

Journal of Scandinavian Cinema
Volume 4 Number 1

© 2014 Intellect Ltd Article. English language. doi: 10.1386/jzca.4.1.35_1

short subject

OLOF HEDLING
Lund University

PELLE SNICKARS
Umeå University

Film studies anno 2013: A bird's eye view

ABSTRACT

1. *This short subject assessing the current*
2. *state of the academic field of film stud-*
3. *ies as practiced at sites of higher learn-*
4. *ing in Sweden is based on experiences*
5. *and knowledge the co-authors gained*
6. *as members of a national committee*
7. *to evaluate the 'academic quality' of*
8. *programmes from a comparative point*
9. *of view.*

- 10.
- 11.
12. During the autumn of 2012 an
13. e-mail from the Swedish Higher
14. Education Authority (Universitetska-
15. nslersämbetet) dropped down in
16. our mailboxes. Cordial in tone, the
17. letter informed us that our domestic

peers had nominated us to be part of a group of examiners whose task would be to evaluate the subject of film studies – together with five other humanities disciplines (musicology, art history, theatre, fashion and textile studies) during the upcoming national teaching quality assurance assessment. After presenting the terms, while at the same time suggesting the significance of the task, the letter spelled out the conditions that would attend our agreement to participate.

What was not spelled out was that ever since its introduction, the evaluations have been controversial, considered ludicrous by some and dubious at best by a number of

KEYWORDS

film studies
New Public
Management
Swedish humanities
audit culture
history of film studies
academic culture

1. English or Swedish language presentations (not every place seems to have an English language homepage) of the various Swedish film studies units discussed in the article may be found at the following homepages: Gävle (www.hig.se/Ext/Sv/Organisation/Akademier/Akademier-for-utbildning-och-ekonomi/In-English/Faculty-of-Education-and-Business-Studies-Departments/Department-of-Humanities/Film-Studies.html?), Göteborg (www.kultur.gu.se/english/disciplines/film-studies/?languageId=100001&disableRedirect=true&returnUrl=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.kultur.gu.se%2Famnen%2Ffilmvetenskap%2F), Halmstad (www.hh.se/hum/student/kurser/filmvetenskap.3169.html), Karlstad (www.kau.se/utbildning/kurser/amne/am1005), Lund (www.sol.lu.se/filmvetenskap/), Stockholm (www.ims.su.se/english/section-for-cinema-studies), Växjö (<http://lnu.se/subjects/film-studies?l=en>) and Örebro (http://lily.oru.se/studieinformation/kurs_lista.cgi?amnekod=FVA&lasar=2011/2012).

professional academics as well as universities. Accordingly, accepting would mean that we would align ourselves with an 'accreditation agency' and its characteristic discourses of suspicion, supervision and inspection that unmistakably form crucial parts of the principles of New Public Management (NPM), a controversial and often despised scheme that presently is much interrogated, not just in Sweden but globally (Lorenz 2012).

In fact, during our final examination work, the daily *Svenska Dagbladet* published a heated opinion piece by two vice-chancellors and their deputies (at Lund and Uppsala Universities), who fiercely assailed the current evaluation practice, describing it as a system of distrust as well as 'unilaterally focused on control and disciplinary action' (Åkesson et al. 2013). The current 'crisis of confidence' must be acknowledged, they claimed, with an urgent need to 'create an evaluation system that is recognized internationally and has legitimacy in the [academic] sector' (Åkesson et al. 2013).

Viewed from this perspective, our task appeared somewhat different. After all, what we were asked to do was to play devil's advocate in relation to the work of our own long-time peers, colleagues and even, in a sense, rivals. Nevertheless, agree we did, believing some kind of evaluation system is necessary even if the present one may be riddled by imperfections. In addition, our cohorts could certainly do worse than ending up with us as their adversaries.

Another cause for complying, furthermore, was that we assumed the undertaking could provide us with a unique bird's-eye view of the current state of a field that we in different ways have a certain stake in: the domestic academic discipline of film studies and its structural make-up.¹

BACKGROUND

In Sweden, film studies was officially introduced into higher education in 1969, when Stockholm University introduced a one-year undergraduate course entirely devoted to film studies. The idea partly stemmed from various initiatives at the Swedish Film Institute during the 1960s. Its founder Harry Schein, for instance, had set up a 'film research group' (*filmforskningsgruppen*) to address censorship issues under the premise that the film experience should not be regarded as dangerous, with unprotected minds running the risk of negative effects and influences. On the contrary film was an art form that could be studied in its own right (Vesterlund forthcoming).

Meanwhile, it was decided that a department that previously had been dedicated to theatre history would add 'and Cinema Arts' to its name. The following year a professor and several lecturers were appointed, and shortly thereafter an undergraduate major was established. While a first set of doctoral candidates enrolled in 1972, the first Ph.D., perhaps paradoxically, had already been awarded the previous year (Bolin and Forsman 1998: 42). The subject matter immediately proved popular with undergraduates and soon attracted large numbers (Waldekranz 1995: 80).

For some time, though, further development was limited, at least from a national perspective. Consequently, in the early 1990s, only Stockholm was offering any sort of comprehensive curriculum. By this time film studies had become an autonomous department, separate from theatre history. Against this background, Jan Olsson, at the time a recently appointed professor, suggested that an additional, second department of film studies be established elsewhere. Simultaneously, however, he cautioned against other forms of growth. When

1. a number of provincial colleges and
 2. universities proposed offering under-
 3. graduate courses, often with a mini-
 4. mum number of faculty, Olsson saw
 5. this prospect as short-sighted and less
 6. desirable, if not outright destructive
 7. (1995: 84). To place Olsson's remarks
 8. in context, they were put forth at a
 9. time when Swedish governments
 10. were stepping up their expansion of
 11. higher education, a development that
 12. would last well into the first decade
 13. of the new millennium but eventually
 14. come to a halt.

15. There is cause for returning to
 16. Olsson's argument, but for now, the
 17. abovementioned suggestion can be
 18. kept in mind as the contemporary
 19. landscape of Swedish film studies is
 20. considered. At the moment, under-
 21. graduate courses are offered at seven
 22. Swedish universities or colleges: at
 23. Stockholm, Växjö, Göteborg, Lund,
 24. Gävle, Karlstad and Halmstad, to
 25. put them in order of the number of
 26. students they admit at that level.
 27. One more university, Örebro, offers
 28. a similar curriculum, but for admin-
 29. istrative reasons – film studies is
 30. strongly linked to the university's
 31. media and communication studies
 32. programme – it was not included in
 33. the assessment. There are also other
 34. universities, among them Umeå, that
 35. offer film studies *lite* as a package
 36. coupled with other subjects such as
 37. drama and theatre. Moreover, during
 38. the last decade, two further colleges
 39. have introduced the discipline, only
 40. to abandon it a few years later.

41. Among the seven, only Stockholm
 42. offers regular M.A. courses (advanced
 43. level courses as they are labelled in
 44. Sweden), with two alternative paths
 45. of study. Other masters programmes
 46. with content related to film stud-
 47. ies exist, notably in Göteborg and
 48. Lund, but for a variety of reasons
 49. neither was evaluated. Doctoral
 50. programmes at Stockholm, Göteborg
 51. and Lund were slated for inclusion
 52. in the assessment but eliminated

due to lack of funding. At this level
 Stockholm dominates because the
 number of available doctoral fellow-
 ships is larger than at Lund or the
 comparatively new programme at
 Göteborg. Ph.D. degrees with a film
 studies focus have also been awarded
 at Örebro, although formally these
 have been in the field of media
 and communication studies.

It may appear that the discipline
 has grown quite extensively during
 the last two decades. Contrary to
 Olsson's suggestion, however, the
 expansion has not come in the form
 of an additional comprehensive
 department. Rather the increase has
 been twofold. On the one hand, the
 subject has grown considerably at
 Stockholm, now among the larger
 units of its kind in Europe. Almost
 30 individuals – professors, lecturers,
 part-time instructors as well as post-
 docs, doctoral candidates and visiting
 professors on fixed-term contracts –
 at present are affiliated with the
 department. On the other hand,
 the development of the film studies
 field has seen a rapid proliferation of
 undergraduate courses at a number of
 universities and colleges, from Lund
 in the south to Gävle in the north.

However, since the tendency
 today is that departments are merg-
 ing (forming larger administrative
 units), the paradox is that currently
 no single university department is
 primarily dedicated to film, cinema or
 film and television studies. Even the
 unit at Stockholm has been merged
 into a larger entity – the Department
 of Media Studies – housing a number
 of disciplines. Accordingly, global
 developments within the academic
 world towards ever larger units, not
 only the demand for undergraduate
 courses that Olsson identified, may
 have played a part in the ensuing
 geography of the discipline. Though
 the Stockholm branch of film studies
 has been and continues to be strong,
 it remains to be seen whether the

merger between film and media, logical albeit somewhat odd since film has always been a medium, will prove productive from a film studies perspective. Still, from a bird's-eye view and with regard to size and the number of faculty employed, differences are drastic. A rough estimate indicates that approximately 50 per cent of the 30 or so film studies scholars employed in tenured positions in Sweden work at Stockholm University, while the rest populate the six other units where the discipline is taught. Among the latter, furthermore, the number of tenured faculty ranges from one to five, meaning that the second and third largest units, Lund and Växjö, are barely one-third of Stockholm's size in this respect.

CONDITIONS OF WORK

In his 1995 review, Olsson observed that by the mid-1990s, teaching and tutoring were increasingly performed by faculty with Ph.D.s. He ventured that this development signified the 'normalization' of film studies, implying that the union of teaching and research in the work of the individual scholar finally was on the horizon (much along the influential ideals famously put forth by German educator Wilhelm von Humboldt more than two centuries ago). From now on, he wrote, 'lecturers with PhDs will get external research grants, will participate in international exchange, present at conferences and publish research and information about research' (Olsson 1995: 84).

Although at present all tenured Swedish film studies scholars have Ph.D.s – a few from abroad, which suggests a nascent globalization of the Swedish academic world – far from all are entitled or able to embrace this conception of academic work. People no doubt strive towards that goal, yet teaching loads are quite heavy. During our evaluation, we observed

that undergraduate teaching and an assortment of administrative tasks dominate by far as the primary duties on most of the work description lists provided for the assessment. This is nothing new, of course. Still, it reflects the distribution of research funding, which is inadequate and dispersed on the basis of individual scholarly excellence through specific, designated governmental organizations rather than by universities. From a national perspective, research funding is exceedingly skewed with regard to certain domestic sites, individuals and to some extent types of employment.

In fact, it can be claimed that higher education in Sweden left the ideals of Humboldt by the roadside as teaching and research became gradually dissociated in the 1960s and 1970s. In the social sciences and the humanities this development – promoted through the motto that only excellence can (and will) be supported – has increased during the last fifteen years or so. Consequently, seen as a collective, the Stockholm scholars are the group that has been most consistently and systematically successful in securing funding, and hence in combining teaching with a sustained and extensive commitment to research. Furthermore, the unit has been proclaimed a 'profiled' discipline within its own university, which probably means further advantages in comparison to its competitors.

Individual scholars outside this particular environment have been able to make significant and lasting contributions as well, although rarely in the same continuous way. Nevertheless, and to connect to an earlier mapping of the field inspired by the concepts of Pierre Bourdieu; within the hierarchical and strictly formalized structure that is Swedish academic film studies, the power connected with research funding, participation in international exchange and publishing has largely

1. remained with Stockholm during the
2. time period marked by strong expansion
3. of the domestic field (cf. Bolin
4. and Forsman 1998: 37).

5. From yet another viewpoint,
6. concerned with what and in what
7. way students are being taught, there
8. are both vast similarities and certain
9. differences. On the one hand, various
10. takes on fundamental film history,
11. national cinema, introduction to film
12. theory and some forays into television
13. still loom large in many a basic
14. curriculum. On the other hand,
15. recurrent words in present course
16. titles and descriptions, such as digital
17. convergence, inter-art perspectives,
18. world cinema and production studies,
19. would probably not have occurred
20. as frequently a decade or two ago.
21. Moreover, it is possible to detect slight
22. biases towards certain key areas. At
23. certain universities the general thrust
24. of the teaching seems to be more
25. sociologically inclined, mainly situat-
26. ing film as a social, political and soci-
27. etal phenomenon, while elsewhere
28. aesthetics, theory and a fondness for
29. specific, occasionally rare filmic forms
30. appears more pronounced.

31. Additionally, instruction in practical
32. film-making and editing is offered
33. in two or three programmes. Others,
34. meanwhile, exclude such matters,
35. whether due to a lack of technical
36. and economic means or the belief
37. that this is not what academic film
38. studies are about and merely acts as a
39. diversion from the core historical and
40. theoretical curriculum. Interestingly,
41. the student essays we examined (the
42. core work of the evaluation) from
43. universities with practical elements
44. in their curriculum were generally
45. just as strong as student work from
46. places driven by an educational idea
47. of 'theory-only'. Courses in practical
48. film-making have long been debated
49. within film studies, yet through digital
50. techniques it is today quite easy to
51. insert various practical elements,
52. and perhaps these facilitates a more

thorough understanding of the craft
of film-making.

TO CONCLUDE

On the English-language homepage
of the Swedish Higher Education
Authority, the governmental agency
responsible for carrying out the qual-
ity assurance assessment, the ration-
ale behind the exercise is stated in
the following way:

The Government has laid down
a qualification descriptor for
each qualification awarded by
the higher education institu-
tions. Irrespective of the organ-
isation of the studies that have
led to the award of a qualifica-
tion, the quality of the courses
and programmes must always
be high enough to ensure that
the goals laid down in the qual-
ification descriptor are attained.

(Universitetskanslersämbetet
2013)

As straightforward as this statement
may appear, the intrinsic view of
higher education it conveys never-
theless seems inconsistent. The
variation in size of the faculty and
consequently the range of scholarly
perspectives students encounter is
just one factor that is not accounted
for as an evaluative norm. Neither
are the scholarly virtues of lectur-
ers, their comparative proficiency
within the particular field in which
they teach and supervise, or their
research activity. Moreover, dissimi-
larities between student groups are
not taken into account, nor is there
any method of ranking students.

However, as student work was
assessed – and not only by us, but
also by an extended group of external
examiners and readers – a fairly tight
correspondence between precisely
such factors as those recounted above
and student output undeniably became

2. The entire completed evaluation may be found at (kvalitet.uk-ambetet.se/resultat/sok.4.25ae7641136bb9ef9e38000719.html?struts.portlet.action=/kvalitet/resultat&sv.url=12.6da1ffd913828526dc880000).

relatively clear. Rather easily assessed factors such as the number of years the course of study has been offered, the number of faculty, the publication rate and the amount of research funding would have provided more or less the same results as the exhaustive grind and trepidation of the teaching quality assurance assessment. At the same time it must be stressed that certain exceptions exist. Solid work is performed by some of the smaller units, units not always benignly handled by external funders or their own universities. Correspondingly, there is rather large variation among the students' performance, at the larger, more established places ranging from brilliant to unacceptable. Perhaps this merely indicates that larger student corpuses inevitably lead to wider deviation.²

Studied from a perspective of two decades, the discipline of film studies has unquestionably developed as a core area of teaching and research in Sweden – even if the various components of this growth have been unevenly distributed. At present, however, the era of expansion seems to have come to a temporary halt. As far as we can determine there are no plans or campaigns for further development of academic programmes, neither at the sites of higher learning included in the evaluation nor elsewhere. It seems that film studies, like the entire sector of higher education in Sweden, at best is in a holding pattern and may be threatened by cuts. Together with the audit culture and control inspections so typical of NPM, and to which we subjected ourselves and our peers, this possibility has produced a culture of uncertainty and hesitation in our field – at least as of now.

REFERENCES

Åkesson, Eva, Malmberg, Anders, Eriksson, Per and Wiberg, Eva (2013), 'Utvärderingarna håller

inte måttet', *Svenska Dagbladet*, 23 September. http://www.svd.se/opinion/brannpunkt/utvarderingarna-haller-inte-mattet_8544218.svd. Accessed 4 April, 2014.

- Bolin, Göran and Forsman, Michael (1998), 'Från filantropi till akademi. Det svenska filmvetandets framväxt och formationer', *Nordicom Information*, 1–2: 1998, pp. 37–49.
- Lorenz, Chris (2012), 'If you're so smart, why are you under surveillance? Universities, neoliberalism, and New Public Management', *Critical Inquiry*, 38: 3, pp. 599–629.
- Olsson, Jan (1995), 'Filmvetenskap anno 1995', *Filmhäftet*, 23: 89–90, 1–2, pp. 84–88.
- Universitetskanslersämbetet (2013), 'The quality of higher education programmes', <http://www.uk-ambetet.se/qualityassurance/thequalityofhighereducationprogrammes.4.4149f55713bbd91756380004975.html>. Accessed 20 November 2013.
- Vesterlund, Per (forthcoming), 'När medier blir vetenskap. Om tre nordiska massmediekonferenser 1972–1974'.
- Waldekranz, Rune (1995), 'Första filmprofessuren', *Filmhäftet*, 1–2, pp. 78–81.

SUGGESTED CITATION

- Hedling, O. and Snickars, P. (2014), 'Film studies anno 2013: A bird's eye view', *Journal of Scandinavian Cinema* 4: 1, pp. 35–41, doi: 10.1386/jsca.4.1.35_1

CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Olof Hedling teaches film studies at Lund University, Sweden and has worked and published extensively on the phenomena of European film policy and regional film and television production. Recently, he has

1. been the co-author and co-editor of
2. *Historical Dictionary of Scandinavian*
3. *Cinema* (2012) and *Regional Aesthetics:*
4. *Locating Swedish Media* (2010).

5. Contact:

6. E-mail: olof.hedling@litt.lu.se

7.
8. Pelle Snickars is Professor in Media
9. and Communication Studies at the
10. Department of Culture and Media
11. Studies, Umeå University – a chair
12. directed towards the digital humani-
13. ties. He has previously worked as
14. Head of Research at the National

Library of Sweden and has published
extensively on new and old media as
well the digitization of cultural herit-
age. For further information, see –
www.pellesnickars.se.

Contact:

E-mail: snickars.pelle@gmail.com

Olof Hedling and Pelle Snickars
have asserted their right under the
Copyright, Designs and Patents Act,
1988, to be identified as the authors
of this work in the format that was
submitted to Intellect Ltd.

Copyright Intellect Ltd. 2014
Do not distribute.