Linköping University Electronic Press

Book Chapter

From Instruction to Reflection: Film in Education in Sweden

Anne-Li Lindgren, Anna Sparrman and Katarina Eriksson Barajas

Chapter 8

FROM INSTRUCTION TO REFLECTION: FILM IN EDUCATION IN SWEDEN

Anne-Li Lindgren, Anna Sparrman andKatarina Eriksson Barajas
Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

INTRODUCTION

A specific vein of media education is under study in this chapter, namely, film in schools. School Cinema was first launched in Sweden as an educational tool in the early 20th century, and has been referred to as "the first IT revolution in school" (Viklund, 1999). The notion that film catches the interest of students is the same today as it was in the past, but the forms and expected learning outcomes have changed. Whereas formal learning was highlighted until the1980s, contemporary education focuses on the learning of social skills.

The chapter is based on a research project funded by a prestigious grant from the Swedish Research Council, *From instruction to reflection – teachers' and pupils' use of school film and school movies* (Grant registration number 2002-2727), and we propose the role of media *in* education as a complement to media education. We adopt a research approach that considers visual culture to be a significant constitutive force in society (Mirzoeff, 1998/2002; Mitchell, 2002), and our aim is to further investigate the role visuals can play in individuals' everyday life, as well as in constructing their knowledge, and their

identity in a school environment. We explore how visual culture and students' perspectives (cf. Sparrman and Lindgren, 2010) are part of learning practices in School Cinema activities today. In doing this, we show that the role of media in education can be understood in new and important ways for both culture and education. The chapter starts with a brief historical overview focusing on film as a visual pedagogical resource.

THE EMERGING DISCOURSE ON SCHOOL CINEMA

In Sweden, educational film was introduced into schools in the early 1920s as an initiative from popular cinema and also from producers of textbooks and teaching aids. Films for school were produced by commercial agencies, and were presented in corresponding subjects in school. For example, the documentary Swedish Birds from 1923 was presented in Biology and A Visit in New Zealand from 1924 in Geography. Individual schools were encouraged to rent projectors and films – or even better, buy the projectors and rent the films – from the distributers in Stockholm. There are no records today of the total distribution of films to local schools in the early decades. However, the main agent, AB Svensk Filmindustri, listed 500 film titles in their film catalogue in 1922, and 1,225 titles 20 years later. The number of titles was highest in 1935/36, with 1,989 films available for schools. The agents strove to get state funding for educational film, and make it mandatory in education (Lindgren, 2009).

It was mainly in science that film found a platform to legitimize its role in education. This is true in the US context (Clark, 1933; Davis, 1932; Finegan, 1928), as well as in the Swedish (Lindgren, 2009). In Sweden, a teacher periodical, Tidskrift för Svensk Skolfilm och Bildnings film (Svensk Filmindustri. Skolfilmsavdelningen, 1924, 1925), listed new materials and described them to support the use of film in education. Arguments in favor of film in education were that this medium makes it possible to visualize processes in nature, such as seasonal changes, growth in plants, insect processes, pollination, and adaptation of plants to different light during the day. The new medium made it possible to observe "the hitherto unseen," "revealing the secrets of nature", and what was "hidden for our eyes" (Lindgren, 2009, p. 43–44). The films were so detailed and clear that it made the students and teachers feel as if they "were there" themselves at the same time as it increased the ability to "penetrate and learn" about the subjects (Lindgren, 2009, p. 43, 41). All this was thanks to technical advances (Crary,

1990), making it possible to use high or low camera angles that could reveal the point of view of a bird or a fish, to use close-ups, and telephoto or wide-angle lenses, or to speed up or slow down time, making it possible to observe really fast events in great detail. The teacher periodical contained many descriptions of the visual effects, claiming that what is seen with the own eyes is not so easy to forget, and, compared to reading a textbook, what has been visually observed becomes a manifest memory (Lindgren, 2009). With a language borrowed from the natural sciences, film was said to "narrativize the real" (Renov, 1993, p. 6). As this demonstrates, the discourse on film education related to the discourse on nonfiction film and the emerging documentary tradition.

Moreover, the teacher periodical used children's voices to tell of the pedagogical advantages of educating through film. Drawings and essays produced by children were published, in which children's voices were used to bring across the message that film was more effective for learning than other educational sources, such as lectures or textbooks (Lindgren, 2009). The main agent for the use of film in school, Gustaf Berg at Svensk Filmindustri, wrote: "I have seen the importance of cinema in hundreds of schoolchildren's essays. These children should be lucky to be born in the age of cinema." (Svensk Filmindustri. Skolfilmsavdelningen, 1925, p. 559) One example of such an essay related to learning about unknown, and distant, countries and cultures. After having seen Nanook of the North from 1922, the first documentary film, according to some sources (Renov, 1993, p 2–3), one 15-year-old girl wrote, "It was really sad when the film ended. It had filled us with sympathy for the Eskimos and made us understand their hard struggle for survival." (Svensk Filmindustri. Skolfilmsavdelningen, 1924, p. 124). Others commented on the importance of seeing other cultures, "The understanding of what you have read becomes much clearer and better if you can see it on a film afterwards." (Svensk Filmindustri. Skolfilmsavdelningen, 1924, p. 181), and: "How much more vivid is not the experience of people and countries, when you see it on a film, compared to when you read about them [sic] in books." (Svensk Filmindustri. Skolfilmsavdelningen, 1924, p. 182).

Since the 1980s, School Cinema has used the ordinary repertoire at local cinemas in Sweden, meaning that students are required to watch popular film during school hours with the purpose to understand more about life and the media. Today, the aim is –

to provide quality film experiences for children and young people, and to encourage them to deepen their knowledge of film and to express themselves

through film as a medium. /.../ This shared cinema experience is a springboard for debate about various life issues, but also about the cinematic language used in films. (Swedish Film Institute, 2008, para. 1–3)

In the 1980s, municipalities started to get public funding for the establishment and development of film education measures via the Swedish Film Institute (SFI). Since then, making educational film available has become a concern for most municipalities in Sweden even though signing up with the SFI is voluntary. Today, regional resource centers for film and video are an important link between the SFI, the municipalities, and individual schools. There are 19 such centers across Sweden. At these resource centers, appointed School Cinema coordinators facilitate the planning and use of film in school, and the SFI produces presentations of, and guidelines for, current films (Swedish Film Institute, 2008). In the research project described in this chapter, the aim is to analyze the classroom activities in various School Cinema activities and understand film in education from the student's perspective.

A RESEARCH PROGRAM ON SCHOOL CINEMA

A standard procedure in School Cinema is that students watch a film at a theater and then meet in school for a classroom discussion about the film. Another follow up activity is to let the students create their own media productions. In School Cinema, film is used as an educational tool in such different subjects as History, Social Science, and Language, or, more frequently, a cross curricular subject presented as Comprehensive School Cinema. We therefore talk about School Cinema not as media education, but about the medium of film as education.

In the present research, data were collected with a media ethnographic approach during the fall of 2003. We focused on the educational activities based on three films: Lilya 4-ever (Jönsson and Moodysson, 2002), Evil (Lönnerheden, Leijonborg, and Håfström, 2003), and About a Boy (Hornby et al., 2002). The reasons for studying the specific films were twofold: the films were offered by local School Cinema theaters in different communities across Sweden, and they addressed the research issues of gender, class, ethnicity, and generation (for more detailed presentations of the methods for film selections, cf. Sparrman and Eriksson, 2004). The main plots of the films can be described as follows:

- Lilya 4-ever (Jönsson and Moodysson, 2002) is based on an actual case and a TV documentary about sex trafficking. The film is about a 16-year-old girl, Lilya, who, at the film's start, is living somewhere in the former USSR. She is abandoned by her mother and gradually Lilya's life falls apart. She leaves school, runs out of money, is raped, and falls into prostitution. With promises of true love and prospects for a decent job, Lilya is lured by a young man into going to Sweden. On arrival in Sweden, she is locked up in an apartment and held as a sex slave. Lilya finally manages to escape and commits suicide by jumping from a bridge.

- Evil (Lönnerheden, Leijonborg, and Håfström, 2003) is based on the semi-autobiographical novel, Ondskan (Eng. Evil) written in 1981 by Jan Guillou. The film is about a boy, Erik, and his experiences of boarding school in Sweden in the late 1950s. Before going to the boarding school, Erik lives with his mother and stepfather, who abuses both Erik and his mother. At the boarding school, Erik resists being part of the internal hierarchical order among the students, which turns newcomers into servants for the older students. He is abused, and retaliates by using violence to get back at his abusers. His behavior forces him to leave the boarding school before examination.

- About a Boy (Hornby et al., 2002) is based on the novel by the same title by Nick Hornby. It is about the bullied boy Marcus living with his suicidal mother in London. The other main character is Will; a single, love-seeking, self-supporting man in his 30s who, in spite of his insecurity, starts to engage with, and care about, the bullied boy and his situation. The supposed victim, the bullied boy, contributes to getting the self-obsessed man to care for others and this makes his life richer, and thereby makes the victim an agent of positive change. The film at times uses double voice-over narration, where the audience hears both Will's and Marcus's thoughts.

The researchers participated in school cinema showings at local theaters during regular school hours. We video recorded the follow up activities in eight classrooms in Junior High School and High School in four towns. Approximately 250 students between 14 and 18 years of age participated. In total, the research data comprise almost 25 hours of video-recorded classroom interactions, and field notes. In addition, we also collected student-produced material: 24 essays; nine student film scripts; 16 video recordings by students; three student audio recordings; and nine photographic pictures series by

students. When collecting the data, the focus was on students' interpretations and constructions and not on the teacher's role in knowledge production. The coding of the data was carried out to describe the whole corpus of data (Fairclough, 1992) in accordance with the overall aim of the research project: to study discursive practices in School Cinema. Four overarching pairs of notions were found in the data: societal institutions and authorities; equality and inequality; collectivism and individuality; and national and international practices (Lindgren, Sparrman and Eriksson, 2005). In addition, we selected samples for detailed analysis (Fairclough, 1992, p. 230), such as talk about trafficking (Sparrman, 2006), sexuality (Eriksson Barajas, in press), and bullying (Eriksson Barajas and Lindgren, 2009), as well as the role of students as co-researchers (Sparrman, 2007), and School Cinema in a historical perspective (Lindgren, 2009). As indicated, different aspects of politics were prominent in school film activities. In the present chapter, the focus is on four examples highlighting how students interpret and understand issues such as visuality and welfare, participation, domestic violence, and bullying. Moreover, this chapter describes varying pedagogical strategies used in School Cinema, and the roles students can play in them.

USING FILM AS EDUCATION

The schools in this research project chose to organize the School Cinema activities in specific ways. In one school, the students watched the film Lilya 4-ever as part of a week-long equality project initiated by four female students organizing film viewings with follow up discussions as a special school project. Another school used the film as part of the 2003 governmental campaign to show the film to all Swedish students in Junior High and High School (aged 16 to 18) as part of a national equality project (Sparrman, 2007). Some activities included listening to a speech, either before or after the film viewing, given by the non-governmental organization End Child Prostitution, Child Pornography and Trafficking in Children for Sexual Purposes. The viewing of About a Boy was used to teach Swedish and English language, while Evil was shown as a film about bullying, without any explicit goals.

The empirical material highlights different ways of organizing follow up activities in the classrooms: either a traditional setup was used, with the teacher in front of the class and the students seated in rows to face the teacher, or the whole class seated in a wide circle, with students and teachers sitting next to, and looking at, each other. In both cases, a discussion about the film

took place, sometimes starting with a prepared question by the teacher or a student as subteacher. In all examples, the discussions, after the introduction, were unstructured, with both teachers and students asking and answering questions. Another way of organizing the follow up activities was to divide the class into small discussion groups of three to five students with a sheet of prepared questions either as a backup for the discussion, or as questions to be answered. In these cases, the lessons ended with a teacher-led summary discussion in the classroom. In one class, questions from a guideline prepared by the SFI were used.

Two classes did preparatory work before watching the movie. The preparations provided a framework for what was important in the movie and what should be dealt with after the viewing – in this case, bullying. During the startup activity, the students were divided into smaller groups and asked to write a film script about bullying. The script writing activity was to be completed after the film viewing. When finishing the film scripts the students themselves decided that the scripts should be performed to the rest of the class. In this School Cinema activity, the teacher integrated the film into language (Swedish and English) teaching, in which students practiced writing a script.

We will now give examples of different topics that were raised in the School Cinema activities, and different ways to organize the education. In the four sections below, we focus on student perspectives. We start with an example of a big group (classroom) discussion with teachers about welfare.

Film Talk about Visualized Welfare

Twenty boys and girls are sitting in a circle together with two teachers to discuss the film Lilya 4-ever they have seen at a local theater. The seats are organized in a circle, with students facing each other, making it easy to have eye contact when talking. A male teacher and a female student acting as subteacher initiated the discussion, and a female teacher is present in the group. All participants are seated in a circle. They all have a similar role as members of the whole group; consequently, the different positions teachers and students hold in school are downplayed. No SFI guidelines are followed; rather, the teacher and student subteacher have prepared their own questions for the session. However, after introducing the session, these are not used. The researcher is present in the room, standing outside the circle, and she is video recording the participants from outside the circle.

The male teacher initiates the session by saying how much time they have for discussion, and that they will have lunch afterwards. He then initiates the group discussion by posing a question about what contrasting issues are shown in the film. A student, David, responds that the film is about society and that it presents images of "what it looks like in Russia today." His argument is that the main character in the film, Lilya, does not want to live in a place that "looks like that," the environment in Sweden when she arrives there "looks much better." David chooses to elaborate on the teacher's question by referring to the way things look in the film. He thereby relates to, and finds answers to, the question in the visual. He points to the way that visuality not only shows but also creates differences, and uses this as an explanation for why Lilya acts the way she does. In doing so, David shows an awareness of how the visual always is part of identity and nationality discourses (cf. Mitchell, 2002). In the following discussion, references to what is seen or not seen, and how visual representations can be interpreted, are discussed:

Example 1. Visualized slums

Participants: Classroom with 20 boys and girls, one male teacher, one female student acting as subteacher, and one female teacher.
Tape: Anna_Lilja 2 KR3_10_22.

Thea:	But I don't believe there were such big contrasts when they arrived in Sweden (.) I thought that the apartment blo[cks]...
Alexandra:	I didn't think that either.
Thea:	...and they looked about the same. (Balances her hands up and down.) What's the place where she lived and this, so it's, on the outside, they were very much alike. It was like a slum a bit where she lived in Sweden too, but then you got into the city in ... Russia and the city here, I thought, where she lived. I don't think there were such big contrasts.
Male teacher:	OK. (Points at David with the whole hand.)
David:	Both were like slums, really, both the place in Sweden and that place in Russia where she was. But you could still see kind of differences ...
Thea:	Yes, but they were not that big.
David:	At her place, the apartment was a mess. It was like ... (shakes his head) dirt on the walls ...
Eva:	... The bathrooms ...

David:	... and everywhere, like when she came to the apartment in Sweden. Like, the stairs, OK, it was not the most beautiful place in the world, but if you compare it to the place where she was before it was still quite a difference, I think.
Sonya:	... and in the room as well.
Tamya:	Yes, but that thing with the bathtub, that she felt if there was warm water or ... all the time ...
Sonya:	Yes.

In the example, Thea engages in the dialogue by responding both to the teacher's initial opening, about what is created as contrast in the film, and to David's interpretation that the visual images show differences between the countries by showing the housing and neighborhoods ("blocks"). Her main argument is that the differences are not mainly between housing. She introduces the word "slum" into the discussion. This is the opposite of what David claims, namely that the contrasting effects relate to how the cities are visualized differently between the two countries. According to Thea, this is what makes the Swedish slum still stand out as a nicer place to be in. Like David, Thea explicitly refers to what can be seen, for example, what the slums look like, how they differ, and how they are presented. By arguing that this is her point of view, Thea also makes clear the importance of the visual in the construction of opinions and identities in the classroom.

David engages in the dialogue by saying that there are slums in both countries, but still the visible differences between the slums must be acknowledged. The dialogue continues with more examples of what could be interpreted as constituting a slum: dirt, toilets, and whether the staircases in the houses are nice or not and if there is access to warm water. In the film, these material facts are presented visually, and the students make different interpretations as to whether these images can be regarded as signifiers of living standards or not. These negotiations take place in the interstices between language and visuality, pointing to the fact that both words and the visual are culturally situated practices dependent on context as well as on who the interpreter is.

The dialogue continues for about 10 minutes; slums are still in focus and there is an engaged discussion about whether the suburb and apartment Lilya arrived at in Sweden is a slum. Several students say that it is not a slum at all but actually "really nice." A new subtheme is then brought up by Maria, who says that the issue is not what is seen but instead, what is not seen.

Example 2. Visualized Welfare

Participants: Classroom with 20 boys and girls, one male teacher, one female student acting as subteacher, and one female teacher.

Tape: Anna_Lilja 2 KR3_10_22.

Maria:	But then I believe you're not allowed to see what it looks like in Russia, in general. You're only allowed to see where she lives. And that is one of those slum areas where it's awful, and so. But you don't know what it, well, is like in the rest of Russia. Maybe it's better 100 kilometers away, and then it might have been enough if she had moved there instead of ...
Male teacher:	Do you feel that it's a bit moralizing?
Maria:	Well, yeah, you are not allowed to see. And now we draw the conclusion that this is what it looks like in the whole ...
Ramid:	That you are not allowed to see a clear picture.
Maria:	Well, yeah we, yes ...
Erik:	Well yes, because that is the kind of prejudice we believe in, that Russia is poor and it's just one huge slum quarter and stuff like that, and then they also show that we have slums here in Sweden and it's not much better here in spite of our welfare and stuff ...

Maria takes a critical view because she position the audience as only meeting images of the place Lilya stays at, a slum area, and not of the rest of Russia. When she uses the phrase "you're not allowed to see" she raises the issue that someone controls the film and has deliberately chosen the film images in order to create a specific interpretation. She repeats the phrase and then explicitly says that this guides the viewer's interpretation. Ramid agrees with her and Erik supports the argument by saying that the film uses standard prejudices about Russia, namely, that Russia has huge slum areas. But he also takes the argument further by referring to how the film shows that Sweden also has slum areas. This is a new way of presenting Sweden, and it goes against the image that many Swedes have of their own country.

Erik interprets the film images as showing real living conditions in Sweden. According to him, the visual is presented as a matter of fact, "they also show that we have slums here in Sweden." He states that these unprejudiced images of Sweden show how it really is, since "it's not much better here."

Erik's comment that "they show" Swedish welfare should be further examined. Taken together with Maria's way of presenting the film as a production where the audience is "not allowed to see," Erik follows her notion that someone is responsible for the way the scenes are represented, but unlike Maria, he gives the film creators credit for this. Erik agrees with the argument that Russia is presented according to prejudices but he adds that this is done with a deeper intention, which is to challenge the Swedes' image of Swedish welfare. A key issue is that both Maria and Erik talk about the film as something deliberately produced, and that it sets the stage for specific interpretations. What they differ about is whether the filmmaker's intentions were "fair" or not; Maria believes she – and the audience – was "not allowed to see," while Erik states the film gave new insights.

Maria and Erik argue for the same interpretation in that a film can be used to question or challenge common prejudiced notions about welfare: Maria's argument is that Russia should not be presumed to be poor, while Erik's argument is that Sweden is poor despite general assumptions about supposed welfare provision. The differences in meaning concern who is using whose visual competences. Maria is critical of the film since she believes its use of images is manipulative, while Erik believes the film images reflects the truth ("what it looks like") and thus his criticism is aimed at public services (e.g., lack of welfare provision). Together, they construct an understanding of the visual as a source of knowledge: what you see is what you get to know. Consequently, the visual is given the same status as other, more traditional ways of presenting facts about society, as in written texts.

Additionally, the discussion shows how students' "mental images" (Mitchell, 1986, 2005) of slums and welfare were challenged, both when watching the film and in the follow up discussion. The film talk made the individual mental images relevant but also possible to reflect upon and share with others. The School Cinema activity is an educational practice where students formulate critical perspectives on, and interpretations of, film as well as presentations on slums and welfare; the visual can be taken as seriously as the textual, we argue. The film is approached, by the students, not as "pure" images (Mitchell, 1994, p. 5), but instead in relation to language, media, technology, and the school context.

Student Participant Research

To ask young people to be co-researchers in research projects today often means using media techniques such as cameras, video (Rasmussen, 2004), or graphical programming software (Christensen and O'Brien, 2003). As a complement to the film viewings with follow up discussions, we asked one of the three participating media classes to participate as co-researchers on the film Lilya 4-ever using media technologies that they were familiar with: photography, and audio and video recordings (Sparrman, 2007). The reason for this decision was that we thought the students would, by making their own video interviews, create another type of research material that was different from classroom discussions. We also wanted to exploit the fact that they were media students. We wanted the media students to create media productions (cf. Dunsmore and Lagos, 2008), through analyzing the film with the help of media. The empirical materials children generate are often used for discussions between children and researchers about both why the pictures were taken and what they mean. We argue that the co-research material can be analyzed as any media representation (Sparrman, 2007), especially since these students were media students.

The idea was that by letting the students do video interviews of other young people on their own terms, using technology they more or less mastered, we would allow other issues to emerge than when teachers or researchers interview or observe young people. We had an introductory seminar raising questions about what it means to be a co-researcher in relation to working in a journalistic style, as well as issues of integrity and anonymity. In all, 16 video recordings, three audio recordings, and nine photographic pictures series were handed in by 30 students (Sparrman, 2007).

The video recordings were produced by three different video interviewing teams: (1) two girls; (2) one boy and a girl; and (3) two girls and a boy. The first two teams conducted five interviews each, while the third team did six interviews. The third team also took the opportunity to express their own thoughts about the movie Lilya 4-ever, discussing their own interpretations of the film in front of the camera. The length of the interviews differed between the teams. The two first teams made interviews more or less covering the whole film while the third team only asked questions about the ending of the film.

Questions asked by the teams included: "OK. What would you have done in Lilya's position?" (Interview Krv1c_1), "Er, do you think we can stop the trafficking in human beings that goes on across the world?" (Interview

Krv1a_1), and "What can individuals do to counteract illegal trafficking, that is smuggling of human beings, and prevent these things from happening?" (Interview Krv1c_1). This last question raises the issue of individuals' intervention to solve problems. However, the answers were fairly discouraging, since the interviewed students had difficulties to come up with any ideas for change.

One team brought up concrete questions about media as such. They asked the interviewees to describe the film, asking about their expectations of the film. They also asked which part of the movie was the strongest scene, technically speaking, and what the interviewees thought about the music used in the film (Interview Krv1c_1-5).

One of the teams had a more professional approach than the others. Their questions were sophisticated in the sense that they tried to start more elaborate discussions. They were even provocative in that they challenged the taken-for-granted notion of Lilya being a victim: "How do you see Lilya? Did she herself choose this situation and if she did, did she have herself to blame?" (Interview Krv1a_4).

Our approach was to let the students participate with their media productions on equal terms as with verbal language. This means that we did not discuss the material with the students or ask them what they meant by any of it; we merely used and analyzed the materials as visual statements and cultural expressions of the students' understandings of the movie Lilya 4-ever. Likewise, we did not play back our own video recordings of the classroom discussions to the students and ask them what they meant by certain statements. Our strategy was not to assess their intentions or the process, but to understand the students' media productions as statements and own analysis (Sparrman, 2007). The strategy was useful. The students conformed to the idea of using research-like approaches. They also raised other kinds of questions than were raised in the teacher-initiated discussions.

Film Talk about Domestic Violence

When discussing the film Evil the students were divided into small groups to answer prepared questions handed out by the teacher. The teacher had picked the questions from the guideline supplied by the SFI, where the subject matter of the film is presented along with suggestions for areas for further discussion: school and society, violence and repression, friendship, class, and

the family. The small group discussions ended with a summarizing discussion with the full class, which is not included in this analysis.

In the small group discussions about Evil, domestic violence, violence more generally, and bullying were dealt with. Generally in these discussions, it was clear that the students struggled with the questions because they were quite complicated in the sense that they were long and raised difficult issues (Eriksson Barajas and Lindgren, 2009).

Sweden was the first country in the world to introduce legislation against corporal punishment for children, in 1979. However, the first step towards passing this law was already taken in 1957 when corporal punishment in schools was done away with (Qvarsebo, 2006). The law against child battering is fundamental to the Swedish welfare system. Still, there are children who are exposed to domestic violence on a daily basis. The following excerpt from a discussion concerns the battering of the main character in the film, 16-year-old Erik, by his stepfather, and what Erik's mother could have done to stop the abuse.

Example 3. Stopping abuse

Participants: Small group consisting of two girls and three boys.
Tape: KE3 Evil:8.

Veronica:	That one? (Reads from questionnaire.) "Think about the mother's role, what could she have done differently?"
Mike:	She could throw that man out, I think.
Veronica:	(Yawns) Yeah, and report him.
Lisa:	Yeah.
Robin:	Yes, but I'm sure it's kind of taboo to divorce publicly like that, people didn't do that ...
Veronica:	But she ought to.
Peter:	She just didn't care, she just, like, played the piano.
Veronica:	Yeah, she ought to, like, call for the father anyway.
Robin:	But I think then, I mean I don't believe, he would have beaten her ...
Veronica.	Nope.
Mike:	Yeah. But, well, he did that.
Robin:	Yeah.
Veronica:	But still. She should have asked for help or something!
Robin:	No, but ...
Veronica:	I bet they didn't have any womens' refuge on those days.

Mike:	No, but she had … there was a lawyer who came to her.
Robin:	… er …
Veronica:	You would think she could have, like asked anyone.
Robin:	… But I believe, like …
Veronica:	… She could have …
Robin:	…that you, she would have been disgraced in the circle of acquaintances, sure, she can't say anything, 'cause then, like, she would have become disgraced.
Veronica:	Yeah … but still I would, still she should, I think she should have stopped him … or thrown him out.
Robin:	Yeah, I think so too.
Veronica:	Yeah.
Peter:	She could have changed the locks.
Everybody:	(Laughs)

The fact that Evil depicts a mother in Sweden in the 1950s has an impact on the discussions. The students argue that the mother is constrained by tradition and conventions and is not able to leave her husband. Such actions might, as the students express it, disgrace her. It was difficult to ask for help at that time since in the 1950s there were no women's refuges. Still, the students discuss other things she could have done, such as report him, talk to him, ask for help, just stop him, throw him out, or change the locks. These are solutions that might work in today's Sweden, but were not an option in the 1950s, as the students are aware of. Especially one girl comes up with several suggestions, and even though the others in her group counter these, saying they will have negative outcomes, it seems that the students hope there would be a positive solution.

Neither could the mother ask, as one student suggests, a lawyer or just "anyone" because bringing up the problem outside the family is balanced against being humiliated in her circle of acquaintances. Referring to the lawyer as a possible helper reflects the students' wish to believe in an adult helper (Aspán, 2009), and at the same time an awareness that this is not always the solution. This is similar to how the students refer to the school psychologist in the bullying example below. To talk to her husband is also out of the question since the consequence could be that he hits her too, which, as one student points out, he does do in the film. The students are critical of, and concerned about, the mother's lack of action, and her passiveness is described as an expression of male oppression.

The discussion continues when the students turn to a new question from the guideline about why the stepfather beats Erik:

Example 4. Why abuse

Participants: Small group consisting of two girls and three boys.
Tape: KE3 Evil:8.

Veronica:	(Reads from questionnaire.) "Discuss why the father is hitting Erik", or the stepfather.
Mike:	He well, well, kind of like this, he doesn't want to let go of Erik. He wants to have power over Erik all the time.
Peter:	But he, it was, like, he just fought 'cause it was fun. He [Erik] just dropped his knife once and then he [the stepfather] just, yeah, so he left like so (Demonstrates.)
Veronica:	Yeah, but he wanted, he … maybe to be best he fights.
Mike:	Yeah.
Veronica:	Maybe he has things he feels bad about.
Robin:	Er, maybe he had a hard childhood.
Veronica:	And then, like, takes out his anger on Erik and says so that … yeah …
Mike:	Or he doesn't like children at all.
Robin:	No, it's not his own son so it's … maybe it would have been different if it had been, like, his son.

Quite a number of explanations as to why Erik's stepfather is battering him are brought up. The different explanations can be divided into three main categories: (1) power; (2) own concerns and emotions; and (3) lack of biological relations. The arguments put forward are that the stepfather wants to be in power and that he enjoys hitting since he can be aroused by the slightest thing, like a knife falling to the floor during dinnertime. The stepfather's own concerns and emotions have to do with his emotional instability. The students argue that maybe he feels bad, that he himself had a poor childhood, and carries anger inside him, which he takes out on Erik. The students discuss the possibility that he might not like children. Finally, the fact that Erik is not his biological son is seen as something that makes the battering worse, and there is an idea that had Erik been his biological son, the abuse would not have occurred. In conclusion, the reason for the battering is accepted as complex in the sense that it is difficult to decide exactly why the stepfather abuses Erik. The students see that there is no single cause for the battering and they construct an understanding of the reasons behind it based on personal as well as common and complex grounds (cf. Hydén, 2001). This, we argue, may be an expression of the shared common understanding among the students

concerning the Swedish law against child battering, and also an awareness of the negative effects of male oppression, especially in the private sphere.

Writing a Film Script

The students' film scripts are interesting because they are the results of the teachers' strategy to combine preparation and the follow up activity. The students' learning activity – to write a film script – started before they had been to the local cinema and seen the film About a Boy. This may have enabled them to make an independent interpretation of bullying, without making direct reference to the film. However, the analysis of the film script shows how the (grade 8) students combine the frame set by the teacher, the pedagogical context, and the theme of bullying, with their own references to popular cultural experiences. It is an example of how students can understand children's actions and adult authority. The film script in Example 5 shows how all these themes are touched upon.

Example 5. Film Script about Bullying

Film script written by four boys in handwriting.
Film Script G8_Group 2.

Ironside School – History X

Victim = Perra
Bully = Micke
Bully = Niklas
Psychologist = JussiMcDuck

One rainy day AT Ironside School, Perra walked down the corridor when suddenly Niklas comes with a big knife threatening Perra.
Lie down in the pud-dle, or you'll get a knife in you. Said Niklas.

Got it! Answered Perra.
Perra walked out of the house and to the closest water puddle. Then he sat down in the water and lay down in the puddle.
Suddenly the Psychologist Jussi came.
Why are you lying here, you'll catch a cold?
Micke and Niklas forced me, but I wasn't allowed to tell.

Next day!

The next day, Perra arrives at school. When he walks down the corridor he hears footsteps behind him.

Did you tell Jussi?

No. I wasn't allowed to.

We don't believe you because he talked to us Says Niklas.

I only said that you told me to lie in the puddle.

Right, for that, you'll get this.

~~Jussi showed a knife. Jussi and Niklas run towards Perra and stab him in the stomach once each.~~

The above film script contains several references to popular culture: the content has elements of popular film plots. Knife stabbing can happen in an ordinary Swedish schoolyard, but this would be a very extraordinary event, while it is much more common in film and in crime series on television. Moreover, the title refers to the feature film American History X from 1998, a film these students would not have been able to see at a movie theater because it is an age-restricted film. Still, they could, of course, have seen it on DVD, or heard peers talk about it.

Yet another reference to popular culture is the psychologist, who is partly named after a cartoon character. In the film script that the pupils wrote in Swedish, the psychologist is called Jussi von Anka, which is a clear reference to the Swedish translation of Uncle Scrooge in the Donald Duck comics, that is, Joakim von Anka. This comic is very popular and has been read by children and adults in Sweden since the late 1950s. The combination of names, using a character from a comic book, and combining it with a very serious professional title – which can only be held by an adult – creates the adult as a humoristic, even ridiculous, character. This could be interpreted as a form of resistance against a school task that the students find too personal to engage in emotionally, and so instead, they ridicule it (Aspán, 2009).

In theory, a school psychologist is an adult with power, whose main task is to help students. In one study of a Swedish school project aiming to teach students self-expression and install values in them, the students repeatedly called for increased adult interference when they got into conflicts. The feeling was that adults left them to solve their own problems and that this increased or prolonged the conflict (Aspán, 2009). In the present film script, the psychologist does not listen to the bullied boy's wishes and needs. Jussi naïvely tells the bullied boy not to lie in the puddle to avoid catching a cold – when Perra's problems are much more severe and damaging than a simple

cold. The naming of the psychologist signals that he does not have a serious function for the students. The school psychologist has power but does not use it in a way that is helpful to the student in need, when helpfulness, according to Margareta Aspán (2009), is what students would prefer. In this way, the psychologist Jussi is like Uncle Scrooge: powerful but not very caring.

A standard piece of advice in Swedish anti-bullying programs is to tell an adult about bullying (see for example www.friends.se). In the film script, it is shown that this is not only useless, but that it aggravates the bullying. The bullied boy gets stabbed for being a telltale. Moreover, the film script emphasizes the idea that adult intervention in peer conflicts can create more problems, rather than reduce or solve them. The bullied boy explicitly tells the psychologist that he was not supposed to tell anyone about the bullying, yet the psychologist acts against the boy's expressed wish – and consequently the bullied boy gets stabbed.

Through references to popular culture, the adult is thus described from children's point of view as a ridiculous person with immense power, who cannot be trusted. Adults are often unaware of this and so it becomes a problem for young people. Another notion, which may seem more controversial to adults, is also described from children's point of view, namely that children can be evil. In contrast to other film talks about, for example, violence, no extenuating circumstances are given that might explain why Micke and Niklas are bullying Perra. This can be compared to the discussion about battering above, where a number of explanations to the assaulting man's wrongful behavior are presented.

To conclude, the film script uses irony and seriousness at the same time, to show how problematic the topic of bullying is. The conclusion is that the adult, since he lacks an understanding of the students' situations and experiences, increases their problems rather than solves them.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the data from the research project described in this chapter present strong evidence that School Cinema encourage student engagement. The visual, in combination with the verbal, plays an important role in the educational settings under study. The project presents the practice of doing School Cinema as well as in depth analysis of classroom discussions using a discourse analytic framework where microanalysis, at different levels, of conversations is interpreted in relation to societal discourse. We have also used

theories of visual culture and about children's perspectives in the analysis. Therefore, at an organizational level, the activities in the project reveal different forms of conversations, in all of which the students play an important role.

By describing different ways of doing School Cinema activities, we do not propose that the students who "only" spoke about the film actually learned or experienced less than the students working with own media productions and/or follow up activities. In all cases, no matter where the teacher was positioned or whether he or she was present or not, the follow up activities aimed to encourage the students to express their thoughts and ideas about the films, which they did. The films are used as pedagogical devices to talk about difficult issues. At the same time, larger political and social lessons are taught and learned, for example about welfare, domestic violence, gender equality, and bullying. For the teachers, the discussions and student-produced materials offer new ways to understand students' perspectives on the role adults play in school, and their abilities to solve problems (among students). A call for an increased understanding by adults of students' experiences and culture is expressed by the students in diverse ways.

The chapter exemplifies how film in different pedagogical settings and tasks – classroom discussions, small group discussions, students' film scripts, or students' media analysis – influences the social at the same time as the social influences films. For example, discourse about welfare, violence, or bullying can never be treated fully without analyzing how the discourse is represented in the media, and, at the same time, how it is interpreted and understood by the viewers, in this case students. This supports the argument put forward by other scholars that visual culture is in dialogue with society.

The Swedish way of using School Cinema is in line with the school curricula, and aims to integrate media in a diverse set of subjects (the Swedish language, the Art and Aesthetics, and the Social Sciences) to reach each individual student, rather than single it out as a specific subject (media education). However, there are also schools offering media communication programs applied by interested students, which is also exemplified in this chapter. The idea of integrating media in the general school curricula points to the fact that media is looked upon as something important for each school to deal with and learn about. In this context, School Cinema plays an important role for the schools to be able to fulfill some of their media goals, and that is not primarily to learn about the medium of film as such or as part of media education. Highlighting media in various subjects has lead to the development

of local practices where cinema becomes part of the everyday school experience.

The learning outcomes from using film *in* education can, we argue, be marked as "prosocial" (Calvert 1999, p. 179). Rather than focusing on pure academic skills when talking about educational media our chapter shows that the preparatory and follow up activities in classroom train emotional and social skills relating to democratic issues and standards. As we have argued, there is a great potential in doing media *in* education since it goes beyond the media-specific, and combines interpretations of media with understandings of the cultural, and the local as well as the global. This is important in the contemporary society where media is integrated in each individual's everyday life. School Cinema as media *in* education therefore needs to be taken seriously.

REFERENCES

Aspán, M. (2009).*Delademeningar*[Shared and divided minds] (Doctoral thesis, Department of Education, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden).

Calvert, S. (1999). *Children's journeys through the information age*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Christensen, P. and O'Brien, M. (Eds.).(2003). *Children in the city, home, neighborhoods and the rise of the child consumer*. Durham, London: Duke University Press.

Clark, C.C. (1933). Sound motion pictures as an aid in teaching science.*Science Education17*(1), 17–23.

Crary, J. (1990). *The techniques of the Observer. On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Davis, H.C. (1932). *Specific Values of Educational FilmsUsed as Supplementary Aids* (Unpublished doctoral thesis).Department of Education, University of Chicago.

Dunsmore, K. and Lagos, T. G. (2008). Politics, Media and Youth: Understanding Political Socialization via Video Production in Secondary Schools. *Learning, Media and Technology33*(1), 1–10.

Eriksson Barajas K. The Pimp and the Happy Whore : "Doing Gender" in Film Talk in a School Setting. London: Routledge; Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research. 2010;54(6), 581-596.

Eriksson Barajas, K. and Lindgren, A. (2009).Den 'rättfärdige' mobbaren [The "justified" bully]. *Utbildning and Demokrati18*(3), 111–130.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Finegan, T.E. (1928).An Experiment in the Development of Classroom Films.*General Science Quarterly 12*(2), 391–406.

Hornby, N. and Harris, L. (Producers), and Weitz, P. and Weitz, C. (Directors). (2002). *About a boy*. [Motion picture.]. USA: Universal Pictures.

Hydén, M. (2001).For the child's sake: parents and social workers discuss conflict-filled parental relations after divorce. *Child and Family Social Work 6*(1), 115–128.

Jönsson, L. (Producer), and Moodysson, L. (Director).(2002). *Lilya 4-ever.*[Motion picture.]. Sweden: Memfis Film AB.

Lindgren, A. (2009). Visualiseringen av naturen i tidig svensk skolfilm [Visualizationofnature in early Swedish schoolcinema]. In G. Halldén (Ed.), *Naturen somsymbolför den godabarndomen* (pp. 34–58). Stockholm: Carlsson.

Lindgren, A., Sparrman, A. and Eriksson, K. (2005). Film i klassrummetreservälfärdsfrågor   [Film   in theclassroomencourageswelfareissues]. *LOCUS* (3–4), 14–25.

Lönnerheden, H., Leijonborg, I. (Producers), and Håfström, M. (Director).(2003). *Evil.*[Motion picture.]. Sweden: Moviola Film and Televison AB.

Mirzoeff, N. (1998/2002).*The visual culture reader.*London: Routledge.

Mitchell, W.J.T. (1986). *Iconology: Image, Text, Ideology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Mitchell, W.J.T. (1994). *Picture theory: Essays on verbal and visual representation*. Chicago: The University Chicago Press.

Mitchell, W.T.J. (2002). Showing seeing: A critique of visual culture. *Journal of Visual Culture1*(2), 165–181.

Mitchell, W.J.T. (2005). *What do pictures want? The lives and loves of images*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Qvarsebo, J. (2006). *Skolbarnensfostran* [The training of the schoolchild]. (Doctoral thesis, Department of Child Studies, Linköping, Sweden: Linköping University).

Rasmussen, K. (2004). Places for children – children's places. *Childhood11*(2), 155–177.

Renov, M. (1993). Introduction: The Truth About Non-Fiction. In M. Renov (Ed.), *Theorizing documentary* (pp. 1–11). New York: Routledge.

Sparrman, A. (2006). Film as a political and educational device: talk about men, male sexuality and gender among Swedish youth. *Visual Studies21*(2), 167–182.

Sparrman, A. (2007). Åttafotografiskabildserier [Eightphotographic imageseries]. *Sosiologiidag36*(4), 53–76.

Sparrman, A. and Eriksson, K. (2004). Skolbiostuderadgenom kameralinsen [School cinemastudiedthroughthecameralens]. *Didaktisktidskrift14*(2–3), 79–89.

Sparrman, A. and Lindgren, A. (2010). Visual documentation as a normalizing practice: A new discourse of visibility in preschool. *Surveillance and Society 7*(3–4), 248–261.

Svensk Filmindustri. Skolfilmsavdelningen (1924). *Tidskrift för Svensk Skolfilm och Bildningsfilm [Journal of Swedish schoolcinema and educationalcinema]*. Stockholm: Tidskrift för svensk skolfilm och bildningsfilm.

Svensk Filmindustri. Skolfilmsavdelningen (1925). *Tidskrift för Svensk Skolfilm och Bildningsfilm [Journal of Swedish schoolcinema and educationalcinema]*. Stockholm: Tidskrift för svensk skolfilm och bildningsfilm.

Swedish Film Institute. (2008). Film in schools – watching, analysing and making films, retrieved from http://www.sfi.se/en-gb/English/Education/ 24 May 2010.

Viklund, K. (Ed.). (1999). *Skolbiokatalogen2000*[School cinemacatalogue 2000].Stockholm: Svenskafilminstitutet.