

# Teaching European Cinema: The European University Film Award (EUFA) Project – Dossier

Skadi Loist (Editor)

***Abstract:** The “Teaching European Cinema” dossier has grown out of the European University Film Award (EUFA) project that was initiated in 2016 by Filmfest Hamburg in collaboration with the European Film Academy (EFA) and the European Network for Cinema and Media Studies (NECS). In its second edition in 2017, the EUFA connected twenty European universities in a common teaching project in which five nominated films were analysed and discussed in courses of the respective universities. Subsequently, one student representative per country joined the three-day student jury deliberation in Hamburg and voted for the final EUFA winner. In 2016, Ken Loach’s *I, Daniel Blake* (2016) won the inaugural EUFA; in 2017, Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson’s *Heartstone* (Hjartasteinn, 2016) was awarded the prize. The dossier works on different levels: first, it aims to present the EUFA project to a wider public; second, it promotes an exchange among the participating colleagues; and third, it operates as a teaching dossier for scholars within the wider field of European film and media studies to discuss questions of how best to teach contemporary European cinema.*



**Figure 1: Presentation of the EUFA 2016 prize at Studio Cinema in Hamburg.  
Photo: EUFA/K. Brunnhofer.**

## Table of Contents

### Introduction

by Skadi Loist, University of Rostock, Germany

### 01 Developing a Visual Dictionary and Discussing Media Mechanisms in Europe

by Pascal Edelmann, European Film Academy

### 02 EUFA and Film Studies at Liverpool John Moores University

by Lydia Papadimitriou, Liverpool John Moores University, United Kingdom

### 03 Film Appreciation, Critical Evaluation, and Scholarship: Some Reflections on Teaching the First Year of EUFA

by Mariah Larsson, Linnaeus University, Sweden

### 04 Evaluation Criticism and Why the European University Film Award Cannot Be another Eurovision Song Contest

by Ioannis Skopeteas, University of the Aegean, Greece

### 05 Showing, Seeing and Discussing: Or, How to Deal with European Cinema by Looking at Contemporary Films and Asking Questions

by Francesco Pitassio, University of Udine, Italy

### 06 Developing an Appreciation for Film and European Cinema

by Skadi Loist, University of Rostock, Germany

### 07 Teaching through the European University Film Award: Promoting a Complex Understanding of European Cinema

by Laura Rascaroli, University College Cork, Ireland

### 08 Between *Polderen* and Programming: A Teaching Report of the EUFA Project at Utrecht University

by Laura Copier, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

### 09 Playing a Film Festival Jury: Cooperative Competition in the Classroom

by Andrea Pocsik, Pázmány Péter University, Hungary

### 10 Learning Jury Dynamics through Creative Pedagogy: Role-Playing at the European University Film Award

by Aida Vallejo, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), Spain

### 11 “And the Winner Is...”: The Hamburg EUFA Jury Meetings

by Dagmar Brunow, Linnaeus University, Sweden

## Suggested Citation

Loist, Skadi, editor. “Teaching European Cinema: The European University Film Award (EUFA) Project.” Dossier. *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 160–218. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

## **Introduction: Teaching European Cinema—The Dossier on the European University Film Award (EUFA) Project**

Skadi Loist

In December 2017, nineteen students representing twenty universities from different European countries came together for three days to discuss five European films, debate film aesthetics, the relationship between narrative and form, and what it means to be European and how “Europeanness” might be defined in cinema.<sup>1</sup> Together they selected the winner of the second European University Film Award (EUFA), a prize introduced by Filmfest Hamburg in cooperation with the European Film Academy (EFA) and the European Network for Cinema and Media Studies (NECS) in 2016. In addition to awarding a pan-European prize, they made friends for life from all over Europe during their cinephile’s camp-like stay in Hamburg. The following dossier will introduce the background of the award and discuss the larger pedagogic project behind it. Pascal Edelmann, spokesperson of the EFA, starts off the dossier by giving insight into the goals of the EUFA project, while Dagmar Brunow, a film scholar teaching in Sweden and close collaborator of EUFA as preselection jury member and moderator of the student jury deliberations, will finish off with an account of the jury work. In the main section of the dossier, nine lecturers participating with their courses in the EUFA project present their individual courses, discuss challenges they encountered, and propose best-practice examples for how to teach contemporary European cinema.

### **For the Love of Film**

Everything started with Filmfest Hamburg programmer Kathrin Kohlstedde’s love for the cinema and her desire to spread the appreciation of the 7<sup>th</sup> art. During one of her trips to Quebec, one of her cinematic love affairs, she came across the Prix collégial du cinéma québécois (PCCQ), an initiative that celebrates the cinema by placing it at the centre of attention of the university community (“Objectifs”). There, fifty colleges from the Canadian province of Quebec take part in selecting the award for best Quebecoise film of the year. Back home, at the end of 2015, Kathrin told me about the idea and her intention to start a similar initiative in Hamburg: a project that would also spread the love of film, not only beyond the borders of generations, reaching young students’ minds, but beyond national borders too. In times of rising nationalist tendencies and attacks on the arts and humanities, she thought the initiative would be housed well in European organisations such as the European Film Academy and the European Network for Cinema and Media Studies. As a member of the NECS Steering Committee, I was immediately drawn to the idea and offered to contact as many film studies colleagues as I could think of and convince them to get involved. The EFA was similarly easily persuaded of the virtues of the idea. Within a few months it was decided to start the European University Film Award in October 2016. The initiators formulated that the “aim of this initiative is to involve a younger audience, to spread the ‘European idea’ and to transport the spirit of European cinema to an audience of university students. It shall also support film dissemination, film education and the culture of debating” (“About EUFA”). Immediately, Filmfest Hamburg went to work to obtain funding for the first edition, the European Film Academy started work to secure the rights for the university screenings and scholars within NECS began to create or adapt courses at their host universities.

### **Creating a European Teaching Project**

In the quest to set up a pan-European teaching project NECS was a very fitting collaborator. The organisation brings together scholars, archivists, programmers and practitioners with the aim to foster high-level and innovative research in film and media theory, history and practice, to provide a forum for communication, exchange and scholarly debate, and to establish film and media studies as a dynamic and important part of the arts and humanities research in Europe (“About NECS”). In the open and collaborative atmosphere of the annual NECS conferences we continually encounter questions of commonalities and differences in approaches, themes and theoretical traditions based in national cultural contexts as regards academic systems as much as local media products and reception. These differences and similarities also became apparent when approaching colleagues to join the EUFA initiative.

While many colleagues were eager to participate, I also encountered unexpected challenges, due to programme structures and difficult working conditions for academics (especially for those in temporary contracts or adjunct positions). Some colleagues in the UK, for instance, could not integrate the project due to very restrictive module structures, which did not allow for a flexible integration of course material that was not previously known and vetted. Here the idea to incorporate films announced in October, when in most countries the semester had already started, was not seen to be feasible. In other countries it was difficult to locate suitable colleagues who were both prepared to participate and in an institutional position that allowed them to adapt or create a new class.

Despite these setbacks, we succeeded in starting the initiative in 2016 with the impressive number of thirteen participating universities in thirteen different countries. In the second edition in 2017 the EUFA project already grew to twenty universities in twenty different countries.<sup>2</sup> After this successful start the aim is to further expand the project to eventually include universities from all of the forty-something countries represented in the European Film Academy.<sup>3</sup>



**Figure 2 (left): Participating countries, EUFA 2016: Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and United Kingdom.**

**Figure 3 (right): Participating countries, EUFA 2017: Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom. Images: EUFA.**

Acknowledging the different institutional settings, degree programmes, and teaching traditions within the national contexts, we aimed to keep the regulations and prescriptions to a

minimum and leave the practical integration of the EUFA nominee films to the teachers. The only requirement was to teach a course at university level within a Media, Communications or Film Studies department. The degree programmes differed, some focussing specifically on film studies while others were rather communications based. This flexibility resulted in a broad variety of course setups, which ranged from mandatory classes (e.g. Rostock; Udine; Cork) or elective courses (e.g. Liverpool; Växjö) to film-club arrangements (e.g. Utrecht; Bilbao), both at BA or MA levels.

The basic guidelines result from the structure of the EUFA process. The time frame is set by the host institution, Filmfest Hamburg, which usually takes place from the end of September to early October, and which announces the five nominated films. If Filmfest Hamburg is the starting point, the European Film Awards, taking place in the second week of December, is the end point. This window makes for ideal timing in the European autumn semester, which in most countries takes place from September to December.

During the festival a jury of film professionals meets in Hamburg to select five films out of a shortlist of twenty titles, which has been preselected by the festival organisers from the fifty feature films and fifteen documentary nominees for the European Film Awards. The announcement of the EUFA nominees sets the two major phases of the EUFA project in motion. In the first phase the films are distributed to the participating universities where they are integrated into the individual courses. Here the stated aims to involve an audience of university students and to support film education are already met.

How to then encourage the culture of debating was exactly the methodological question that the EUFA project teachers faced, and is one of the key questions behind this dossier. The aim was to enable students to discuss the five nominated films in a way that helps them to judge them. Each university course was asked to submit their top three among the five films, following a ranking system in which all students on the course could vote individually, awarding three points to their first choice, two points to the second, and one point to the third. The total points are added up and represent the top-three films for each class and, thus, each country. This point system, which might remind one of the Eurovision Song Contest (as Ioannis Skopeteas argues in his piece for this dossier), was devised as a way to involve and give voice to all students in the participating classes and to potentially see differing judgments according to national contexts. In addition, the goal was to prepare students to be part of the second phase of the EUFA project.

This second phase consists of a two/three-day student jury deliberation meeting in Hamburg, hosted by Filmfest Hamburg with the institutional support of the Körber Stiftung. One student per country was invited to represent their university and come together with their European peers to discuss their ideas and choices in a moderated jury process in the week preceding the European Film Awards. In order to foster the culture of debate and the European idea, the representatives were free to choose and vote for their own winner, independent of their university colleagues' votes at home. The points of all universities were used to eliminate two of the five contestants in the EUFA. Out of the commonly voted top-three, the final winner was chosen after discussing each film again as well as coming to a mutual understanding in the student jury of what the criteria for their judgment should be. After exchanging ideas based on their course experiences and getting to know each other and start cross-national discussions about film and life in Europe during their stay in Hamburg, each student had the chance to defend their favourite film, convince their fellow jurors, and

finally vote. (In her contribution, Dagmar Brunow describes the jury deliberations in more detail.)

### The Dossier

The following dossier has grown out of this initiative with the desire to present the EUFA project to a wider public, and more importantly to contribute to an exchange among the participating colleagues and discuss questions of how best to teach contemporary European cinema within the wider field of European film and media studies. The dossier is an invitation to join the EUFA project and its discussion as it is continued at the NECS conferences.

This initiative is indebted to a strand in film studies that over the last decade has challenged the debate on European cinema as a narrow collection of single national cinematographies and that has proposed a transnational perspective to discuss film both in terms of production and reception (Bergfelder; Shaw). Despite its focus on Europe it is also part of the larger discussion on the position of world cinema (Andrew, “Atlas”; “Time Zones”). With regard to the specifics of pedagogy it joins a growing field of literature concerned with the challenges and potentials of teaching transnational cinemas and world cinema, and seeing and teaching the world through film (Carson and Costanzo; Gamm; Marciniak and Bennett).

Reading the dossier in one sitting will reveal common threads and discussions that emerge across the various courses and sessions. This might say as much about the general understanding of film studies as presented and lived by teachers across Europe as it does about our shared or hidden canons of key terms and traditions in film studies. At the same time it shows a variety of pedagogical ideas and methods and gives insights into similarities and differences of our respective teaching environments.

All four components of the title—European; University; Film; Award—prompt discussions of their own in the context of the project. The first, “European”, seems the most obvious yet it is also the most complex issue. What is European cinema? Is it defined by production context and contributing talent, by actors, auteurs and stars, or by setting, by themes and topics, and what part do dissemination and reception play in its definition? Thomas Elsaesser and others have challenged the dichotomy between ubiquitous commercial Hollywood cinema and European arthouse cinema. Nevertheless, distinct aesthetics and topics emerge that are related to and have been discussed by various teachers in this dossier as part of European film history, including traditions visible in narrative devices, themes and aesthetics of the new waves. Both *The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki* (*Hymyilevä Mies*, Juho Kuosmanen, 2016) and *Graduation* (*Bacalaureat*, Cristian Mungiu, 2016) lend themselves to be discussed in relation to new waves, the former in relation to French New Wave aesthetics and the latter in relation to the more recent Romanian New Wave. The inclusion of films by veteran European filmmakers like the British Ken Loach (*I, Daniel Blake*, 2016) and the Finnish Aki Kaurimäki (*The Other Side of Hope* [*Toivon Tuolla Puolen*], 2017) lend themselves to discuss concepts of auteurism. Along traditional arthouse and/or European cinema themes (Krämer) such as identity, stories of coming-of-age and personal growth or stagnation—as seen in *Graduation*, *Home* (Fien Troch, 2016), *Heartstone* (*Hjartasteinn*, Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson, 2016), and *Loveless* (*Nelyubov*, Andrey Zvyagintsev, 2017)—more recent issues concerning the current condition of life in Europe

appear. Several films deal with precarity, austerity and the difficulties of a globalised economy as it relates to Europe and the man in the street, e.g. in *Toni Erdmann* (Maren Ade, 2016), *I, Daniel Blake*, and *Graduation*. Several other films, especially the documentaries, focus on political topics such as Europe's position in the current migration of refugees from the Middle East and North Africa—as seen in *Fire at Sea* (*Fuocoammare*, Gianfranco Rosi, 2016), *The Other Side of Hope*, and *The War Show* (Andreas Dalsgaard and Obaidah Zytoon, 2016).



**Figure 4:** The five EUFA 2016 nominees (pictured left to right): Ken Loach's *I, Daniel Blake* (2016), Gianfranco Rosi's documentary *Fire at Sea* (*Fuocoammare*, 2016), Juho Kuosmanen's *The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki* (*Hymyilevä Mies*, 2016), Maren Ade's *Toni Erdmann* (2016) and Cristian Mungiu's *Graduation* (*Bacalaureat*, 2016). Image: EUFA/Freundeskreis Filmfest Hamburg.

These films, thus, offer entry points for discussions and negotiations of European identity. The transnational stories and issues that are dealt with by the films' narratives invite a discussion of "Europeanness" not only on a level of textual analysis but also in the process of reception. These films and the EUFA project at large offer the opportunity to use national cinema and often, by virtue of their coproduction histories, transnational cinema, both as a concept in cinema studies and a lived cultural history that the students are likely familiar with, to look both inward and outward and situate the films, their production, distribution and reception on local, national and transnational levels. In an atmosphere of rising far-right nationalist tendencies across Europe, these films then also offer an opportunity to rethink national identity within a European context and how European cinema is situated as part of a cultural identity.



**Figure 5: The five EUFA 2017 nominees (pictured left to right): Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson's *Heartstone* (*Hjartasteinn*, 2016), Fien Troch's *Home* (2016), Andrey Zvyagintsev's *Loveless* (*Nelyubov*, 2016), Aki Kaurismäki's *The Other Side of Hope* (*Toivon Tuolla Puolen*, 2017) and Andreas Dalsgaard and Obaidah Zytoon's *The War Show* (2016). Image: EFA.**

The second component of the award's title, "University", evokes traditions in film studies and teaching cinema. Several of the contributions bring up the notion of a canon (Larsson; Pitassio; Papadimitriou; Skopeteas). In an attempt to offer an overview of (European) film most classes are set up to teach along a film history tradition and a canon of film classics. The EUFA project works well both to challenge and to supplement this approach. On the one hand, discussing contemporary cinema might help students get involved with arthouse cinema in a way that an old set canon of film history might not. Even though these contemporary European arthouse films diverge from their usual upbringing on Hollywood films, it offers students the advantage of topicality of films that are in current circulation and release while being discussed in class, which also heightens the sense of participating in a current award. On the other hand, couching the contemporary films in a historical line of film analysis and theory helps creating a lineage and offers a background for current analysis.

Another issue of university teaching is how best to employ pedagogical methods when teaching film analysis, and in the particular case of the EUFA, how to judge and debate films. The dossier offers an array of creative components ranging from more traditional methods of class discussion and review and essay writing (Loist; Pitassio) to more interactive methods which highlight political backgrounds in using word clouds (Pocsik) to activating methods such as role-play and training of strategic communication skills (Vallejo).

The third component, "Film", seems self-evident in the context of film and media studies. As has been hinted at already, film is discussed in terms of formal aesthetics and narratives, in relation to history. The setting of the EUFA and its connection to the host

institutions Filmfest Hamburg and EFA furthermore brings into focus the production and distribution contexts. What is the relationship of European cinema to pan-European and trans/national funding schemes? How does European cinema, as arthouse cinema, relate to, travel and benefit from the festival circuit? And what impact does this have on the circulation and distribution patterns and finally on the reception opportunities and film culture in Europe and beyond?

The fourth and final component, “Award”, is related to the question of what role film festivals and awards play in the larger film culture. The function of awards is adding symbolic value to a film within the attention economy. An award generates press and buzz, which is a component that helps festival films to come into wider release and reach wider audiences (Mezias et al.). The EUFA project offers the opportunity to study, analyse and discuss the impact of awards in direct case studies. Furthermore, it offers the opportunity to consider the inner mechanisms of judgment behind the awards first-hand.

A large part of the voting in the first and second phase is based on judging films. For some teachers this focus on judgment resulted in a tension between training and teaching the specialised skills of academic discussion of film, based on knowledge of theories, canons, history, aesthetics and what seemed to them a flattening judgment based on ranking (see Larsson and Skopeteas in this dossier), an argument that echoes the old discussion of the decline of film criticism. Continuing from this issue, some teachers commented on what they perceived as a lack of directives (see Rascaroli): what should be the criteria for awarding the prize? Should these be predetermined? Or are they (seemingly) self-evident? What are the dynamics of judgment and within a jury?

What became clear during the EUFA project is that these questions are a significant part of the process: continually asking the questions related to all of the four components is what this European teaching project is all about. Listening to the participants and reading their dossier contribution shows that EUFA has been a challenging and rewarding experience both for the teachers and students involved. And above all, it succeeded in one of the main objectives of the EFA: bringing a community together and connecting people (see Edelmann in this dossier) and bringing alive the European idea of diversity and solidarity that EFA President Wim Wenders called for in this speech at the 30<sup>th</sup> European Film Awards in December 2017.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> In 2017, twenty universities in twenty countries participated in EUFA. Due to unexpected visa issues, however, sadly the representative from Turkey was unable to join the deliberation meeting.

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed list of the participating universities see the EUFA website.

<sup>3</sup> At the time of writing, contacts have already been established to integrate universities in Austria, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania and Russia. Interested film scholars from yet unrepresented countries are encouraged to get in touch.

## References

- “About EUFA”. European University Film Award, [www.eufa.org/en/#about](http://www.eufa.org/en/#about). Accessed 13 Jan. 2018.
- “About NECS”. NECS – European Network for Cinema and Media Studies, [necs.org/about-necs](http://necs.org/about-necs). Accessed 13 Jan. 2018.
- Andrew, Dudley. “An Atlas of World Cinema.” *Remapping World Cinema: Identity, Culture and Politics in Film*, edited by Stephanie Dennison and Song Hwee Lim, Wallflower, 2006, pp. 19–29.
- . “Time Zones and Jetlag: The Flows and Phases of World Cinema.” *World Cinemas, Transnational Perspectives*, edited by Nataša Đurovičová and Kathleen E. Newman, Routledge, 2010, pp. 59–89.
- Bergfelder, Tim. “National, Transnational or Supranational Cinema? Rethinking European Film Studies.” *Media, Culture & Society*, vol. 27, no. 3, 2005, pp. 315–31.
- Carson, Diane, and William Costanzo, editors. “New Approaches to Teaching World Cinema.” *Cinema Journal Teaching Dossier*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2014, [www.teachingmedia.org/new-approaches-teaching-world-cinema-cinema-journal-teaching-dossier-vol-21/](http://www.teachingmedia.org/new-approaches-teaching-world-cinema-cinema-journal-teaching-dossier-vol-21/). Accessed 13 Jan. 2018.
- Doughty, Ruth, and Deborah Shaw. “Teaching ‘the World’ through Film: Possibilities and Limitation.” *Teaching Transnational Cinema: Politics and Pedagogy*, edited by Katarzyna Marciniak and Bruce Bennett, Routledge, 2017, pp. 96–104. AFI Film Readers.
- Elsaesser, Thomas. *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam UP, 2005.
- EUFA – European University Film Award*. [www.eufa.org](http://www.eufa.org). Accessed 13 Jan. 2018.
- Fire at Sea [Fuocoammare]*. Directed by Gianfranco Rosi, Stemal Entertainment, 2016.
- Gamm, Kate. *Teaching World Cinema*. BFI Education, 2004.
- Graduation [Bacalaureat]*. Directed by Cristian Mungiu, Canal+, 2016.
- The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki [Hymyilevä Mies]*. Directed by Juho Kuosmanen, Aamu Filmcompany, 2016.
- Heartstone [Hjartasteinn]*. Directed by Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson, SF Studios, 2016.
- Home*. Directed by Fien Troch, Prime Time, 2016.
- I, Daniel Blake*. Directed by Ken Loach, Sixteen Films, 2016.

Krämer, Moritz. *Die fabelhafte Welt des europäischen Spielfilms: Dramaturgie und Ästhetik der Gewinner des europäischen Filmpreises im beginnenden 21. Jahrhundert*. Tectum, 2008.

*Loveless* [*Nelyubov*]. Directed by Andrey Zvyagintsev, Non-Stop Productions, 2017.

Marciniak, Katarzyna, and Bruce Bennett, editors. *Teaching Transnational Cinema: Politics and Pedagogy*. Routledge, 2017.

Mezias, Stephen, et al. “Transforming Film Product Identities: The Status Effects of European Premier Film Festivals, 1996–2005.” *Negotiating Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Competitive Events*, edited by Brian Moeran and Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen, Cambridge UP, 2011, pp. 169–96.

“Objectifs”. *Prix collégial du cinéma québécois*, prixcollegialducinema.ca. Accessed 3 Jan. 2018.

*The Other Side of Hope* [*Toivon tuolla puolen*]. Directed by Aki Kaurismäki, Sputnik, 2017.

Shaw, Deborah. “Transnational Cinema: Mapping a Field of Study.” *Routledge Companion to World Cinema*, edited by Rob Stone et al., Routledge, 2017, pp. 290–98.

*Toni Erdmann*. Directed by Maren Ade, Komplizen Film, 2016.

*The War Show*. Directed by Obaidah Zytoon and Andreas Dalsgaard, Fridthjof Film, 2016.

Wenders, Wim. “A Speech for Europe.” 30<sup>th</sup> European Film Awards, Berlin, 10 Dec. 2017. [www.europeanfilmawards.eu/en\\_EN/efa-2017-wim-wenders](http://www.europeanfilmawards.eu/en_EN/efa-2017-wim-wenders). Accessed 3 Jan. 2018.

### Suggested Citation

Loist, Skadi. “Introduction: Teaching European Cinema—The Dossier on the European University Film Award (EUFA) Project.” *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 162–170. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Skadi Loist** is a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute for Media Research of the University of Rostock and leads the three-year research project “Film Circulation on the International Film Festival Network and the Impact on Global Film Culture” (2017–2020) funded by the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF). Various publications in German and English, including the edited volume *Film Festivals: History, Theory, Method, Practice* (with Marijke de Valck and Brendan Kredell, 2016). Skadi is cofounder of the Film Festival Research Network (FFRN), a Steering Committee member of the European Network for Cinema and Media Studies (NECS) and co-editor of the Festival Review section of *NECSUS: European Journal of Media Studies*.

## Developing a Visual Dictionary and Discussing Media Mechanisms in Europe

Pascal Edelmann

Introduced in 2016, the European University Film Award (EUFA) is voted for by university students from across Europe. Based on the selection lists for feature and documentary films for the European Film Awards, an international committee of experts decides on five nominations. The five nominated films are viewed and discussed in universities across Europe and at each institution the participating students select their favourite film. In early December, one student representative from each university attends a deliberation meeting to decide on the overall winner. The announcement of the winning film then takes place in the week of the European Film Awards in early December.



**Figure 6 (left):** Albert Wiederspiel, director of Filmfest Hamburg, presented the EUFA 2016 award to the crew of *I, Daniel Blake* at the European Film Awards event in Wroclaw. Photo: EFA/Erik Riikojä.  
**Figure 7 (right):** The EUFA statuette, designed by a student of the 2016 participating Lisbon Arts University. Photo: EUFA/K. Brunnhofer.

The aim of this initiative by the European Film Academy (EFA) and Filmfest Hamburg is to involve a younger audience, to spread the “European idea” and to transport the spirit of European cinema to an audience of university students. It allows university students from Lisbon to Lodz, from Budapest to Istanbul to experience European films—as a common social activity and a shared passion—and it supports film dissemination, film education and the culture of debating.

As the EFA, which now unites more than 3,000 European film professionals with the common aim of promoting European film culture, we regularly initiate and participate in various activities dealing with film politics as well as economic, artistic, and training aspects. While the programme includes conferences, seminars and workshops, a common goal is to connect people. This concerns filmmakers from across Europe, the different fields of filmmaking, creativity and the industry, but also film professionals with their public, and with academia.

Cinema, like most arts, does not exist in a vacuum outside society. It often is a conscious reaction to society and needs contact, confrontation, discussion and debate—it addresses an audience. And, in the long run, it benefits from this audience’s reactions. If European cinema wants to remain relevant it has to maintain contact with its audiences, with younger generations of film lovers and future audiences across Europe and beyond.

Unfortunately, what the few theatres that are still operating outside of big cities and their shopping centres are able to programme leaves very little room for European cinema and so in our countries we see increasingly fewer films from the rest of Europe.

In a reality that is often shaped by an overflow of information and images, and the overwhelming dominance of a few mainstream films with a formidable promotion budget, it is important to understand how stories are told, how images work. It is in particular the age group of the twenty-to-thirty-year olds that is constantly exposed to promotion and marketing campaigns and a basic understanding of these mechanisms should be part of their education as conscious media users and consumers in today's world.

Cinema is always also part of a larger discourse about the social and political realities in which we live and it is extremely important for us to involve university students in this dialogue. European films address issues that are relevant to people in Europe today—issues including refugees, coming-of-age, gender equality, unemployment, personal crises or changes in society—because of its history as much as for what is happening today. Thus the EUFA aims not just at developing a European visual dictionary and an understanding of media mechanisms, but also at locating these issues, not just historically and politically but also intellectually, within the bigger framework of academic debate as such.

Finally, through these films and the stories that they tell, but also through the pan-European character of the EUFA and particularly the final round of debates, which brings delegates from all participating universities together, Europe becomes less of an abstract structure and more of a vibrant experience.

While it may appear as if the continent is still, or once again, drifting apart into national(ist) interpretations of its history and presence, the reality of these students has led them from single home countries to a European society in which they live and study today, building up international networks, and living in an international world. Wherever this reality is in danger of being divided and compartmentalised, EUFA can bring home not only the visual and topical repertoire of European cinema, but it can also offer a different approach and freedom of debate.

### Suggested Citation

Edelmann, Pascal. "Developing a Visual Dictionary and Discussing Media Mechanisms in Europe." *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 171–172. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Pascal Edelmann** is the Head of Press & PR of the European Film Academy and responsible for the EFA's communication and publications as well as the accreditation procedure and press services for the European Film Awards. During his studies of English and Communications he worked as a tour guide, translator and production manager for theatre, and eventually settled as a free-lance journalist and translator. He did the presswork for the first Berlinale Talent Campus and started working as press officer for the European Film Academy in 2003.

## EUFA and Film Studies at Liverpool John Moores University

Lydia Papadimitriou

At Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU) the EUFA project is integrated in the second year of the undergraduate Film Studies programme, as part of the European Cinema module (which is mandatory for the single honours students, but optional for the joint Creative Writing and Film Studies students). The project is ideal for the module as it allows students to explore key aims of the course through very recent films, but also to participate in the process of offering a real award organised by established institutions such as the European Film Academy (EFA) and Filmfest Hamburg and, in the process, consider what is European about European cinema.

Addressed to undergraduate students with little to no previous sustained engagement with European cinema (and often with an aversion to subtitles), the primary aims of the course are to introduce the diversity of cinematic traditions in Europe and the concepts of national, transnational and European. The course also explores the boundaries and relationship between art and popular cinema in Europe; investigates institutional contexts for the promotion, distribution and exhibition of European films (especially film festivals); and aims to develop the students' critical engagement, especially through the practice of film reviewing.

In 2016–17, when the EUFA project was introduced into the curriculum, the European Cinema module was taught over one semester (twelve weeks from September to December) over six hours weekly during which students had lectures, screenings and workshops/seminars. This delivery format (three hours twice per week) provided a lot of flexibility to accommodate the EUFA screenings, and relate them to the overall aims and objectives of the course. In what follows I will demonstrate the way in which EUFA was integrated into my class. I will also assess its effectiveness in engaging the students and helping them understand both the processes and the significance of film awards, but also their role in promoting a values-based European cinema.

One of the challenges in including the project into a pre-existing course framework was the fact that I only found out the shortlisted EUFA films on week three of the module. However, the flexibility of the module's design enabled me to accommodate the films seamlessly. For the first two weeks, the students were introduced to the concepts of Europe and European cinema, national/transnational, art/popular cinema. Week three focused on the role and practice of film reviewing. On a practical level, the aim of this session was to prepare the students for their first assignment, a 1,000-word review of a European film not screened or discussed on the module; on a broader level, it introduced specific skills (analysis, contextualisation, evaluation) necessary for critical thinking, and set the terms and tone for future discussion of the films explored on the module—including the EUFA films.

Week four was scheduled to explore film festivals and introduced the first EUFA film. The timetable ran as follows:

Week	Session 1 (Tuesday)	Session 2 (Thursday)
4	Film Festivals	<i>I, Daniel Blake</i> (Ken Loach)

5	Italian Neorealism	<i>Fire at Sea</i> (Gianfranco Rosi)
6	French New Wave	<i>The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Maki</i> (Juho Kuosmanen)
7	No Class	
8	German Cinema	<i>Toni Erdmann</i> (Maren Ade)
9	Romanian Cinema	<i>Graduation</i> (Cristian Mungiu)

The pairing of the sessions worked surprisingly well, and with the exception of the Finnish film, the preplanned national case studies matched with the EUFA films. Some happy coincidences also helped. For example, I scheduled *I, Daniel Blake* on the week when we examined Film Festivals—a very apt choice as Loach’s film was the 2016 Palme d’Or winner. Furthermore, the film was just about to be released in the UK (I screened it on the Thursday and its national premiere was on the Friday), which meant that there were discussions and reviews about it in the British press and media—further highlighting the relevance of EUFA to the students. Normally I exclude English-speaking films from the module, as I aim to familiarise the students with films from “across the Channel”. However, the presence of Loach’s film in the context of European cinema allowed us to frame it within issues that exceeded the British context—particularly in the year of the Brexit referendum.

Once I finalised the timetable, I uploaded links to reviews (from trade journals and quality newspapers) on the module’s Virtual Learning Environment, and invited the students to read them in advance of the screenings. In week five, I paired the Italian documentary *Fire at Sea* with an exploration of Italian Neorealism. This allowed us to explore what is socially responsible and engaged filmmaking, while also considering the constructed nature of documentary—and realism more broadly.<sup>1</sup> Week six appeared to be the least integrated with the pre-existing material, as Finnish cinema was not a topic examined. However, Kuosmanen’s black-and-white debut set in the 1960s made clear references to the aesthetics of the French New Wave, illustrating—in a rather unexpected manner—the continuing appeal of this movement’s casual, vérité-style aesthetics, its focus on youth, and its self-reflexivity. The class discussion focused around the ways in which the nostalgic reconstruction of the past and the “real-life” story of this boxer were combined with a critique of the media and its role in forcing ambitions. In week eight, *Toni Erdmann* was paired with a session on German cinema, which offered some historical context on the New and post-Wall German cinema. Ade’s film, however, exceeds the national, as its transnational story, set largely in Romania, focuses on a troubled father–daughter relationship, and utilises dry humour to offer a subtle critique of aspects of globalisation. The film engaged (but also puzzled) the students, who stayed in class for a fourth hour (after the three-hour screening) for the discussion. The last EUFA film screened was Cristi Mungiu’s *Graduation*, which matched perfectly with a session on New Romanian cinema that I had already planned. The students had already watched the same director’s *4 Months, 3 Weeks and 2 Days* (*4 luni, 3 saptamâni si 2 zile*, 2007), and his latest offering allowed a deeper insight into his minimalist storytelling techniques. The young age of the film’s protagonist encouraged a further degree of empathy with the students, who found the depiction of Romania’s post-Communist society intriguing (if rather bleak).

In the discussion that followed each screening I invited the students to respond to the film as if they were preparing to write a review. I encouraged subjective evaluation, but I also stressed the importance of backing up their opinions with arguments. This at times led to vivid discussions, which then helped us reflect on the implicit criteria we use for evaluating

films. In the last session (expanded to four hours to allow for the screening of *Graduation*) we recapped points about the previous EUFA films, and highlighted connections. The students noted the fact that despite their differences all films shared a social consciousness. This led us to consider what might be “European” about these films, and therefore what values they implicitly promote. Following this discussion and a break, the students were given a few minutes to write down the three films they would like to award, by order of preference. I then collated their responses and communicated them to Kathrin Kohlstedde of Filmfest Hamburg, so that she could feed them into the deliberations in Hamburg.

By that stage, the process of selection of the student who would represent LJMU had been completed. I had invited all the students who were keen to be members of the EUFA jury to write a 200-word paragraph explaining what qualities they would bring to the role as LJMU representatives for the EUFA jury, and how this experience would benefit their academic studies and career ambitions. The statements were submitted anonymously, but I had informed the students that I would take into account participation and class contribution before making the final decision. We read the statements with one of my colleagues, and jointly agreed on the strongest one. On revealing the author’s identity, it emerged that it belonged to a student that had also shown consistent commitment in class, thus making their choice firm. After the trip to Hamburg for the jury deliberations, I invited the student to explain in class how the whole process had worked.

Participation at the EUFA awards greatly enhanced my module as it gave it a strong sense of relevance and currency. First of all, the students had unique opportunities to watch, discuss and analyse films that were still making the festival rounds, some of which they may not have had the inclination to watch had they had the opportunity. Secondly, and most crucially, they became part of real-life decision-making about a film award, thus indirectly contributing to the visibility and critical acclaim of a particular film. Finally, the social and even activist nature of the selected film pointed to the political dimension of cinema, and made them reflect on their civic and ethical responsibilities, while also sensitising them to the plight of the underprivileged at a national, European and global level.

The EUFA project worked very well in the inaugural year, and I happily repeated it in 2017–18. Overall I maintained the same approach in terms of integrating it with the rest of the curriculum, but I also adjusted it to a new academic timetable, which meant that the teaching hours for the course were reduced from six to four per week (delivered in one continuous block). The main difference from the previous year is that the screening and the discussion of the EUFA films took place on different days, a week apart. I screened each EUFA film at the last two hours of a four-hour teaching block, and began the following week’s session with a discussion of that film. I then delivered a one hour lecture based on the course curriculum (which may or may not have had links with the EUFA films), and (after a short break) dedicated the last couple of hours to the next EUFA film. While originally concerned that the week’s delay in the discussion might reduce the students’ engagement, I found that it actually worked well because it allowed them to exchange opinions among themselves between the two sessions, and prepare for the discussion by reading reviews, and thinking about the films in some more depth. I plan to repeat the same format for delivery next year.

## Note

<sup>1</sup> Peter Bradshaw's review of the film also underlines the connections: "Gianfranco Rosi's beautiful, mysterious and moving film is a documentary that looks like a neorealist classic."

## References

Bradshaw, Peter. "Fire at Sea review: Masterly and moving look at the migrant crisis." *The Guardian*, 9 June 2016, [www.theguardian.com/film/2016/jun/09/fire-at-sea-review-masterly-and-moving-look-at-the-migrant-crisis](http://www.theguardian.com/film/2016/jun/09/fire-at-sea-review-masterly-and-moving-look-at-the-migrant-crisis).

*Fire at Sea* [*Fuocoammare*]. Directed by Gianfranco Rosi, Stemal Entertainment, 2016.

*4 Months, 3 Weeks and 2 Days* [*4 luni, 3 saptamâni si 2 zile*]. Directed by Cristian Mungiu, Mobra Films, 2007.

*Graduation* [*Bacalaureat*]. Directed by Cristian Mungiu, Canal+, 2016.

*The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki* [*Hymyilevä Mies*]. Directed by Juho Kuosmanen, Aamu Filmcompany, 2016.

*I, Daniel Blake*. Directed by Ken Loach, Sixteen Films, 2016.

*Toni Erdmann*. Directed by Maren Ade, Komplizen Film, 2016.

## Suggested Citation

Papadimitriou, Lydia. "EUFA and Film Studies at Liverpool John Moores University." *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 173–176. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Lydia Papadimitriou** is Reader (Associate Professor) in Film Studies at Liverpool John Moores University. She has published extensively on Greek and Balkan cinema, documentary, film festivals and distribution. She is the author of *The Greek Film Musical* (2006), coeditor (with Yannis Tzioumakis) of *Greek Cinema: Texts, Histories, Identities* (2011), and the Principal Editor of the *Journal of Greek Media and Culture*.

## Film Appreciation, Critical Evaluation, and Scholarship: Some Reflections on Teaching the First Year of EUFA

Mariah Larsson

What is a good film? How do we recognise a masterpiece? And how do we measure one film against another? Is, say, *The Virgin Spring* (Ingmar Bergman, 1960) a better film than *Breathless* (*À bout de souffle*, Jean-Luc Godard, 1960), *Citizen Kane* (Orson Welles, 1941) than *Vertigo* (Alfred Hitchcock, 1958), *Battleship Potemkin* (Sergei Eisenstein, 1925) than *Sunrise* (Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau, 1927), *Downfall* (Oliver Hirschbiegel, 2004) than *Let the Right One In* (Tomas Alfredson, 2008)?

Having taught film for some fifteen years, I would have thought that these questions had obvious answers for me. They did not. Preparing for my first EUFA screening followed by discussion with my students made me realise that being a film critic was in no way a part of my identity as a film scholar, university professor, and film historian. Although I do evaluate films that I see, pass judgement on them as to whether they are good or not, and have participated in at least one “critics referendum” on the best Swedish films of all times, as well as been a member of a film festival jury, my own appreciation of individual films felt like a private matter that did not have much to do with my work as an academic more than in a vaguely general way.

As it so often happens, my students were smarter than me. After my brief introduction about critical parameters, the responsibilities of film evaluation, and a final, hackneyed comment about trusting your “gut instinct”, my first year students were able to sustain a remarkably engaged and mature discussion of the virtues of the first film, *Toni Erdmann* (Maren Ade, 2016).

Many students come to film studies precisely because they are interested in good films. It might be art, auteur, or festival films, classical Hollywood, avant-garde, or cult films. Some of them are fans of particular auteurs, like Stanley Kubrick, Martin Scorsese, or David Fincher. Others are into film as a political medium. At the university, fervent passion has to meet detached discipline and, somehow, these two opposites need to fall in love or at the very least learn how to get along. The love of certain films or filmmakers has to be put into context, and how film canons are formed, developed, and maintained must be understood as well as questioned.

The process of formation of film canons was famously and thoroughly analysed by Janet Staiger in her 1985 article “The Politics of Film Canons”, where she questioned, not the need for a selection of all films made, but the implicit understandings of how to make these selections and how to distinguish which films are valuable and which films are not. For early film scholarship in the 1960s, when film was gradually becoming accepted as an academic discipline, critical evaluation was an integral and essential, perhaps even overriding, principle of film studies. Thanks to auteur theory and the growth of European art cinema, film came to be seen as worthy of serious study as an art form. Accordingly, separating the wheat from the chaff played a significant role in establishing film as a discipline. Like in art or literature, a canon was formed of “masterpieces” and “great artists”. However, all such selections are, as Staiger so astutely observes, imbued with various values that express themselves in, for instance, the devaluation of female filmmakers as trivial or eclectic.

## A Great Tradition: Robin Wood

Albeit complex and fluctuating during his fifty-odd years as a film critic, British Robin Wood had his own very clear aesthetic principles and evaluative standards, based in his study of English literature at Cambridge University (Hedling, *Robin Wood*; “Looking for Robin”). As one of the significant figures in the rise of film studies as an academic subject, Wood seemed to pass judgement on films and filmmakers with complete confidence in his ability to do so, after years of having studied “the best of which has been thought and said” (Arnold 233), as if, by attuning oneself to truth and beauty in literature, one would develop a sense for truth and beauty in anything else, like Hollywood cinema. The kind of criticism to which Wood devoted himself might be described as intuitive or instinctive. However, it was not simply a raw feeling, a “gut instinct”, but a meticulously honed skill, groomed through careful reading of literary masterpieces and the canon of the great tradition (Hedling, *Robin Wood*). “Why should we take Hitchcock seriously?” is perhaps the most rhetorical, well-answered, and famous question in film scholarship history (Wood 55). Although sometimes quirky and irreverent, his analyses and evaluations of anything from Ingmar Bergman’s films to *American Pie* (Paul Weitz and Chris Weitz, 1999) were always eloquently argued, soundly based in the films themselves, and acutely observant. In addition, his approach, although assuredly confident, always held the implicit invitation to disagree and to discuss. Initially quite obviously one of the auteurists, Wood’s evolution during the years encompassed readings of individual films as well as of genres, and he does not easily fit into either of Staiger’s categories of auteurist critics or ideological critics (11–18).

## A Teachable Format

To me, Wood will always embody the ideal critic, combining aesthetics with a deeply felt humanist politics, while at the same time being an impossible model for teaching. There was no way I could take my students through a similar trajectory of intense close readings and tutorials of great English literature in order to prepare them to pass judgement on five European festival films. A more teachable approach was offered by the team of David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson, and, as luck would have it, the students were already familiar with *Film Art: An Introduction*, which was required reading for the course preceding the ones that coincided with the EUFA screenings. *Film Art* actually contains a chapter entitled “Critical Analysis of Films”, including sample analyses of both classical Hollywood narration, “alternatives to classical filmmaking” as well as documentary (Bordwell & Thompson 400–50). Describing the Bordwell/Thompson approach as hands-on and practical, however, does not mean that such approach does not rest on the authors’ immense experience of meticulous shot-by-shot film analysis. In addition, not only are they finely attuned to the intricacies and specificities of film style; they are also scrupulously familiar with the conditions and contexts for film—like economy, technology, cultural capital, censorship, and the audience. The mode of address is, however, significant: *Film Art* is a textbook, intended for undergraduate students, and designed to be as teachable as possible.

One way to approach the evaluation and assessment of films, then, is to attempt to break down “appreciation” into a series of questions: Does this film appeal to me? Why does it appeal to me? Does it have to do with its style, genre, political message, immersion into the main characters, distancing devices, the moral of the story? How does it relate to film history? How does it relate to the current situation for film in Europe? What kind of representational strategies does it use? What kinds of devices are foregrounded? Is it consistent? Is it personal,

philosophical, aggressive, contemplative, ambiguous? Does it provoke joy, sadness, anger or shame?

## Conclusion

In her article, Staiger posed the following questions:

by what standards do we make value judgements? What are the political implications of various standards? What ends do these standards promote? How do we, if we are to make selections based on value, choose among the standards? If evaluative standards are for the social good, who determines the social good? Are standards for the society at large, for segments of the society, for individuals? What about those outside a particular hegemonic culture? (11)

Although posed over thirty years ago, these questions are still valid. Accordingly, presenting the students with a hands-on approach for critical assessment would only be one part of the job. The other, and perhaps more important part, would be to teach them to be self-reflexive about their own gut instincts and to understand their position in the world.

## References

- American Pie*. Directed by Paul Weitz and Chris Weitz, Universal Pictures, 1999.
- Arnold, Matthew. *The Complete Prose Works of Matthew Arnold*, Vol. V: *Culture and Anarchy with Friendship's Garland and Some Literary Essays*. U of Michigan P, 1965.
- Battleship Potemkin* [*Bronenosets Potemkin*]. Directed by Sergei Eisenstein, Goskino, 1925.
- Bordwell, David, and Kristin Thompson. *Film Art: An Introduction*. McGraw-Hill, 2017.
- Breathless* [*À bout de souffle*]. Directed by Jean-Luc Godard, Les Films Impéria, 1960.
- Citizen Kane*. Directed by Orson Welles, RKO Radio Pictures, 1941.
- Downfall* [*Der Untergang*]. Directed by Oliver Hirschbiegel, Constantin Film, 2004.
- Hedling, Olof. *Robin Wood—brittisk filmkritiker*. Filmhäftet förlag, 2001.
- . "Looking for Robin: Notes on a Completed PhD Project a Decade Later." *CineAction*, no. 84, Spring 2011, pp. 9–12.
- Let the Right One In* [*Låt den rätte komma in*]. Directed by Tomas Alfredson, EFTI, 2008.
- Staiger, Janet. "The Politics of Film Canons." *Cinema Journal* 24:3 (Spring 1985): 4-23.

*Sunrise* [*Sunrise: A Song of Two Humans*]. Directed by Friedrich Wilhelm Murnau, Fox Film Corporation, 1927.

*Toni Erdmann*. Directed by Maren Ade, Komplizen Film, 2016.

*Vertigo*. Directed by Alfred Hitchcock, Alfred J. Hitchcock Productions, 1958.

*The Virgin Spring* [*Jungfrukällan*]. Directed by Ingmar Bergman, Svensk Filmindustri, 1960.

Wood, Robin. *Hitchcock's Films Revisited*. Faber & Faber, 1989.

### Suggested Citation

Larsson, Mariah. "Film Appreciation, Critical Evaluation, and Scholarship: Some Reflections on Teaching the First Year of EUFA." *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 177–180. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Mariah Larsson** is Professor of Film Studies at Linnaeus University, Sweden. Among her recent publications are *The Swedish Porn Scene* (2017); "Adapting Sex: Cultural Conceptions of Sexuality in Words and Images" (in *Women of Ice and Fire*, 2016); and "Documentary Filmmaking as Colonialist Propaganda and Cinefeminist Intervention: Mai Zetterling's *Of Seals and Men* (1979)" (in *Film History*, 2015, with Anna Stenport). Currently, with Elisabet Björklund, she is editing *A Visual History of HIV/AIDS: Exploring the Face of AIDS Film Archive*.

## Evaluation Criticism and Why the European University Film Award Cannot Be another Eurovision Song Contest

Ioannis Skopeteas

In the Department of Cultural Technology and Communication, University of the Aegean, Greece, the undergraduate studies last four years and aim to combine culture with technology that may be used to collect data. One fourth of the modules offered is related to pure audiovisual issues (film history, camerawork, editing, production, sound, etc.). Normally, the theoretical sessions last three hours, therefore, for the first EUFA in 2016, the Department organised three extended sessions (of four hours each) within the mandatory Film History module of the second year; the students watched the films, discussed them and then wrote down notes and criticism that helped them to vote for the films. The big amphitheatre permitted the attendance of visitors; one of the students was accompanied by his much older brother who was also the president of the local Cinephile Club. At the end of the first session, both of them approached me and asked how they should mark films. I told them that in the EUFA they (the students) are the jury. And they replied: “Yes, but we are in a university class and you are the teacher. You have to tell us how.”

At this moment, it became very clear to me that the brilliant idea of Filmfest Hamburg and EFA with the launch of the European University Film Award put us, the scholars, in the front line of a very peculiar challenge: thirteen universities, including mine, that cultivate film/media theory and produce much scholarly criticism on audiovisual works of all kinds and all periods have to provide film criticism that will end with giving evaluation marks. Indeed, although the main purpose of the EUFA contest is discussion, commentary and theory related to the values of European cinema, at the end, and above all, an award would be gained by one of the five nominated films. Probably for the first time in their history, these university departments have to organise a process of thinking similar to the one of festival juries and magazine critics that add “stars” and “points” next to the commented summary of the films. Even more difficult, these films were neither 1920s “masterpieces”, nor “milestone” films by acclaimed “auteurs”, as it is usually the case in university classes. Very few texts have been written about them since their recent release; therefore, the criticism produced has to be genuine, based on theory but without references to a published bibliography on the subject.

The film/media scholars are well aware of the main currents of scholarly criticism and unavoidably use one or some of them in their courses. Stromgren and Norden summarise the methodologies of criticism up to 1984 as derived from the application of the relevant film theory: auteur criticism, genre criticism, *mise-en-scène* (formalist) criticism, political criticism, feminist criticism and sociocultural criticism. To these, the “neglected tradition of phenomenology” that started to regain strength in the late 1970s should be added, “where there is a long standing distrust of pure reason, viewing rationality as a single mode of consciousness among others, ... because life itself tells us that experience is dearer and more trustworthy than schemes” in favour of a more holistic approach and a viewer-oriented method that emphasises the spectator’s reaction to film, not the film itself or its societal codes (Andrew 631). In addition to these, nowadays the dominant notion is poststructuralist/postmodernist with a relativist core, i.e. there are no absolute, universal value judgments; truth and “standards of reasoning, and procedures of justification are products of differing conventions and frameworks of assessment [while] their authority is confined to the context giving rise to them” (“Relativism”).

The idea of the EUFA has landed in this very complicated landscape of scholarly criticism.

### **Not Another Eurovision Song Contest**

As described by our representative who travelled to Hamburg in 2016 for the ultimate stage of the first EUFA, the issues at stake were not clear at all and, therefore, the award was given after several hours of discussion where students tried to persuade each other on the fairness of their opinion, which were based on totally different starting points. At the end, there were subjective attitudes against other subjective attitudes reflecting the subjective reactions of the speakers and the majority of the students of the class they represented. If this description is accurate, the ultimate stage resembled, more or less, what happens in the Eurovision Song Contest where everyone judges everything with no real arguments, issues at stake and criteria apart from their undefined “taste”, and at the end, they simply vote; a quasi-phenomenological criticism.

But the EUFA, based at European Universities, cannot be another Eurovision Song Contest. First of all, because film and media students and their teachers are by definition reflective researchers of film and media communication whereas very few of the voters in a Eurovision Song Contest are experts in what the art of music, song writing and singing entail. Secondly, the purpose of the former is to enhance the values of European cinema and culture while the latter is to support the music industry, its profits and marketing. Thirdly, and most importantly, a quasi-, or even a proper, phenomenological criticism, despite its great contribution to the evolution of film criticism, is inappropriate for a serious competition for an award as it is in direct contrast to a fair system of standards and marks: the subjective experience of the viewer unavoidably favours different issues, depending on their individual background.

In any field of human competition with an evaluation or ranking system, as well as the exact sciences, where numbers and ranks are the only truth, this is not acceptable; for instance, in sports, it is out of question to have five athletes in the same race who will be evaluated for different qualities or tasks (one for their strength, another for their staying power, a third for their speed, etc.) or according to the impressions of the sport’s entertainment value. There is no such race, and equally there cannot be a serious and fair evaluative film competition with five films based on the viewer’s experience, by institutions whose role it is to systematically cultivate film and media studies; it is as if they admitted that their studies and methods of teaching are of no use.

### **“Best Film as Regards What?”**

The two major questions in any evaluative criticism are the issues at stake (the categories) and the ideal with which the work is compared, i.e. the standard by which it will be judged. What is particular in the EUFA evaluative criticism is that the latter is almost evident in the context of film and media studies: in a university class, the five films are compared with the rest of the film tradition (in the given issue) and then to one another. The most satisfying ones take a better mark. All film and media scholars can easily explain to their students the standards, e.g. what distinctive cinematography or profound analysis of a subject within a script is according to its complexity, originality, coherence and intensity. This explanation is, by definition, an essential part of their role as teachers, and normally there will

be very few disagreements. Teachers may explain as well that these criteria can emerge as one engages with the particularity of the work and its critical context, which makes evaluative criticism conditional, practical, pragmatic, but not arbitrary (Klevan 3). Therefore, the crucial question in the EUFA evaluative criticism concerns the issues and the values at stake, the categories within which the films will be judged: “best film” as regards what?

In my opinion, films are films, that is, texts with image and sound, and undoubtedly formalist (*mise-en-scène*) criticism is the first criticism that has to be applied when films are compared to one another: direction, narrative formal system, cinematography, sound, editing, settings, costumes, special effects and acting are the definite major categories for judging films. David Bordwell and Kristin Thompson, V. F. Perkins, and Barry Salt present very clear methods of such criticism. However, the other forms of criticism may be covered as well under relevant criteria of judgement, concerning the text and the “subtext” of the film. For instance, there could be criteria for the “genre of the film” (and the degree to which the film fits it, or how well it reinvigorates it), the “authorship” (and its ingenuity) and the “sociocultural analysis” provided. Given the special identity of the EUFA, there could also be a criterion for the degree of the “relationship of the film with European identity and culture”. The type and the number of categories at stake should be open for proposals by all scholars. What is really crucial is that the final overall mark for each film should be extracted by adding all marks for all criteria and dividing by the number of the criteria at stake. In such a way, the maximum objectivity and justification, as well as a common ground for discussion, would be assured.

In November 2017, the categorical method of evaluation above was tested by the University of the Aegean in the second EUFA award. This happened in parallel with the official EUFA method of evaluation, according to which the “personal top 3” films were chosen by each student, and the first choice was multiplied by three points, the second by two and the third by one point. The categorical method of evaluation comprised marks from 1 to 5 for Screenwriting (the successful script’s narration in accordance with the film genre), Theme (the broadness of the subtext and its relation with the European identity), Direction (genuine style), Performance and actor’s direction, Cinematography, Editing, Music, and Major Achievements Not Otherwise Specified. In total, eight categories. The final sum was divided by the number of categories marked (some categories may not be relevant to all films, i.e. the actor’s performance in the case of documentaries) and the “best film” was literally revealed in a definite way without further discussion. The students voted first with the official evaluation method and then with the categorical method of evaluation. The result took us by surprise: both evaluation methods led to the same result for the five films! For the record, *Heartstone* received 25 in points and 3,941 in marks, *Loveless* 20 in points and 3,845 in marks, and *Home* 15 in points and 3,369 in marks. This outcome of course, demands further psychological analysis and confirmation because, at first glance, it proves that the film students (and possibly, any audience) may provide the same kind of judgment on a film either consciously or subconsciously.

However, there is a major difference between the two evaluation methods: using the categorical method, and in contrast to the official method, the students specified with precision the positive aspects of each film and deeply understood their function within the film production; this, indeed, has always been the overall purpose of a film module and our main task as scholars. In short, with the categorical method of evaluation, the screenings for the EUFA have become essential part of our classroom teaching.

## Conclusion

The EUFA project and Award can be a significant experiment on criticism provided by scholars and, at the same time, a discourse on the identity of European cinema. The EUFA provides the scholars with a unique opportunity to combine scholarly criticism with two other major types of criticism, that is the popular criticism (a mixture of promotion, consumer reports and journalism) of the popular press and websites that adore giving marks to everything, and the festival criticism where evaluation marks are usually given by practitioners based on their work experience. Therefore, it is a great opportunity to contribute to the evolution of film criticism by defining categories, values and criteria at stake. In my opinion, the situation, as well as the film audience that considers the scholars to be the experts in the field by definition, demand a proposal and, possibly, an agreement among all universities on the criteria of this evaluative criticism.

The EUFA cannot be another Eurovision Song Contest and not even a pure and simple matter of phenomenological criticism; both approaches are inappropriate for a serious contest with marks, given the huge tradition in theory and criticism of the film and media departments. A list of the relevant categories and criteria has to be defined; it can be as long as necessary to cover all issues of all kinds of criticism. The scholars and universities should propose the issues they consider as important for criticism and justification; the final list should be compiled by simply adding all of them together.

## References

- Andrew, Dudley. "The Neglected Tradition of Phenomenology in Film Theory." *Movies and Methods: An Anthology*, Vol. II, edited by Bill Nichols, U of California P, 1985, pp. 625–32.
- Bordwell, David, and Kristin Thompson. *The Film Art: An Introduction*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed., McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- Heartstone [Hjartasteinn]*. Directed by Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson, SF Studios, 2016.
- Home*. Directed by Fien Troch, Prime Time, 2016.
- Klevan, Andrew. "What is Evaluative Criticism?" *Film Criticism*, vol. 40, no. 1, 2015, doi:10.3998/fc.13761232.0040.118.
- Loveless [Nelyubov]*. Directed by Andrey Zvyagintsev, Non-Stop Productions, 2017.
- Perkins, V. F. *Film As Film*. Penguin, 1988.
- "Relativism." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 11 Sept. 2015, plato.stanford.edu/entries/relativism/#1.2.
- Salt, Barry. *Film Style and Technology: History and Analysis*. Starword, 1992.

Stromgren, Richard L., and Martin F. Norden. *Movies: A Language in Light*. Prentice-Hall, 1984.

### **Suggested Citation**

Skopeteas, Ioannis. "Evaluation Criticism and Why the European University Film Award Cannot Be another Eurovision Song Contest." *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 181–185. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Ioannis (Yannis) Skopeteas** teaches screenwriting, direction, editing and audiovisual cultural applications in the Department of Cultural Technology and Communication (University of the Aegean, Lesvos, Greece). He holds an MA from Goldsmiths University of London and a PhD from the University of Westminster, London. He has written and edited books on camerawork, narration, documentary and film criticism.

## Showing, Seeing and Discussing: Or, How to Deal with European Cinema by Looking at Contemporary Films and Asking Questions

Francesco Pitassio

Is Europe just a geographical expression, as Otto von Bismarck put it, or a project and a legacy, as its founding fathers after the Second World War promoted it? Is it just a bureaucratic entity, as in the eyes of recent populist movements, or a sense of belonging exceeding national boundaries and local affiliations? Is it a shared culture and set of values (humanitarianism, welfare, progress, patronage of the arts, etc.), or a cage for otherwise fresh energies and creative prompts? Is European cinema an institution, i.e. a system of agencies, a cultural legacy, a homogeneous audience, or just the sum of national productions? In my class I strove to deal with these issues, and to prompt the students to deconstruct inherited notions of Europe and European cinema, in order to reflect on how they could look at this past and present production, and assess the EUFA-selected films on a level which went beyond mere appreciation. To sum up, two were the pivotal questions around which the class discussion developed: is European cinema, as expressed through the films under discussion, a homogeneous cultural and artistic corpus, or does it articulate its identity at local, national, and transnational levels, where major differences might appear between one production and another? Furthermore, should we focus on and discuss European cinema just as representation, or should we broaden our approach and look at juridical frameworks bringing national and transnational productions into being, promoting coproduction schemes, favouring transnational circulation, and creating value for individual products and trends?

The class took place within a very favourable framework: a Master of Fine Arts (MoFA) financed through an Erasmus Mundus scheme, entirely taught in English. The programme gathered students coming from different European (UK, France, Italy) and non-European countries (Indonesia, US, Mexico, Japan, Egypt). The MoFA is titled “Euroculture” and stems from a network of European universities. I was responsible for introducing film studies into the curriculum, and a course of “European Screen Studies” was created for the occasion. Therefore, circumstances were very propitious, for two reasons: on the one hand, I was speaking to a class whose interests revolved around European culture; on the other hand, so far film studies were missing from the course, and the class offered a dangerous supplement (to echo W. J. T. Mitchell when discussing visual culture) to a programme mostly rooted in history and political science.

Nowadays, instructors cannot take the depth of students’ knowledge of film history or contemporary cinema for granted, even less so in my case. Thus, the idea was to provide students with some keywords to European film identity. I initially foregrounded five notions which might help students locating European cinema (historical heritage, avant-garde, realism, authorship and production mode) and subsequently focused on the five films. I assigned them a weekly reading foregrounding those notions, as related to European cinema. The first five readings scrutinised overall issues; in the following weeks, the readings rather focused on the questions on which individual EUFA films prompted to reflect (small national cinemas, state-funded film production, European film festivals, migration and diaspora). Said approach offered the class an opportunity to consider the selected films not solely as texts, and to track them on a broader map, wherein cultural matters are tightly intermingled with economic, political, and social ones.

During the first five weeks the class was mostly based on lectures, albeit there was room for discussion of the assigned readings, wherein students reported on their understanding and expressed doubts or requested further clarification. The second five weeks were mostly based on class screenings and group discussion. As regards film discussion, I usually favoured an initial brainstorming, inviting every student to express his or her opinion, whenever possible connecting it with previous readings and/or their background knowledge. I then collected said opinions, and strove to merge them into a bullet-point-style set of issues to be discussed in a second round, focused as closely as possible on the films themselves, i.e. on how broader concerns (e.g. the migrant crisis, unemployment etc.) were represented and articulated within individual films.

As a mid-term task, I asked the students to write a review of *I, Daniel Blake* (Ken Loach, 2016), which was the first film we screened. According to participation in class discussion, grading of the paper and proficiency in English I defined a shortlist of potential student representatives. Then I inquired about respective availability. Since class discussion was open, and each student was aware of others' clarity of thought and linguistic proficiency, and since the papers' grading was previously discussed with every single student, everybody agreed on the choice of our representative. The voting for the three best films was secret, because I did not want to influence their decision in any way.



**Figure 8: Between local, national and transnational: Newcastle upon Tyne in *I, Daniel Blake* (Ken Loach, Sixteen Films, 2016). Screenshot.**

In teaching European cinema, as related to the European University Film Award, I believe three key issues are of paramount importance. The first of these is the productive tension between local, national and transnational levels of existence for European film production. To bring this issue back to *I, Daniel Blake*, the film that was eventually awarded,

it relies on the dialectics between specific setting (Newcastle upon Tyne), expressed through the location and dialogues, a national matter (the decline of British welfare) and a transnational issue (the consequences of the financial crisis on a cornerstone of European societies, i.e. the individual). Students realise that what they usually label as a national product is both less and more than that. Moreover, what we often brand as national products often deploy a dual strategy, as Andrew Higson has suggested: “On the one hand, a national cinema seems to look inward ... On the other hand, a national cinema seems to look out across its borders, asserting its difference from other national cinemas, proclaiming its sense of otherness” (67). We also referred to the notion of “ImpersoNation”, as Thomas Elsaesser elaborated it, i.e. a partially intentional, widely circulating cinematic negotiation of national identity, overlapping both cultural demands and market needs. This negotiation frequently portrays national issues through modes of representation belonging to a transnational legacy; accordingly, while looking inward, European national cinemas are also outbound, as is the case of two other films selected for EUFA, *The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki* (*Hymyilevä mies*, Juho Kuosmanen, 2016) and *Graduation* (*Bacalaureat*, Cristian Mungiu, 2016). Whereas the former tells the true story of a Finnish boxer in the early 1960s by making use of a nouvelle-vague style, the latter portrays moral decay in contemporary Romania through typical European auteurism options, such as long takes, a slow-paced narrative and an open ending. Consequently, what is supposedly typical for a national product is at least twofold, both national and transnational.

The second key issue is awareness of the close intermingling of cultural and political European values and production schemes—a topic that could easily attract the class’ attention, since political issues are part of its everyday social experience. If we turn to the Berlinale award-winner *Fire at Sea* (*Fuocoammare*, Gianfranco Rosi, 2016) or the EFA award-winner *Toni Erdmann* (Maren Ade, 2016), instructors and students grasp the connection between humanitarianism and criticism of turbocapitalism and institutional production schemes such as Eurimages, or national producers fostering European films reinforcing that set of values, as Les Films d’Ici. About the connection between European values, national cinemas, and production strategies, the notion of “small cinemas” explored by Mette Hjort was also productive in some cases, namely *The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki* and *Graduation*. According to Hjort, small cinemas “reject the winner-take-all ethos that supports the idea of using success as a purely personal platform for even greater rewards” (2). Both films, then, stem from “small cinemas”, and illustrate characters who embrace the above-mentioned ethics (Hjort and Petrie).

Finally, and third key issue, through class discussion and production histories we worked to unveil the relationship between European film production and media networks. We examined both European production schemes aimed at increasing the market value of European media products (e.g. MEDIA programme), supporting European art films (e.g. Eurimages), and circulating European films (e.g. Europa Cinemas) (Jäckel). However, we also considered the nonnegligible role of national agencies or producers, such as state funds or national broadcasters. European films are not exclusively art products floating in an economic and juridical void, but come into being thanks to the complex intermingling of different national and supranational agencies, each with a different agenda.

The class was in many ways too short, given the richness of European film heritage and the multiplicity of the issues we tackled. However, I believe courses should be aimed less at closing the questions they deal with, and more at prompting new questions—which, I believe, is also part and parcel of the European critical legacy.

## References

- I, Daniel Blake*. Directed by Ken Loach, Sixteen Films, 2016.
- Elsaesser, Thomas, *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*, Amsterdam UP, 2005.
- Fire at Sea [Fuocoammare]*. Directed by Gianfranco Rosi, Stemal Entertainment, 2016.
- Graduation [Bacalaureat]*. Directed by Cristian Mungiu, Canal+, 2016.
- The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki [Hymyilevä mies]*. Directed by Juho Kuosmanen, Aamu Film Company, 2016.
- Higson, Andrew, “The Limiting Imagination of National Cinema.” *Cinema & Nation*, edited by Mette Hjort and Scott McKenzie, Routledge, 2000, pp. 63–74.
- Hjort, Mette, “Small Cinemas: How They Thrive and Why They Matter.” *Mediascape*, Winter 2011, [www.tft.ucla.edu/mediascape/Winter2011\\_SmallCinemas.html](http://www.tft.ucla.edu/mediascape/Winter2011_SmallCinemas.html).
- Hjort, Mette, and Duncan Petrie, editors. *The Cinema of Small Nations*, Indiana UP, 2007.
- Jäckel, Anne. *European Film Industries*. BFI, 2003.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. “Showing Seeing: A Critique of Visual Culture.” *Journal of Visual Culture*, vol. 1, no. 2, 2002, pp. 165–81.
- Toni Erdmann*. Directed by Maren Ade, Komplizen Film, 2016.

## Suggested Citation

Pitassio, Francesco. “Showing, Seeing and Discussing: Or, How to Deal with European Cinema by Looking at Contemporary Films and Asking Questions.” *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 186–189. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Francesco Pitassio** is associate professor of Film Studies at the Università degli Studi di Udine. He is part of the editorial board of *NECSUS–European Journal of Media Studies*, and of the NECS steering committee. He edited with Leonardo Quaresima *Writing and Image* (1998) and *Multiple-Language Versions III* (2005), with Tim Bergfelder and Vinzenz Hediger the *Cinéma & Cie.* special issue *The Geopolitics of Cinema and the Study of Film* (2013), with Dorota Ostrowska and Zsuzsanna Varga *Popular Cinemas in East Central Europe: Film Cultures and Histories* (2017). Among his books are *Ombre silenziose. Teoria dell'attore cinematografico negli anni Venti* (2002), *Maschere e marionette. Il cinema ceco e dintorni* (2002), *Attore/Divo* (2003), and *Il cinema neorealista* (with Paolo Noto, 2010). His research interests are focused on film theory, film acting and stardom, Italian film history and culture, documentary cinema, and Central-Eastern European cinema.

## Developing an Appreciation for Film and European Cinema

Skadi Loist

When I got the opportunity to design a course for the EUFA initiative at the Institute for Media Research at the University of Rostock, Germany, I needed to take into account the specificities of our department and degree programmes, which presented me with a few structural challenges. Our BA in Communications and Media Studies is only a minor within a BA structure combining two disciplines, which leaves only five modules dedicated to communications and media, and no obligatory film studies classes. There is only one entry-level film analysis course and the occasional elective film courses. Therefore, students entering our MA in Communications and Media Studies, which is also part of a degree programme combining two disciplines within one Master's degree, have very little working knowledge of film studies. This was one of the challenges to take into account when designing the mandatory MA course around the European University Film Award.

The second structural challenge was the lack of screening time. Teaching film studies as part of specialised university degrees usually means that a dedicated screening slot is provided in addition to the lecture time. As film is only a very minor part of our degree at Rostock (and of our small department), screening times had to be carved out of the class time. The third structural challenge was Germany's own academic schedule: the autumn semester only starts mid-October, and usually lasts till the end of January. This makes it difficult to align the course with the EUFA schedule. While courses in many other European countries start before the EUFA nominees are announced, and can use these weeks to establish the basics of European cinema studies and film analysis, the course in Rostock started late and students did not have much prior background knowledge I could work with. Luckily, we were able to block the course time, using three-hour screening slots on Mondays followed by two-hour seminar slots on Wednesdays to discuss the films and issues of film theory and film history for context. The course ended mid-December, after the EUFA was awarded in Hamburg, and the outcome and experience there were incorporated into the last teaching session to wrap up the course.

The mid-October to early-December timeframe set by the announcement of the EUFA nominees and by the EUFA deliberation scheduled for the week of the European Film Awards left a short eight-week window. The first two weeks, equalling four sessions, were dedicated to providing some grounding for the students before delving into the discussion of the five EUFA films. In the first week we refreshed the basics of film analysis, training the students in closely watching film texts and providing the basic vocabulary to discuss the formal aspects and aesthetics of film, narrative strategies and character development. Along this, we developed a first list of criteria for the analysis of the EUFA films to be used in the following weeks.

Another preparatory segment was the hands-on discussion of film criticism. All students were asked to bring in three reviews of either current or classic films from newspapers, magazines or film journals, which we then analysed in terms of structure and content. Aided by a handbook on writing art criticism, which we discussed, and this personal archive of film reviews to draw inspiration from, the students were tasked to choose three out of the five EUFA films on which to write film reviews in the following weeks. The reports were part of the grade, and served several purposes; in particular: 1) they encouraged students

to watch the films closely and try to put into words what they had seen, thus making them structure their first thoughts about the films and develop arguments that lead to an evaluation of the films, something which in turn aided the discussion in class; 2) they made students practice their writing, and in a timely manner. In order to guide the process, I would read the papers on the night of the same day they were turned in and returned them during the next session. This way, students received immediate feedback and could incorporate the comments into their next report writing. At the same time, I gained an overview of the opinions and comments on the films, which helped me guiding the discussion in the subsequent class. The course scheduling of the first EUFA edition in 2016 was unfortunate in that the Monday evening screening was followed by a Tuesday morning class, which put a lot of pressure on the students for writing the reports, and on me for reading them late at night, so that I could have an idea of their comments in time for the following morning. In 2017, we were able to move the seminar session to Wednesday, which left more time for review writing and reading.

The third preparatory segment was dedicated to the discussion of concepts of European cinema. Among the readings were several introductory articles on European cinema history which provided a backdrop in theoretical concepts such as discussing European cinema in terms of national and transnational cinematographies, European cinema history based on specific canons, and concepts such as the new waves, auteurs and art-house conventions, as well as (co)production and funding contexts (Blankenship and Nagel; Ezra; Harrod, Liz and Timoshkina; Jäckel; Steinwender and Zahlten). For the discussion of a definition of European cinema in practical terms we also took a close look at the regulations provided by the EFA, stating which films are considered European by virtue of their production contexts and talent involved and are thus eligible for the European Film Awards. The short German-language book by Moritz Krämer discussing the dramaturgy and aesthetics of the European Film Award winners between 2000 and 2005 was well received by my students. Firstly, German-language reading is still preferred by German students, who are often shy of using foreign-language teaching materials. Secondly, the scope of this short study fits very well with our discussion of what European cinema is and how to describe it. Krämer first lists all clichés of European cinema in opposition to Hollywood, such as open and complex narrative structures, genre rejection, character-driven plots and long takes in order to then test these categories in relation to the European Film Award winners. As a result he finds that EFA winner films seem to perpetuate the myth and clichés of European cinema—maybe unwittingly fuelling the difficult noncommercial position of European cinema vis-à-vis Hollywood entertainment. The hands-on approach as well as the direct applicability of the analysis of the previous EFA winner films was very helpful for the students within the EUFA project, even when some of the findings seemed to lack a more nuanced approach.

After this packed introductory section of the course, we started watching and discussing the films during the following five weeks. Additional reading was provided for the seminar sessions, which were picked in accord with the week's films. Key concepts such as documentary film helped to discuss *Fire at Sea* (*Fuocoammare*, Gianfranco Rosi, 2016) and *The War Show* (Obaidah Zytoon and Andreas Dalsgraad, 2016), as the only documentary nominations compared to the four feature films in each of the two years of the award; auteur concepts fitted with films by Ken Loach and Aki Kaurimsäki; concepts of genre such as coming-of-age films fit well with the 2017 nominees *Heartstone* (*Hjartasteinn*, Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson, 2016) and *Home* (Fien Troch, 2016); concepts of identity, gender and sexuality fit not only with the coming-out film *Heartstone* (Fien Troch, 2016), but with most of the nominees; new waves, such as the Romanian New Wave could be discussed with

*Graduation* and issues of awards and circulation helped bring the discussion back to the final task of voting for the EUFA and which criteria to keep in mind.

This very intense course layout was successful in making students feel involved and excited about European cinema. In both years, several students took the class without knowing much about film studies; they seldom (or never) attended an arthouse cinema or watched European films—yet, they emerged from the class feeling enthusiastic about film. For the second edition, students from the previous year came back and asked if they could join a few of the screenings. In 2016, one of the key moments for them was the realisation that they were indeed part of a larger transnational reception context and European university project. When they watched the German film *Toni Erdmann* (Maren Ade, 2016) being streamed during class with English subtitles, one student said that the experience made her realise that this German film in this instance was not primarily a national product, but was being seen by all other students in the other participating European countries as a European film. In 2017, one of the most significant moments for my students was watching *The War Show* with a Syrian refugee who now lived and studied in Rostock. As a port city that, during the so-called refugee crisis, was a waypoint on the migration route from Syria via the Balkans through Germany, onward to the neighbouring Sweden by ferry, Rostock (and students actively involved in the support networks) had seen the refugees streaming in during the summer of 2015. Yet, watching both *The Other Side of Hope* (*Toivon tuolla puolen*, Aki Kaurimäki, 2017) and especially *The War Show* together with a Syrian student giving personal insights into the situation was a much more intense and personal experience for them than discussing *Fire at Sea* the previous year. These examples and the eagerness of the students to participate in the screenings show that the idea behind the EUFA does work out. The opportunity to engage with current European film in a way that opens up the meaning behind the more “serious” art films through writing reviews and discussion, and the motivation to engage with the films for a broader goal such as voting for a European award, rather than merely a course grade, has created an appreciation of film and, maybe, has even sparked a new generation of European cinephiles.

## References

- Blankenship, Janelle, and Tobias Nagl. “Introduction: Towards a Politics of Scale.” *European Visions: Small Cinemas in Transition*, edited by Janelle Blankenship and Tobias Nagl, Transcript, 2015, pp. 15–46.
- Ezra, Elizabeth. “Introduction: A Brief History Of European Cinema.” *European Cinema*, edited by Elizabeth Ezra, Oxford UP, 2004, pp. 1–17.
- Fire at Sea* [*Fuocoammare*]. Directed by Gianfranco Rosi, Stemal Entertainment, 2016.
- Graduation* [*Bacalaureat*]. Directed by Cristian Mungiu, Canal+, 2016.
- Harrod, Mary, Mariana Liz, and Alissa Timoshkina. “The Europeanness of European Cinema: An Overview.” *The Europeanness of European Cinema: Identity, Meaning, Globalization*, edited by Mary Harrod, Mariana Liz, and Alissa Timoshkina, I.B. Tauris, 2015, pp. 12–21.

*Heartstone* [*Hjartasteinn*]. Directed by Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson, SF Studios, 2016.

*Home*. Directed by Fien Troch, Prime Time, 2016.

*I, Daniel Blake*. Directed by Ken Loach, Sixteen Films, 2016.

Jäckel, Anne. “Changing the Image of Europe? The Role of European Co-Productions, Funds and Film Awards.” *The Europeanness of European Cinema: Identity, Meaning, Globalization*, edited by Mary Harrod, Mariana Liz, and Alissa Timoshkina, I.B. Tauris, 2015, pp. 57–66.

Krämer, Moritz. *Die fabelhafte Welt des europäischen Spielfilms: Dramaturgie und Ästhetik der Gewinner des europäischen Filmpreises im beginnenden 21. Jahrhundert*. Tectum, 2008.

*The Other Side of Hope* [*Toivon Tuolla Puolen*]. Directed by Aki Kaurismäki, Sputnik Oy, 2017.

Steinwender, Harald, and Alexander Zahlten. “Überlegungen zum europäischen Populärfilm.” *Transnationale Medienlandschaften: Populärer Film zwischen World Cinema und postkolonialem Europa*, edited by Ivo Ritzer and Harald Steinwender, Springer, 2017, pp. 189–213.

*Toni Erdmann*. Directed by Maren Ade, Komplizen Film, 2016.

*The War Show*. Directed by Andreas Dalsgaard and Obaidah Zytoon, Fridthjof Film, 2016.

### Suggested Citation

Loist, Skadi. “Developing an Appreciation for Film and European Cinema.” *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 190–193. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Skadi Loist** is a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute for Media Research of the University of Rostock and leads the three-year research project “Film Circulation on the International Film Festival Network and the Impact on Global Film Culture” (2017–2020) funded by the German Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF). Various publications in German and English, including the edited volume *Film Festivals: History, Theory, Method, Practice* (with Marijke de Valck and Brendan Kredell, 2016). Skadi is cofounder of the Film Festival Research Network (FFRN), a Steering Committee member of the European Network for Cinema and Media Studies (NECS) and co-editor of the Festival Review section of *NECSUS: European Journal of Media Studies*.

## Teaching through the European University Film Award: Promoting a Complex Understanding of European Cinema

Laura Rascaroli

At University College Cork, Ireland, the European University Film Award (EUFA) initiative was incorporated in a core module of the MA in Film and Screen Media, devoted to the topic of Film and Screen Cultures and Industries. This flexible, team-taught module was an ideal pedagogic framework for the award and its activities. The MA combines theory and creative practice, and interfaces with the film and culture industries, with a particular emphasis on production, distribution, archives and film festivals. Hence, EUFA provided an extraordinarily rich opportunity to expand our MA students' understanding of film in the context of cultural institutions such as the European Film Academy, the European Film Awards and Filmfest Hamburg.



**Figure 9: Students from the University College Cork 2016 EUFA class. Photo: Daniel O'Connell.**

The five films were taught in the context of my section of the course, devoted to ideas of European cinema, on the basis that the EUFA initiative was introduced “to spread the ‘European idea’ and to transport the spirit of European cinema to an audience of university students” (“About EUFA”). The central focus of EUFA is, therefore, dual: on the one hand, to consolidate an idea of Europe and its values, in particular among young generations of Europeans, and, on the other hand, to promote the knowledge of (and, hopefully, an appetite for) European films. Consequently, it was decided that the best approach would be to place the films in the context of theories of European film. The question of what European cinema

has been in the past and what it has become today is pivotal to my course, where it is also contextualised within the broader issue of what Europe may be said to be—as a continent and a geopolitical entity.

The lack of directives as to what students would need to focus on in their decision-making process was initially perceived as a potential weakness; yet, the absence of prescriptive coordinates was seized by the class as an opportunity for debate and became a significant component of the teaching and learning process, giving rise to a stimulating discussion on what a European university award should prize in a film. The debate focused on issues of European relevance. Students felt that the chosen film should reflect on questions that, even if localised, have a continental import and participate in some debate or contribute to an issue of broad relevance for European citizens. This focus gave us opportunities to broaden the debate from the cinema to questions of Europeanness. At the same time, it was felt that a university prize awarded by students of film and media should reflect their understanding and appreciation of film aesthetics, history and theory—in other words, that the awarded film would have to make a significant, innovative contribution to filmmaking in general, and to European cinema in particular.

Of course, there was awareness that this approach may not chime with that of other participating institutions; yet, it gave the process some structure. Nevertheless, more than this basic framework was needed to facilitate the discussion in class, as well as support student learning in the context of an advanced Master's level module. The first part of the course, accordingly, focused on ideas of European film, looking at historical and contemporary genres, trends, critical debates, and terminologies in use, and asking questions around issues of style and the meanings attached to the “European cinema” label, historically and today. We focused, in particular, on how ideas of European cinema have been constructed with reference and in contrast to Hollywood, drawing and adapting some concepts from the existing literature, for instance Thomas Elsaesser's *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*. Broad binary conceptions that have marked the history of ideas of European cinema, such as industry vs. auteurism, cinema of action vs. cinema of inaction, and escapism vs. engagement were identified, investigated and called into question through a series of concise case studies illuminating a variety of key issues—from questions of national cinemas to production and coproduction strategies, from the historical success of certain popular genres to the concept of the auteur, from the role of festivals to that of stardom. I was particularly interested in highlighting notions that have been pivotal to the construction of a “European cinema brand”, and that still recur in critics' takes on contemporary films, as well as in past and recent concepts that scholars have introduced to understand European film. Notions of canon, genre, arthouse, identity, industry, style, realism, engagement, slowness were all discussed with the help of scholarly readings—this advanced work was facilitated by the fact that most students in the class had majored in film and screen media at undergraduate level and were already broadly familiar with film history and theory. Another important focus was the problematic circulation of nonnational European films in Europe, and the existing supranational funding schemes to support the production and distribution of European films (Eurimages, MEDIA).

In advance of each debate that composed the second section of the course students were tasked to prepare synthetic presentations on key aspects of the films: the director's background and the film's production history; festival participation and awards won; main points raised by filmmakers and producers in interviews; main points drawn from three-to-five film reviews. This hands-on research work helped grounding the debates, while training students to identify types of festivals and awards, key publications and influential film critics.

An effort was then made to contextualise the films within ideas of European cinema—traditions, genres, and concepts. In some cases, this work was especially productive. For instance, in the first EUFA edition in 2016, *The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki* (*Hymyilevä Mies*, Juho Kuosmanen, 2016) was discussed, among other things, in light of the boxing drama, the period film, heritage, *vérité* style, and the “cinema of small nations” literature (Hjort and Petrie); *Graduation* (*Bacalaureat*, Cristian Mungiu, 2016) supported a debate on notions of the new wave, both historically and today; and *Fire at Sea* (*Fuocoammare*, Gianfranco Rosi, 2016) was studied with reference to traditions of engaged cinema, slow cinema and documentary, and of the film’s adaptation and updating of observational strategies.

While this type of work was very fruitful from my teaching perspective, in line with the aims of my course, it tended to structure classes too much and thus channel and contain the debate to a degree. The problem was finding a balance between the more traditional teaching components, even if delivered via a fluid seminar structure, and the experimentation of student-led learning, where the focus is on experiential learning through reflection and doing. The students were involved to a considerable degree, on the basis of their own research, in-class presentations, and participation in debate—yet on occasion I wondered whether a less structured didactic approach might have supported more lively, albeit possibly less focused, debates. A challenge was also posed by the difficulty to remember the fine detail of discussions that had taken place weeks earlier. After the end of the series of screenings, a final debate was held on all five films, after which students cast their votes. That session, however, highlighted the need for some form of record of prior debates, which could be used to refresh students’ memory of the complexity of the discussions, and provide a stronger basis for their individual decisions.

On the basis of this experience and of the students’ and my perception of both the strengths and shortcomings of our approach, for the second edition of EUFA in 2017 I tested a comparatively less structured approach to the debates, and introduced an evaluation sheet that the class filled in at the end of each debate. The evaluation included the following criteria, which were agreed at the start of the process: Story, Screenplay, Characters, Acting, Mise en scène, Technique, Aesthetics, Originality, Themes, Europeanness. While marks were assigned by consensus (on the basis of a majority vote), it was agreed that these evaluations would not be prescriptive or binding with respect to the final, individual vote, but would be used exclusively as a record of the evaluations expressed by the students. In addition, notes detailing the key points raised and discussed in class were recorded, and proved to be extremely useful during the last debate, as a reminder of the subtleties of prior discussions. Students were also set a short individual written assignment. They were asked to choose one of the five films and carry out an analysis of its reception by critics, highlighting those elements of the chosen reviews that were pertinent to one or more of the critical discourses explored in the first section of the course, such as ideas of national/transnational cinema, art film, the cinema of small nations, slow cinema, cinema of social concern, realism, new waves, auteurism. This exercise highlighted how much contemporary criticism is still informed by established, traditional notions of the “Europeanness of European cinema” (Harrod, Liz, and Timoshkina).

Feedback from the student ambassador at the 2017 edition confirmed that the individual research she carried out on the films, both for the class presentations and the assignment, aided her during the debates in Hamburg. The first, theoretical section of the course was especially useful to her when meanings and definitions of European cinema were

discussed, and the evaluation reports with the detailed student notes came very useful during the debates on the five films.

To conclude, the incorporation of EUFA into a flexible Master's level module with a focus on the film and culture industries is highly productive. Within such context, EUFA offers unique opportunities to develop exciting strategies for student learning in between the university teaching of film history and theory and institutions and events such as the European Film Academy and Filmfest Hamburg. Personally, I especially value the opportunity it offers to promote students' understanding of European cinema as a complex object, shaped both historically and today by a composite of ideas, forces, subjects and institutions.

## References

- “About EUFA.” *European University Film Award*, [www.eufa.org](http://www.eufa.org). Accessed 19 Dec. 2017.
- Elsaesser, Thomas. *European Cinema: Face to Face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam UP, 2005.
- Fire at Sea [Fuocoammare]*. Directed by Gianfranco Rosi, Stemal Entertainment, 2016.
- Graduation [Bacalaureat]*. Directed by Cristian Mungiu, Canal+, 2016.
- The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki [Hymyilevä Mies]*. Directed by Juho Kuosmanen, Aamu Filmcompany, 2016.
- Harrod, Mary, Mariana Liz, and Alissa Timoshkina. “The Europeanness of European Cinema: An Overview.” *The Europeanness of European Cinema: Identity, Meaning, Globalization*, edited by Mary Harrod, Mariana Liz, and Alissa Timoshkina, I.B. Tauris, 2015, pp. 12–21.
- Hjort, Mette, and Duncan Petrie, editors. *The Cinema of Small Nations*, Indiana UP, 2007.

## Suggested Citation

Rascaroli, Laura. “Teaching through the European University Film Award: Promoting a Complex Understanding of European Cinema.” *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 194–197. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Laura Rascaroli** is Professor of Film and Screen Media at University College Cork, Ireland. She is the author and editor of several books, among which *How the Essay Film Thinks* (2017), *The Personal Camera: Subjective Cinema and the Essay Film* (2009), *Crossing New Europe: Postmodern Travel and the European Road Movie* (2006), co-written with Ewa Mazierska, and *Antonioni: Centenary Essays* (2011), co-edited with John David Rhodes. She is general editor of *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*.

## **Between *Polderen* and Programming: A Teaching Report of the EUFA Project at Utrecht University**

Laura Copier

From the moment I was approached by my colleague Marijke de Valck (via Skadi Loist) in April 2016 to join this special programme, I was very enthusiastic about the initiative, yet we also knew that there would be some constraints in terms of scheduling. We had just launched our new MA programme and the curriculum was already more than full, with students taking three mandatory classes simultaneously over a period of ten weeks. As such, the EUFA project was never going to be a compulsory part of the curriculum. Instead, we told our students this would be a great “after school activity”, where not only would they be able to see new films well before they would go into general release, but also discuss them, rank them, and eventually vote on them as part of a much larger festival setting. Of course the cherry on top was the opportunity for one of the students to be sent as a delegate to partake in the final voting procedure. On the basis of this “sales pitch”, twelve (out of thirty-eight students) signed up for the screenings, which took place once a week on Wednesday between 5 and 8 p.m.

Given that the screenings took place after regular teaching hours and that they were not explicitly part of the curriculum, I deemed it important to provide context within our MA programme. In the period of the screening of the five EUFA films, I teach a class called Programming and Curating. This course aims to highlight current debates and practices of programming for (film) festivals. The textbook for this class, Marijke de Valck, Brendan Kredell and Skadi Loist’s *Film Festivals: History, Theory, Method, Practice*, provided the necessary context in terms of film festival selection practices. Moreover, the notion of the film festival as part of larger cultural network, fostering a certain taste and societal relevance proved to be productive in relation to the particularities of the European University Film Award.

The Wednesday night screenings were followed by a fairly freeform discussion, mostly facilitated by myself (occasionally one of my colleagues). I think students actually learned mostly how to engage and sustain a meaningful discussion, where all participants were equal and every opinion mattered. Usually the conversation would start with some quick, first thoughts on the film. As the facilitator, my job was to not let these hasty verdicts on a given film, sometimes no more than expressions of boredom or unease, dominate the ensuing discussion. Initially, discussions tended to focus on issues of aesthetics, for instance the persistent use of the long take, the absence of diegetic music, or the “naturalistic” acting. Since our students are neither trained in nor taught on film form or aesthetics at MA level, these types of discussions, valuable as they were, often led to somewhat unsatisfying results for everyone involved, simply because not all participants were equally aware of the presence or absence of certain formal elements.

As the screenings progressed, I noticed a significant change in the students’ evaluation of the films: rather than judging every film individually, they actively sought to uncover recurring dominant themes and read and evaluate the films in relation to one another. The topic of “Europe” was of course crucial in the thematic discussions. This became even more pronounced when we were coming towards the end of our screenings and the moment of voting for the top three films for Hamburg was imminent. Often students would bring up the

representation of Europe and Europeans and the extent to which the five films were somehow representative of the many troubling, challenging and exciting aspects of the notion of Europe, living in Europe or feeling a sense of belonging in Europe. I think this was one of the most striking topics of discussion instigated by the UEFA film selection. My students—as far as I was concerned, or as far as I had experienced until then—do not seem to be particularly interested or engaged in the idea of a (some sort of) European identity. Contrary to my own experience when I was a student twenty years ago, “Europe” as a larger cultural construct or category of belonging does not seem to hold my students’ interest or imagination. Rarely do we address issues from a distinct European perspective; it seems to be an element of our identity that goes without saying. Watching and extensively discussing five films that were somehow chosen on the basis of their “Europeanness” forced my students to come to terms with and think through their notions of what it means to be European, to identify as such or, in some cases, not to identify as such.



**Figure 10: Student deliberations at Körber Stiftung, Hamburg, 2016 UEFA edition. Photo: UEFA/K. Brunnhofer.**

At the end of the series of screenings, I asked two students to write a report on the UEFA experience, as a way to bring the UEFA initiative to the attention of a larger group of people. They wrote a concise, yet very enthusiastic report of the screenings and the voting procedure, which was published in the faculty and university-wide digital newsletter (UU Nieuws en Agenda). In this report, they emphasised the aspect of discussion, of becoming able to actually listen to someone else’s opinion as the most valuable learning experience they got out of their involvement. Dutch students tend to be quite adept at the performance of discussion, and always seem to reach a (somewhat) common ground, meaning all participants feel their opinion was heard and taken into consideration. There is a Dutch verb for this kind of consensus decision-making: *polderen*, derived from the concept of the polder model used

in economic and social policy making, which, according to *Wikipedia*, is often understood as “a pragmatic recognition of pluriformity” and “cooperation despite differences”.

The challenge presented by the EUFA discussions was that, apart from having a meaningful exchange on these films, eventually the films had to be ranked. In the act of ranking, the philosophy and act of *polderen* no longer hold any ground and this is where things got complicated.

The group had decided early on that an in-class voting procedure would be held after the final screening. The idea was to make the process as open and transparent as possible. The students ranked the films by giving them one, two, three, or zero points, effectively submitting the top three. I did not partake in the voting, but I was responsible for tallying the results and facilitating the discussion as the results came in after each round. After the first round of voting, it turned out that *I, Daniel Blake* (Ken Loach, 2016) was by far the favourite of the group and that *Toni Erdmann* (Maren Ade, 2016) received only one point. Discussion ensued over whether *I, Daniel Blake*'s popularity might have something to do with the fact that it happened to be the last film we watched (I think we rightly assumed this may have had some influence on the voting behaviour). On the basis of this first round of voting, *Toni Erdmann* was out of competition, which caused discussion among some students who felt that this result did not do justice to the obvious merits of the film. The students agreed on revote of the first round, now that the potential impact of the top-three system was obvious. In the end, it took at least six more rounds of voting to arrive at our top three: *I, Daniel Blake*, *Graduation (Bacalaureat)* (Cristian Mungiu, 2016), and *Fire at Sea (Fuocoammare)* (Gianfranco Rosi, 2016), the latter ultimately becoming the number one choice. Voting for the top three was partly an exercise in reaching consensus, yet it also taught the students the lesson that in these kinds of activities eventually the majority vote is decisive. For a small number of students this was a tough pill to swallow, as some of their favourite films were consistently ranked low. Nevertheless, a consensus was reached and the resulting top three were deemed a proper reflection of what the students from Utrecht University valued most in the EUFA selection of films: thematic resonance, artistic merit and social relevance. It was now up to our democratically elected student representative Jasper to go and represent the top three films in Hamburg to the best of his abilities.

Overall, I was very pleased with the opportunity the EUFA project gave us to discuss contemporary European films with a dedicated group of students. As mentioned, our university's scheduling unfortunately will not allow for this initiative to become a structural part of the curriculum. Nevertheless, I think it is a valuable supplement to our programme, in that it not only facilitates a sustained discussion on film and Europe, but also gives students a hands-on experience of the work involved in programming and selecting films in a festival context.

## References

de Valck, Marijke, Brendan Kredell, and Skadi Loist, editors. *Film Festivals: History, Theory, Method, Practice*. Routledge, 2016. Print.

*Fire at Sea [Fuocoammare]*. Directed by Gianfranco Rosi, Stemal Entertainment, 2016.

*Graduation [Bacalaureat]*. Directed by Cristian Mungiu, Canal+, 2016.

*I, Daniel Blake*. Directed by Ken Loach, Sixteen Films, 2016.

“Polder model.” Wikipedia, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polder\_model. Accessed 20 Dec. 2017.

*Toni Erdmann*. Directed by Maren Ade, Komplizen Film, 2016.

UU Nieuws en Agenda. “Studenten Film-en Televisiewetenschap nemen deel aan European University Film Awards.” 23 Dec. 2016, www.uu.nl/nieuws/studenten-film-en-televisiewetenschap-nemen-deel-aan-european-university-film-awards.

### Suggested Citation

Copier, Laura. “Between *Polderen* and Programming: A Teaching Report of the EUFA Project at Utrecht University.” *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 198–201. www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf. ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Laura Copier** is an Assistant Professor of Film and Television Studies at Utrecht University. Her research is focused on the interdisciplinary exchange between religion and popular culture, film in particular. Her monograph *Preposterous Revelations: Visions of Apocalypse and Martyrdom in Hollywood Cinema 1980–2000* (Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012) analyses the divergent representations of the Apocalypse, in image as well as in words, appearing in contemporary Hollywood cinema.

## **Playing a Film Festival Jury: Cooperative Competition in the Classroom**

Andrea Pocsik

### **Introduction**

New research agendas in the field of film studies involve innovative methodologies in higher education. An example is the initiative of the European Film Academy and Filmfest Hamburg that mobilised the Film Festival Research Network, proving again how beneficial networking can be. We, European Network for Cinema and Media Studies (NECS) members, especially those of us who are active teachers, all share the problem of bringing theory and practice together; yet, we have little opportunity to find solutions together and of learning from each other. The core question “How to teach European cinema?” raises crucial questions concerning our cultural identity, our profession as teachers and academics and our subject: film studies. In spite of globalisation, contemporary European cinema produces many images that feed on old traditional values, but it is a real challenge (and, I am convinced, an important task for engaged film scholars) to show and teach such images while avoiding reinforcing Eurocentric views.

In this paper, I argue that EUFA is a treasury of methodological opportunities since it can generate classroom activities that connect theory and practice. In my contribution, I will try to demonstrate how cooperative competition (or, to use a neologism, “coopetition”), originating in game theories and widely used in the business sphere, can be applied to this project and what benefits it can bring. I intend to show how it deepens our knowledge about contemporary film production and distribution, how it develops students’ skills in project work, where they practice coopetition in order to be nominated as the representative of their university, and how it educates emancipated students by extending their right of selection and judgement of highly valued products of European cinema.

### **Teaching European cinema**

The theoretical assumptions of Benedict Anderson about nation are adapted by several theoreticians in the field of European studies so that we can think about Europe as an “imagined community”, with what probably is more a desired (and promoted by European Union integration policies) than an actual cohesive, common identity. Recent economical, political and social crises all over the continent, but especially the reactions and possible solutions to them, have questioned the reality of the basic democratic laws of this large, diverse community of shared interests and values. Furthermore, belonging is a rather passionate relationship and, just as in the case of nationalism, European identity has recently been exploited by populist politicians and has become a debated (utopian) idea rather than a descriptive term for something existing. Even so, Europe has to be defended and surrounded by fences, some of them believe.

Film is the memory and imaginary of the twentieth century, as Thomas Elsaesser argues; cultural traditions and reminiscences of past events were first saved on celluloid and other analogue media and then in new digital formats. Obviously, most research focuses on the products of this complex machinery but learning about audiences, those millions who bought tickets to watch these films, and understanding why they liked or disliked them and

what sort of communities they created in the process is not equally known. In the introduction to their volume *Film–Cinema–Spectator: Film Reception* (Schenk, Tröhler, and Zimmermann), the editors try to map relevant fields of film studies to remedy this lack. They start from reception studies and continue with New Film History and New Cinema History, both of which stress the importance of the cultural history of film and cinema, using new methodologies (oral history and cultural studies methods). But this is the historiography of the social and aesthetic practice of film reception. To understand the present situation (and make the work of future film scholars easier) the new field of film festival studies undoubtedly constitutes a big step forward in the scholarship.

In their contribution to the first volume of the *Film Festival Yearbook*, Marijke de Valck and Skadi Loist provided an overview “of this burgeoning field”. They constructed six axes to approach it: film as work of art; economic continuum; festival as institution; reception: audiences and exhibition; politics of place; the film festival circuit; and history. They also provided a thematic, annotated bibliography that further defined the picture, and which they updated in the *Film Festival Yearbook 2* (Loist and de Valck).<sup>1</sup> A couple of years later, a volume of the same series examined programming, the topic that is closer to our project (Ruoff).

The EUFA project with this serious awarding game (which I will describe in detail later) created an (interpretational) framework that made possible to add a second question to the main one (how to teach European cinema?): how to teach film festival studies?

### **Working Process (Film Analysis) Based on Politics and Poetics**

Our case, the Pázmány EUFA Lab in Budapest, was somewhat special in terms of the methodology since it was based (as all distance learning) on a mixture of online and physical presence. I was on a DAAD scholarship of the German Academic Exchange Service, for which I spent half of the term in Berlin, so we used e-mail consultations, created a Facebook group, uploaded and shared, liked and commented. It was an extra-curricular activity, which I prefer because it provides a component of fun to the work, thus increasing student motivation, although it is more difficult to make demands of them, due to the lack of credits. The students were selected on the basis of motivation letters they wrote, and worked in teams. I gave each team a film to discuss and asked them to sum up the films’ features and the results of their analysis (cooperation). In our lab work we listened to student analyses, commented on them, and provided counterarguments. In order to stress the importance of a cultural studies approach I created a so-called “label cloud” involving terms referring to formal and historical aspects of film (e.g. direct cinema tradition, docu-realistic approach, French new wave style, new Romanian film) and sociocultural themes (e.g. anticommercialism, criticism of neocapitalism, bureaucracy, corruption, refugees). Students had to pair labels with each film and explain their choices. In the next workshop we analysed the establishing shots of the films and discussed how they prepare the audience for what they are going to see. The closing activity was the most exciting: we nominated the top three films using the official evaluation sheet and I summarised the result. For the best film each student had to vote individually and prepare an argument to defend their choice in the form of a short vlog (3–5 minutes long). After having watched all vlogs, students had to nominate the representative of the Pázmány EUFA Lab who would go to Hamburg (competition). Based on the votes and their performance in the lab we selected Kristóf Sági to attend the EUFA workshop and award ceremony.




Figure 11: Film analysis: student notes at the 2016 EUFA edition in Hamburg.  
Photo: EUFA/K. Brunnhofer.

### Award-Giving Game: Simulation of a Film Festival Jury

This brief overview of the project shows how I understand the concept of “emancipated students” and why I think these initiatives are crucial to develop a film studies teaching methodology in higher education. First of all, during the simulation of a film festival jury students use their theoretical (film historical and analytical) knowledge actively towards a certain and well-definable goal: the award. It gives them the opportunity to discuss why and how a film is evaluated in comparison with other films (that is, why the process differs from review writing, which is also an important ingredient of a film studies curriculum). Selecting a film means considering its “politics and poetics”—how the film’s chosen topic and form represent our social, political and cultural environment in Europe—and estimating what effect it will have on the audience. Incidentally, since this is an international project, comparing the criteria and judgements of the universities of these very different regions would be a fascinating research topic. Also, we should deepen students’ knowledge of programming and film festival studies for several purposes, and first of all to lend a theoretical depth to this very practical project work—but knowledge that is based on the experiences of festival organising tasks.

If we take a closer look at the five films we had to analyse in the first year of EUFA, we might agree they all raise awareness of social issues, but students have to learn to express the consciousness of this fact in order to learn how to develop the audiences’ sensitivity and openness toward socially engaged art forms. This is also a form of “resilience techniques” that should (and can) teach us to make a better world—to put it very simply.<sup>2</sup>

To sum up, in my personal teaching philosophy I would highlight one issue here that originally comes from Immanuel Wallerstein's essay on the question whether there is such a thing as a world culture: universities should be "permanent places for cultural resistance" (198). EUFA offers one opportunity to practice this resistance. I believe its methodology should be further developed by drawing on its network of universities and on the very different infrastructure, academic environments and experiences of the diverse European identities that compose it.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The annotated bibliography has since been frequently updated and is available online on the website of the Film Festival Research Network ([www.filmfestivalresearch.org](http://www.filmfestivalresearch.org)).

<sup>2</sup> In EUFA 2017, this experience gained even more importance. One of the four features and also the documentary film were related to the complex social phenomenon of refugees. Coincidentally, *The War Show* (Obaidah Zytoon and Andreas Dalsgaard, 2016) revealed the origin of conflicts and followed the subsequent tragic events in Syria through the camera of eyewitnesses. In *The Other Side of Hope* (*Toivon tuolla puolen*, 2017) Aki Kaurimsäki, a Finnish director of the older generation who has represented European cinema, takes a satiric, critical look at the possible integration of refugees through the odd encounter of a Syrian refugee and a Finnish citizen. The analysis of these two films became a challenge in a social, political environment where anti-migration propaganda dominates public speech.

## References

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. 1983. Revised and extended ed., Verso, 1991.
- de Valck, Marijke, and Skadi Loist. "Film Festival Studies: An Overview of a Burgeoning Field." *Film Festival Yearbook 1: The Festival Circuit*, edited by Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne, St Andrews Film Studies, 2009, pp. 179–215.
- Elsaesser, Thomas. *Film History as Media Archaeology: Tracking Digital Cinema*, Amsterdam UP, 2016.
- Loist, Skadi, and Marijke de Valck. "Thematic Bibliography on Film Festival Research—Update: 2009." *Film Festival Yearbook 2: Film Festivals and Imagined Communities*, edited by Dina Iordanova and Ruby Cheung, St Andrews Film Studies, 2010, pp. 220–58.
- The Other Side of Hope* [*Toivon tuolla puolen*]. Directed by Aki Kaurimsäki, Sputnik Oy, 2017.
- Ruoff, Jeffrey, editor. *Coming Soon to a Festival Near You: Programming Film Festivals*, St. Andrews Film Studies, 2012.
- Schenk, Irmbert, Margrit Tröhler, and Yvonne Zimmermann. "From the Ideal Spectator to the Social Practice of Reception: An Introduction." *Film–Cinema–Spectator: Film*

*Reception*, edited by Irmbert Schenk, Margrit Tröhler, and Yvonne Zimmermann, Schüren, 2010, pp. 17–24.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. “The National and the Universal: Can There Be Such a Thing as World Culture?” *Geopolitics and Geoculture: Essays on the Changing World-System*, Cambridge UP, 1991, pp. 184-199.

*The War Show*. Directed by Obaidah Zytoon and Andreas Dalsgraad, Fridthjof Film, 2016.

### Suggested Citation

Pócsik, Andrea. “Playing a Film Festival Jury: Cooperative Competition in the Classroom.” *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 202–206. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Pócsik, Andrea** is a senior lecturer at Pázmány Péter Catholic University. Her main research areas are film, cultural and Romani studies, and media archaeology. Her most recent research about Roma representation in film and media has just been published in a book titled: *Passings—The (An)archaeology of Roma Image Making*. Her academic activities are devoted to purposes of domesticating engaged scholarship and building cultural resistance, working out new higher education methods of teaching film, media and cultural studies. In 2011 she founded Roma Visual Lab, a methodological innovation at ELTE University. She has been working as a film curator in many film events and recently as an academic expert in RomArchive.

## **Learning Jury Dynamics through Creative Pedagogy: Role-Playing at the European University Film Award**

Aida Vallejo

Framed within the European University Film Award initiative, the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU) organised the EUFA course as an optional 1-ECTS credit course.<sup>1</sup> The aim was to train students in evaluating films in international contexts, and was organised in five sessions, each of which was aimed at improving specific skills to be implemented when being part of a film jury.

As studies about jury deliberations in the film realm have demonstrated, the negotiation of awards can be influenced by different aspects involved in group dynamics, including the personal geopolitical or cultural environment, professional background or social relationships of jury members (de Valck and Soeteman; Piauxt). Jury negotiations therefore require not only technical, historical, cultural or artistic knowledge about film, but also social and psychological skills that can be trained. With that aim, we used innovative teaching strategies of creative pedagogy, applying cooperative learning techniques that help film students acquire professional skills such as effective communication, compelling argumentation and collaborative decision-making. Two techniques were applied: the “Six Thinking Hats” (to reflect about how one’s personality affects the way one evaluates films), and a role-playing session (in which the relationships between identity, social interaction and power were explored).

### **Six Thinking Hats to Analyse Films**

“Six Thinking Hats” is a technique invented by Edward de Bono in 1985 to improve efficiency in meetings through establishing clear guidelines and instructions for decision-making and debate. The technique presents itself as an alternative to direct confrontation and adversarial approaches, promoting instead “parallel thinking” to explore different aspects of a subject from different perspectives. It has been mostly applied in the context of management and political science, but also many other fields, including film.<sup>2</sup>

This technique consists in adopting a different way of thinking about a given issue (in this case, a specific film), depending on the colour of the hat one is wearing. The six hats have six different colours, and each colour is associated with one point of view:

- The white hat is associated with facts and figures. The person who wears it focuses only on information and data. When analysing a film this could be: specific use of camera shots and styles, development of characters and their goals, narrative structures, and so on.
- The red hat refers to emotions and feelings. When wearing a red hat, the student can be impulsive and use their intuition to talk about what the film transmits, what it makes them feel.

- The black hat calls for a cautious and careful attitude. The student who wears it must be critical, and sometimes play “the devil’s advocate”; they should mention the negative aspects and weaknesses of the films discussed.
- The yellow hat proposes a speculative–positive attitude, in which the positive aspects of the film should be highlighted.
- The green hat is associated with creative thinking. The person wearing it should think about alternative ideas and readings of the film in discussion. They should search for new perspectives that have been overlooked by others.
- The blue hat calls for control and monitoring. The student wearing it must have an overview of all the aspects to be analysed in the film, taking into account comments and opinions expressed by other students.

In our course, online animated videos were shown as a brief introduction to the technique (Reed Learning; TheBegtangan), and coloured scarfs were distributed to the students.<sup>3</sup> Each student was given a colour representing a way of thinking opposite to their usual attitude (e.g. a very positive person would wear the black scarf; a very impulsive one the white one, and so on). Then we started to discuss the film we had just seen. Students were free to express their own opinion on the film (whether for or against it), but had to support their opinions based on the perspective of the colour they were wearing. During the discussion, students exchanged coloured scarves from time to time, in order to change the perspective from which they looked at the film being debated. As the “game” developed, some students found it easier to change their perspectives than others. When any of the students forgot the attitude associated with the colour they were wearing, the lecturer would make them notice and redirect their argument.

The technique proved very useful in helping the students understand other people’s statements and approaches to film. Moreover, it served as a self-inquiry tool to identify their default attitude when analysing a film, and their tendency to focus always on specific aspects, overlooking others. They also realised how one’s personality has a remarkable influence in the way one experiences a film.

### **Role Play Simulation and Jury Deliberations**

Role-playing has been used in educational environments as an active learning creative teaching tool to improve social and professional skills (Lane; Meyers and Jones), and has been applied to train specific abilities, such as leadership or language use. It consists in creating a “fake” situation in which students perform diverse roles assigned by the teacher. The aim is to learn to act in different situations and interact with others, while training social and psychological skills. Role-playing involves actively searching for solutions to specific problems and/or negotiating and getting collective agreement to achieve certain goals.

Organising a role-play simulation involves three important phases:

- Assigning roles: the teacher writes down a different role for each student. Individual sheets with specific information are handed out privately to help students prepare their “performance” (Tables 1 and 2). In the UEFA case, the roles were extremely

stereotyped so that the students could easily focus on a specific issue to empathise and share the goals of their persona.

- **Role-playing:** students come together and the teacher explains the “fake” situation. In this case, it consisted of a simulation of a jury deliberation between students from all over Europe, who had to decide which of the five candidate films should win the European University Film Award. The teacher moderates the discussion, especially if students fail to assume the roles they have been assigned.
- **Evaluation:** once the debate is over, students stop playing the roles, and each participant reads out loud in front of the others the guidelines of their role-sheet and shares with others how they felt during the simulation. The student should mention if their goals have been fulfilled, and which difficulties have been faced to achieve them. Then we make a final collective reflection about the whole experience, including some remarks by the teacher about jury deliberations and their dynamics.

Your role	A male student from Finland
Your goals	You want the Finnish film to win
Public information (that you can share with others)	You consider that European film should be shot in European territory You know a lot about film from Nordic countries but not as much about other film traditions
Private information (that you keep for yourself but affects your decisions)	You are a nationalist
Useful words and expressions	Geographic setting / location Landscape Production country, European coproduction

Your role	A female student from Germany
Your goals	You want the film about LGBT to win
Public information (that you can share with others)	You believe that a University award should be given to a film that tackles the problems of young people You believe that gender representations must be taken into account when assessing a film
Private information (that you keep for yourself but affects your decisions)	You are a lesbian
Useful words and expressions	Gender issues “Apart from technical issues it is important to take into account how young people are presented in the film”

**Tables 1 and 2: Examples of role sheets used in the EUFA role-play at the University of the Basque Country.**

Other roles assigned to our EUFA students were: a cinephile with a deep knowledge of film who likes to listen to himself, an NGO activist involved in helping refugees, a Hollywood fan who can't stand boring plots, and a feminist who only focuses on the representation of women in film. The roles were designed as exaggerations of some attitudes

by film critics or film industry professionals to facilitate students' performance and bolster confronting situations.



Figure 12: EUFA students of the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU). Photo: Aida Vallejo.

In addition, two important issues were taken into account when organising the EUFA simulation. Firstly, each student was assigned a role which was as distant as possible from their usual standpoint and opinions expressed in previous sessions. This included their usual arguments (including preference for commercial cinema or more alternative approaches, concern about specific topics such as the representation of women or more technical issues such as the cinematographic quality of a given film), as well as attitudes (being shy or cautious, or at the opposite being too talkative and monopolising conversations; or being more inclined to debate and change one's mind or not). The goal was, on one hand, to help students putting themselves in the skin of others to understand and reflect on their viewpoints; and on the other, to train them in communication skills such as talking in public, leading conversations and convincing others.

Secondly, when designing the role sheets it was important to make the goals of each role/student at times compatible with each other, and at times impossible to conceal. For example, two roles could agree on the film *Heartstone* (*Hjartasteinn*, Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson, 2016) to be awarded, one because it was shot in Europe and another because it had an LGBT topic. On the other hand, *The War Show* (Obaidah Zytoon and Andreas Dalsgraad, 2016) could be rejected by the "Finnish student" role, because even though it was coproduced by Finland, it was not shot in Europe.

The role-play simulation proved of high value to train students for jury deliberation, and actually brought into the discussion many issues that came to the fore later on in the real EUFA deliberations taking place in Hamburg. Moreover, role-playing was especially useful to prepare them to discuss in international environments in which jury members could have different training, social, cultural or political backgrounds, and help them gain a richer understanding of the different aspects to be taken into account when awarding a film.

## Final Remarks

Using creative pedagogy techniques has proven very useful for training personal and social skills which are not necessarily related to film, but play a big part in the decision-making process during a jury deliberation. In the EUFA course at the University of the Basque Country, these techniques proved truly valuable for the students, who could perform the task of negotiating which film they wanted to win, with a reflexive attitude towards their own behaviour. As a final remark, I want to note some issues to be taken into account when applying these techniques, and point to other positive effects that resulted from their implementation in class.

On the one hand, these techniques require previous testing and psychological analysis from the part of the teacher to identify the different attitudes, backgrounds and/or knowledge of each student. Therefore, it is advisable to organise this session once the teacher has a general idea of each student's personality and ideas on film. In addition, the space in which it takes place is very relevant, as the interaction develops differently when participants are sitting in a cinema theatre or in a class looking at the professor or at a round table or in a circle where they can look at each other directly, this last option being the one which fosters the most effective social interaction among them.

On the other hand, creative pedagogy techniques had parallel positive effects. Firstly, they opened the students' minds and created empathy and awareness about issues that they were not previously concerned about (e.g. feminism or the refugee crisis; or film traditions from other countries). And secondly, and more importantly, these "performed" experiences increased their social interaction and even friendship, creating personal relationships that remain after the course. In the long-term this involved their attendance to other film screenings together and therefore fulfilled the course's goal, of "contributing to their appreciation of the act of watching films as a communal and social practice" ("University of the Basque Country").

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The first edition took place in Bilbao in November–December 2017 in BilbaoArte cultural centre, and participants included graduate and postgraduate students in Audiovisual Communication, Fine Arts and Journalism. The course consisted of five sessions divided in two parts, with the screening of the film at the beginning of the class, and a debate and small exercises in the second part, for two-to-three hours) ("European University Film Award").

<sup>2</sup> Wilma De Jong, Erik Knudsen and Jerry Rothwell propose to use the technique to think creatively about documentary film projects.

<sup>3</sup> Scarves were used instead of hats because they are easier to wear and don't affect as much the students predisposition to engage in the game, as some happen to feel ashamed of wearing a hat.

## References

- De Bono, Edward. *Six Thinking Hats*. 1985. Penguin, 2017.
- De Jong, Wilma, Erik Knudsen, and Jerry Rothwell. *Creative Documentary: Theory and Practice*. Pearson Logman, 2012.
- de Valck, Marijke, and Mimi Soeteman. “‘And the Winner Is...’ What Happens behind the Scenes of Film Festival Competitions.” *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3, 2010, pp. 290–307.
- “European University Film Award.” *Ehusfera*, [www.ehu.eus/ehusfera/eufa/](http://www.ehu.eus/ehusfera/eufa/). Accessed 13 Jan. 2018.
- Gredler, Margaret E. “Games and Simulations and their Relationships to Learning.” *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*, vol. 2, 2004, pp. 571–81.
- Heartstone [Hjartasteinn]*. Directed by Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson, SF Studios, 2016.
- Lane, David C. “On a Resurgence of Management Simulations and Games.” *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 46, no 5, 1995, pp. 604–25.
- Meyers, Chet, and Thomas B. Jones. *Promoting Active Learning: Strategies for the College Classroom*. Jossey-Bass, 1993.
- Piault, Colette. “Festivals, Conferences, Seminars and Networks in Visual Anthropology in Europe” (“Appendix: Festivals, Juries and Awards”). *Film Festivals and Anthropology*, edited by Aida Vallejo and María Paz Peirano. Cambridge SP, 2017, pp. 68–72.
- Reed Learning. “Creative Thinking Model: 6 Thinking Hats.” *YouTube*, 27 June 2014, [www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_2JimLV\\_2AI](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_2JimLV_2AI).
- TheBegtangan. “Six Thinking Hats.” *YouTube*, 30 July 2012, [www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rwu1YlveU\\_4](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Rwu1YlveU_4).
- “University of the Basque Country.” *European University Film Award*. [www.eufa.org/en/universities/021\\_University\\_of\\_the\\_Basque\\_Country.php](http://www.eufa.org/en/universities/021_University_of_the_Basque_Country.php). Accessed 13 Jan. 2018.
- The War Show*. Directed by Obaidah Zytoon and Andreas Dalsgraad, Fridthjof Film, 2016.

**Suggested Citation**

Vallejo, Aida. "Learning Jury Dynamics through Creative Pedagogy: Role-Playing at the European University Film Award." *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 207–213. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Aida Vallejo** is assistant professor of media studies at the University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU). She is coeditor of *Film Festivals and Anthropology* and has published extensively in international journals on film festivals, documentary film, narratology and ethnography of media. She is the founder and coordinator of the documentary workgroup of the European Network for Cinema and Media Studies (NECS) and currently works on an edited collection about documentary film festivals.

## “And the Winner Is...” The Hamburg EUFA Jury Meetings

Dagmar Brunow

Since 2016, each of the participating European universities sends one student delegate to the EUFA workshop in Hamburg in December, at the end of which the winner of the European University Film Award is announced. While the most obvious aim of the workshop is to choose the winning film (Ken Loach’s *I, Daniel Blake* in 2016; Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson’s *Heartstone* in 2017), the preceding discussions and encounters offer a unique opportunity for the participating students to explore different perspectives on both film culture and film studies, as well as reflecting on the European idea and the role of cinema in contemporary Europe. In Hamburg students from diverse backgrounds come together, bringing their diverse experiences and skills to the group after having discussed all films at length in their classes and film clubs. The pedagogical aims are: 1) to develop criteria for the selections of film for the EUFA, 2) to gain an understanding of the tasks of a film (festival) jury, 3) to improve analytical skills by discussing film aesthetics, 4) to improve writing skills, 5) to advance rhetorical skills by speaking in favour of one’s selected film(s) and by trying to convince fellow jury members. Initially, the pedagogical aims were developed in the process of translating the Quebecoise version into a European context. Based on an idea by Kathrin Kohlstedde from Filmfest Hamburg, Skadi Loist and I joined in to adapt the Canadian model to European university students. I am also part of the team which selects the shortlist of five films to be studied in class at the different universities in the weeks before the final workshop, which I then host. The workshop sets out to accomplish these goals through different teaching methods. This dossier contribution will give an insight into the EUFA debates in Hamburg. It will start by introducing the preselection work, before giving an overview over various moments from the student workshop.

Apart from the main student jury, another EUFA jury also meets up in Hamburg: the preselection team for the shortlist. In October during Filmfest Hamburg, a committee of four, representing different sections of the film industry (director, producer, film critic and film scholar), selects a shortlist of five films from five European countries out of the fifty feature films and fifteen documentaries eligible for the European Film Award. In 2016 the committee included director Feo Aladag (Germany), film critic Luis Martinez Lopez (*El Mundo*, Spain), producer Patrick Sobelman (France) and myself, film scholar Dagmar Brunow (Linnaeus University, Sweden). This group shortlisted the following films: Cristian Mungiu’s *Graduation (Bacalaureat)*, 2016), Ken Loach’s *I, Daniel Blake* (2016), Juho Kuosmanen’s *The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki (Hymyilevä Mies)*, 2016), Maren Ade’s *Toni Erdmann* (2016) and Gianfranco Rosi’s documentary *Fire at Sea (Fuocoammare)*, 2016). The 2017 committee members were director Juho Kuosmanen (Finland), film critic Elli Mastorou (Belgium and Greece), producer Fabian Gasmia (Germany) and myself. In 2017 the shortlist consisted of Aki Kaurismäki’s *The Other Side of Hope (Toivon Tuolla Puolen)*, 2017), Fien Troch’s *Home* (2016), Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson’s *Heartstone (Hjartasteinn)*, 2016), Andreas Dalsgaard and Obaidah Zytoon’s *The War Show* (2016), and Andrey Zvyagintsev’s *Loveless (Nelyubov)*, 2016). The selection followed the criteria developed by the EUFA planning committee: the films should represent five different European countries, they should represent a variety in terms of form and/or content, and they should be able to stimulate reflection and discussion among university students. In 2016 and 2017 we included one documentary each, but we might focus on fiction filmmaking from 2018 onwards, as one

documentary among four fiction films might prevent a consistent discussion among the students.



**Figure 13: Preselection Jury of the EUFA 2016 with the initiators from Filmfest Hamburg, European Film Award and NECS: Patrick Sobelman, Marion Döring (EFA), Albert Wiederspiel (Filmfest Hamburg), Feo Aladag, Dagmar Brunow, Luis Martinez Lopez, Kathrin Kohlstedde (Filmfest Hamburg) and Skadi Loist (NECS). Photo: Filmfest Hamburg/Martin Kunze.**

The first student jury meeting took place as a workshop in December 2016 at the Körber Stiftung in Hamburg, one of the EUFA collaborators. In 2017 a second location was added with the independent cultural centre Viktoria-Kaserne, where the students also had their accommodations. The morning session of the jury meeting was dedicated to developing criteria for the selection of the winning film. For this task the jury was divided into smaller groups of four-to-five students. Each group was tasked with writing a preliminary jury statement for each of the five shortlisted films. This step offered the opportunity to discuss films beyond subjective criteria and to emphasise the distinctive qualities of each film. It was also a way to compare how the films were discussed, analysed and evaluated in the different national university contexts. After lunch the public vote was announced during a sightseeing moment—while visiting the new Elbphilharmonie concert hall in 2016 and on an Elbe river cruise in 2017, respectively. The public vote is the sum of the voting results from the participating universities, giving a voice to the other EUFA classmates back home. Through this process, two films were eliminated from the list, leaving three films in the competition. In 2016 these were *Fire at Sea*, *Toni Erdmann* and *I, Daniel Blake*; in 2017 the three finalists were *Loveless*, *Heartstone* and *The War Show*. Including the public vote allows the delegates in Hamburg to be independent from the vote of their fellow students at home. It gives them the freedom to make up their own minds once two films had been eliminated, and to let

themselves be convinced by their fellow jurors' arguments about a film. This procedure sets out to strengthen the decision-making process within the jury workshop.

The aim of the afternoon session (in 2016), or the second day (in 2017) was to outline criteria for the winning film as well as to debate the purpose and possibilities of the award as such. First, to foster direct exchange, the students would discuss the criteria for the award in small groups of four. In 2016 the students gathered arguments for each of the remaining films during a roundtable debate, moderated by me. Instead of presenting their favourite film and justifying their decision, though, the students were asked to explain which of the other films would be the prime competitor to their favourite—and why. This round offered another opportunity not to simply dismiss the other films, but to highlight their strengths and qualities. The students were able to practice their rhetorical skills by speaking in favour of one's selected film(s) and by trying to convince their fellow jury members. In 2017 this process was replaced by a more thorough discussion of the award criteria.



**Figure 14: First round of the deliberations in Hamburg at Körber Stiftung (EUFA 2016 edition).  
Photo: EUFA/K. Brunnhofer.**

Before moving on to the final segment, in which the students finally cast their votes, the following round was dedicated to debating the idea(s) behind the award. Discussing each of the terms in its title, “European”, “university”, “film”, and “award”, the students reflected on their positioning as a European jury of film students, but also on their understanding of Europeanness and of film aesthetics. Some of the questions discussed were: in what way should the award address the state of Europe? Which values does Europeanness represent? How might the student jury's decision differ from the prize-winning films at the European Film Award? How can the EUFA become a statement from the perspective of a younger European generation? (“As a new generation we have a responsibility!”). One central aspect

was the stated ambition by EFA and Filmfest Hamburg to reach younger audiences and foster European understanding. Further aspects for discussion were the impact of recognising a younger filmmaker as opposed to an established director, the director's gender or the notion of sexuality in the film. Another recurring topic in the discussion was the importance of the film's theme in relation to its aesthetics, while also noting that form and content are inextricably linked. Collectively reflecting on the complexities of the award proved very rewarding. After each student made a final statement, the election process started. While the margin between the two finalists in 2016 (*I, Daniel Blake* and *Toni Erdmann*) was extremely narrow, in 2017 many students changed their opinion during the debate. After the vote, the students, again in smaller groups, had the opportunity to rephrase the previously written jury statements and to prepare themselves for the public presentation.

In the early evening, the students presented the five finalists and the winning film at an exclusive film screening for invited guests from the supporters (*Freundeskreis*) of Filmfest Hamburg at the independent Studio cinema (2016) and at Körber-Stiftung (2017). The idea behind this official event is to present the students' accomplishment to a wider audience and to reconnect to the world outside academia. Moreover, the occasion provided a proper finale for the students, especially because due to logistics they could not be present at the European Film Awards in Wrocław (2016) or Berlin (2017). As a special gimmick of the EUFA prize statuette, designed by a student at the 2016 participating Lisbon Arts University, the announcement of the award is recorded with a little camera inside the statuette and is handed over on an integrated SD card to the director of the winning film. As part of the Welcome reception to the European Film Awards, Kathrin Kohlstedde and Albert Wiederspiel from Filmfest Hamburg delivered the award to Ken Loach in 2016 and to Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson in 2017.

Due to the intense workshop programme in 2016, several of the students expressed a wish for a longer stay in Hamburg to have more time for discussion and deliberation. Therefore, for the 2017 edition, the workshop was expanded to two days. The students also had two useful suggestions for the preceding teaching period within the national courses and film clubs: 1) to encourage a deeper discussion of the award and its intentions, and 2) to practice the writing of jury statements with the help of real jury statements provided by the teacher. Overall, the workshop can be considered a success. As the student group is growing (from thirteen in 2016 to twenty in 2017 and expanding in the years to come) new challenges might arise. But that's exactly as it should be—after all, the future of EUFA has only just begun.

## References

*Fire at Sea* [*Fuocoammare*]. Directed by Gianfranco Rosi, Stema Entertainment, 2016.

*Graduation* [*Bacalaureat*]. Directed by Cristian Mungiu, Canal+, 2016.

*The Happiest Day in the Life of Olli Mäki* [*Hymyilevä Mies*]. Directed by Juho Kuosmanen, Aamu Filmcompany, 2016.

*Heartstone* [*Hjartasteinn*]. Directed by Guðmundur Arnar Guðmundsson, SF Studios, 2016.

*Home*. Directed by Fien Troch, Prime Time, 2016.

*I, Daniel Blake*. Directed by Ken Loach, Sixteen Films, 2016.

*Loveless* [*Nelyubov*]. Directed by Andrey Zvyagintsev, Non-Stop Productions, 2017.

*The Other Side of Hope* [*Toivon tuolla puolen*]. Directed by Aki Kaurimsäki, Sputnik Oy, 2017.

*Toni Erdmann*. Directed by Maren Ade, Komplizen Film, 2016.

*The War Show*. Directed by Obaidah Zytoon and Andreas Dalsgaard, Fridthjof Film, 2016.

### Suggested Citation

Brunow, Dagmar. “‘And the Winner Is...’ The Hamburg UEFA Jury Meetings.” *Alphaville: Journal of Film and Screen Media*, no. 14, Winter 2017, pp. 214–218. [www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf](http://www.alphavillejournal.com/Issue14/Dossier.pdf). ISSN: 2009-4078.

**Dagmar Brunow** is a Senior Lecturer of film studies at Linnaeus University in Växjö, Sweden. Her research centres on questions of memory, the archive, video collectives and the essay film. She was awarded a three-year grant by the Swedish Research Council for her research project “The Cultural Heritage of the Moving Image” (2016–2018). She is the author of *Remediating Transcultural Memory: Documentary Filmmaking as Archival Intervention* (de Gruyter, 2015) and the editor of *Stuart Hall: Aktivism, Pop & Politik* (ventil, 2015). Together with Ingrid Stigsdotter she edited a special issue on film archives and film historiography of the *Journal of Scandinavian Cinema* (2/2017). Dagmar is also one of the programmers of the Hamburg International Queer Film Festival.