals). These films attracted a total of 10,620,229 European viewers. This number represents an average of 708,015 spectators per work. Festivals legitimize the work on the international scene. Thus, it is possible to affirm that the festival is the best way for the internationalization of Brazilian film and the largest propagator, allowing access to a greater number of markets.

By evaluating the movement from national works to foreign markets, through the Theory of Internationalization of the Uppsala School, it was possible to establish relevant connections through the analysis of the following elements: the reason that leads to internationalization, how the choice of markets was made and how the insertion in the global market took place. Regarding the modes of entry into the international market, the main strategies adopted are indirect export, export through a subsidiary of a producer or distributor abroad. The companies rarely established a group of partners (producer, distributor, sales agent) from the beginning of the project, that is, guaranteeing the feasibility of marketing before the film was conceived. Regarding the reason for internationalization, an inconsistency was found. While Uppsala's Theory understands the internationalization process as a response to the saturated domestic market, in the national film industry, the strategy corresponds to an alternative action, becoming more evident as the discussions around the retaking of the space of the national films in Brazilian cinemas (in response to the predominance of North American works).

Among the countries with the highest number of spectators in the European market, Germany, Spain, Italy, Portugal, France and England stand out, representing more than 76,66% of the public attending the works analyzed in the European continent. Regarding the choice of markets, a strong cultural relationship was perceived. From this group of countries, four of them, or 2/3 of them, have a Latin language, that is, they have a cultural narrowness. Germany has historical ties with Brazil due to the flow of immigrants to Brazil. In England, in the opposite direction, it presents an important stronghold of Brazilians. By taking as base only the Latin-speaking countries and Germany, due to cultural and historical ties, the psychic distance helps in understanding the entry of Brazilian works in these markets.

The way in which Brazilian film producers and distributors enter foreign markets in general is not planned (although there are exceptions such as in Flores Raras by Bruno Barreto), national films in general find their distribution channels through negotiation at festivals or international shows. Although co-productions adopt a different path, as their distribution in producer markets is guaranteed, it follows the same logic with regard to distribution in markets other than producers. This accidental process is characterized as an important property of the Uppsala School, which understands the internationalization process as incremental, in which knowledge is gradually acquired in the foreign market.

5 Conclusion

When evaluating the market as a field, it is imperative to specify the players and understand how social relationships and cultural understanding take place in order to reduce the difficulties of competition and uncertainty. The cinematographic field includes a group of actors (producers, distributors, directors, exhibitors and regulatory bodies), collective and

individual, who lead to stability in the field. In the dynamics of foreign trade, the main existing actors are: producers, distributors, directors, APEX, ANCINE and Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

At the national level, local culture makes it possible to understand the internal dynamics of the field. The agent responsible for initiating the process is the producer who makes the production process feasible through the design of the project (film) and also by gathering the necessary financial resources for the production of the film. The governance units provide opportunities for fundraising mechanisms and regulate the functioning of other actors in the film chain: production, distribution and exhibition. Although this relationship seems simple and perfect, the analyzed strategic field of action is located in a larger field, the international cinematographic field. While Brazil has its share of contribution, other countries contribute to this articulation. Just as the national cinematographic segment influences other strategic fields of action (French, German, British market), foreign cinematographic fields intervene in the internal dynamics of Brazil.

In this juncture of international dynamics, the Brazilian cinematographic field is in a position where the international field exerts power, dominating the national field, largely due to the performance of the North American cinematographic field. Thus, national films end up occupying a small portion of this space due to these interpretative frameworks previously established between major distributors and national exhibitors. Brazilian governance units, despite establishing protection mechanisms for national works, end up helping national masters, rarely imposing more effective restrictions or barriers against the entry of foreign works.

Producers, distributors and the director are important aspects, but they do not directly interfere in a greater advantage for entry into the domestic market. As for the directors, there is an important caveat, they can facilitate the search for resources and the ability to produce more films compared to others. In the dynamics of the domestic market, Fernando Meirelles, José Padilha and Walter Salles can be considered dominant, as they have the capacity to gather the necessary conditions for the production of more works than the others. But this advantage, given the data collected, does not provide a differential in foreign markets.

Festivals and awards operate as legitimizers in the international context. Even though they do not function as an agent, these places enhance the performance of films, creating interest from international exhibitors. Through the collected data, it was noticed that a film recognized at a festival has greater chances of reaching different markets than works restricted to internal exhibitions. Therefore, the festival offers the greatest capacity for the internationalization of films in the international context.

The role of the governance units is essential to enable the output of works from the Brazilian cinematographic field to the international market. ANCINE's regulatory and fostering role, together with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, is significant for bilateral partnerships. ANCINE manages fundraising policies and assists Brazilian works in reaching larger collections and, through this, increases the possibilities of sending Brazilian works abroad. APEX, through the sectorial program, allows the discussion and search for international channels for national works. This dynamic of these agents corroborates the stimulus needed to increase the capacity of the cinematographic field. On the other hand, the criticisms of ANCINE regarding the formalistic requirements for co-productions and, of the government, in the regulation of specific policies, end up imposing barriers for challenging producers. With this, the role of the governance units ends up favoring, in many cases, the dominant actors in the field.

Through the lens of Uppsala Theory, it was possible to verify the congruent aspects present in this study, such as the higher incidence of Brazilian works in countries that have a smaller psychic distance and the internationalization process in an incremental way. An aspect that departs from the theory is the reason for internationalization, as it does not occur from the saturated internal market,

The way in which Brazilian film producers and distributors enter foreign markets in general is not planned (although there are exceptions such as in Flores Raras by Bruno Barreto), national films in general find their distribution channels through negotiation at festivals or international shows. Although co-productions adopt a different path, as their distribution in producer markets is guaranteed, it follows the same logic with regard to distribution in markets other than producers. This accidental process is characterized as an important property of the Uppsala School, which understands the internationalization process as incremental, in which knowledge is gradually acquired in the foreign market. For future studies, the application of this study in other continents is suggested to enrich the debate on the subject.

References

Alencar, D. G., Santos, M. L. D., & Guissoni, R. (2021). Creative Economy, Cinema and Tourism: A Study about the Movie Os Xeretas in the City of Castro/ Paraná – Brazil. *Revista de Turismo Contemporâneo*, 9(1), 104-125.

ANCINE. (2021). Agência Nacional do Cinema: Ministério da Cidadania. Governo Federal. Informações sobre Cinema Brasileiro. Available in: <www.ancine.gov.br>. Access: July 20, 2021.

Bowen, A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9 (2): 27-40.

Carneiro, J. & Dib, L. (2007). Avaliação Comparativa do Escopo Descritivo e Explanatório dos Principais Modelos de Internacionalização de Empresas. *INTERNEXT: Revista Eletrônica de Negócios Internacionais da ESPM*, 2 (1): 1-25.

Cinema do Brasil. (2012). O Programa Cinema do Brasil visa Promover o Cinema Brasileiro no Mercado Externo e Desenvolver Condições Favoráveis para a Atuação das Empresas Nacionais no Exterior. Available in: <<http://www.cinemado brasil.org.br>>. Access: January 20, 2012.

Dimaggio, J. (1979). Review Essay: On Pierre Bourdieu. *American Journal of Sociology*, 84 (6): 1460-1474.

Duarte, R., Teles, A., & Fonseca Filho, A. (2020). O Turismo Cinematográfico pelas Lentes da Teoria do Ator-Rede. *Turismo: Visão e Ação*, 22(3), 485-507.

Fachinelli, A. C.; Luchesi, J. R.; Crespi, K. M. & Machado, R. (2013). Inteligência Competitiva e Distância Psíquica no Setor Moveleiro. *Faces: Revista de Administração*, 12: 28-43.

Figueiredo, J. L. (2019). O sistema produtivo da indústria do cinema brasileiro e sua dispersão concentrada. *Gestão e Desenvolvimento*, 16(2), 62-94.

Fligstein, N. (2001). *The Architecture of Markets: An Economic Sociology of Capitalist Societies*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Gomes, C. L., Campos, J. L. A., & Pereira, J. K. C. (2021). Tessituras das Paisagens Mineiras no Programa Filme em Minas: Desafios para o Turismo Cinematográfico. *Turismo: Visão e Ação*, 23(2), 288-307.

Hilal, A. & Hemais, A. (2003). O Processo de Internacionalização na Ótica da Escola Nórdica: Evidências Empíricas em Empresas Brasileiras. *Revista de Administração Contemporânea*, 7 (1): 109-124.

Johanson, J. & Vahlne, J.-E. (1977). The Internationalization Process of the Firm: A Model of Knowledge Development and Increasing Foreign Market Commitments. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 8 (1): 23-32.

Körössy, N., & Paes, R. G. D. S. (2020). A Produção Científica Brasileira sobre Turismo Cinematográfico: Uma Análise Bibliométrica de 2011 a 2018. *Rosa dos Ventos - Turismo e Hospitalidade*, 12(4), 1064-1078.

Martin, J. (2003). What is Field Theory? *American Journal of Sociology*, 109: 1-49.

Osland, G. E.; Taylor, C. R. & Zou, S. (2001). Selecting International Modes of Entry and Expansion. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 19 (3): 153-161.

Prahalad, C. K. & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-Creation Experiences: The Next Practice in Value Creation. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18 (3): 5-14.

Produtores.TV (2015). O produtores.tv.br é um portal de notícias sobre audiovisual e do Pólo Cinematográfico de Paulínia. Available in: <produtores.tv.br>. Access: April 03, 2015.

Rezende, S. F. L. (2006). Multinationals and Interdependence in Internationalisation Processes. *BAR: Brazilian Administration Review*, 3 (1): art.1, 1-16.

Schneider, L. G. & Lopes, F. D. (2016). As Transformações do Campo Cinematográfico no Brasil e suas Implicações sobre a Entrada do Filme Nacional no Mercado Europeu. In: *VII Encontro de Marketing da ANPAD, EMA*.

Silveira, V. P., & Baptista, M. L. C. (2020). Turismo e Cinema: Produção Cinematográfica e Atratividade Turística em Garibaldi-RS, Brasil. *Rosa dos Ventos - Turismo e Hospitalidade*, 12(4), 982-996.

Spink, K. (2003). Pesquisa de Campo em Psicologia Social: Uma perspectiva Pós-Constructivista. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, 15 (2): 18-42.

Tay, F. (2008). Which Market, What Entry Strategy? *Market in Focus*. Available in: <<http://www.singapura-management.com/Downloads/MIF.pdf>>. Access: March 30, 2008.

Vargo, S. L. & LUSCH, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a New Dominant Logic for Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 68: 1-17.

Yin, R. K. (1981). The Case Study Crisis: Some Answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26: 58-65.

Wacquant, L. (2007). Esclarecer o Habitus. *Educação & Linguagem*, 10: 63-71.

Welch, S. & Loustarinen, R. (1988). Internationalization: Evolution of a Concept. *Journal of General Management*, 14 (2): 34-55.

Wooten, M. & Hoffman, A. (2008). Organizational Fields: Past, Present and Future. In: Greenwood, R; Oliver, C.; Suddaby, R & Sahlin, K. (Org.). *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*, 130-147. California: Sage.