



Getting Your Money Back: Swedish Funding Institutions and Questions About Quality Films

Zehra Cerrahoğlu, Dokuz Eylül University

zehra.cerrahoglu@deu.edu.tr

Volume 11.1 (2023) | ISSN 2158-8724 (online) | DOI 10.5195/cinej.2023.595 | <http://cinej.pitt.edu>

Abstract

This article explores the ways in which policymakers, national institutions, and film funding bodies try to navigate the current challenges for Swedish cinema, and if/how distinctions such as “commercial value”, “circulation potential” and “quality” remains important criteria for them. This is done by analyzing reports and interviewing people from both the industry and funding bodies.

Keywords: film funding; film policy; Sweden; Swedish Film Institute; film production; film industry



New articles in this journal are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 United States License.



This journal is published by the [University Library System](#) of the [University of Pittsburgh](#) as part of its [D-Scribe Digital Publishing Program](#) and is cosponsored by the [University of Pittsburgh Press](#).



Getting Your Money Back: Swedish Funding Institutions and Questions About Quality Films

Zehra Cerrahoğlu

Introduction

The fragmented structure of European film finance has long been a much debated issue, and it has grown more so over time as a result of the participation of diverse public funding actors in each country. In these processes, national film policies of European nations and the organizations that carry them out have also taken centre stage.

At least since the 1910s, when producer Charles Magnusson decided to make fewer films but of higher quality, and hired Victor Sjöström, Mauritz Stiller, and George af Klercker (Furhammar, 1998, pp. 56- 61), questions of quality, funding, and box office success, have always been a central part of Swedish film policy and film debates. At certain times the questions have reached beyond the film industry itself and become public debates, as in the late 1930s (Furhammar, 1998, pp. 127-128) or in the early 1960s. The latter discussion was led by Harry Schein, who would go on to create the Swedish Film Institute in order to make sure that a funding system was in place for quality films (Vesterlund, 2010, p. 27). He also provided a definition of what quality means in terms of cinema. To this day, those issues, and Schein's definition¹, continues to form the basis of film policies and film debates in Sweden. The concept of quality

film was close to art film in terms of narration, and these were also in connection with auteur cinema and the idea that the director was the real artist in the film.

As Per Vesterlund points out, Harry Schein's film reform process dates back to a 1951 document where "a number of prominent film-makers, politicians and intellectuals make an appeal for a new quality-based film subsidy" (Vesterlund, 2010, p. 25). The 1963 film reform, which initiated a film agreement between government and industry components, was a significant transformation in Swedish cinema. Schein created the Swedish Film Institute as a part of the film reform. The plan was for 10% of Swedish box office revenue to be channelled to the Swedish Film Institute, which would then fund Swedish film production. The support grants were chosen by a jury of film consultants and based on the quality of the films. The defined missions and activities of the Swedish Film Institute, together with Harry Schein, marked the period. On the way from film agreement to film policy, Swedish cinema witnessed many different developments. In the film agreement, industry components constituted an important part of the deal. In this way, the Swedish Film Institute's film fund was fuelled by the film industry and used to make more films.

The desire to support artistically superior, innovative, and original films has found a place in the film policies of all public institutions aiming to develop film art in their countries. The evaluation criteria for quality, however, are also absolutely influenced by historical and social

factors. Supporting original films also means being willing to take risks. This draws attention to another hotly debated issue: Are supported films attracting the audience? Do they have circulation potential? Today, considerations of audiences and circulation potential have a significant place among the requirements of many film funds. The money is intended to be given to the films that will appeal to a wide audience. However, priority values in the diversified and increasingly fragmented field of film finance do not always meet at the same point. While good movies and large audiences are everyone's desire, the priorities and selection criteria continue to spark a lot of debate.

So, what is the situation today? This article will investigate it through a literature review and qualitative interviews with policymakers, advisors, former and current board members of the Swedish Film Institute, former CEOs of other funding bodies, and film professionals. Those were done in Stockholm during a research visit in 2021.

A background to public film funding in Sweden

Since the 1960s, the production structure in the Scandinavian countries has gradually shifted from a market-driven culture with big companies dominating to “a much more diverse and

fragmented structure based on public support, with very few big and strong production companies and a lot of small and somewhat unstable production companies” (Bondebjerg and Novrup Redvall, 2011, p. 37).

In Sweden, there are several different funding bodies. The national fund is the Swedish Film Institute, other wide-reaching funding comes from the Nordisk Film and TV Fond and the public broadcasting companies SVT and TV 4. There are also regional film funds. Recently, various streaming services, not least Netflix, have also began funding Swedish film projects. A combination of most of these funding bodies are usually necessary for the films to be realized. These funding bodies, with the potential exception of the streaming services, have a few things in common such as the criteria of quality, the potential for films to achieve international festival success, and the potential for films to reach as wide an audience as possible.

To have several funding bodies has become more and more necessary during the last decades. According to John Hill and Nobuko Kawashima, the global cinema industry has seen significant changes over the past 20 years because of both economic globalization and technological advancements. Hollywood has expanded its international operations, but regional screen industries have emerged and created new forms of collaboration. These changes have also presented policymakers with new economic and cultural difficulties, forcing them to re-evaluate

how cinema policy objectives should be developed, specified, and carried out (Hill and Kawashima, 2016, p. 667). Margareta Dahlström and Brita Hermelin describe the European film production system as requiring significant state funding through cultural policies for the education of film professionals and to produce films (Dahlström and Hermelin, 2007, p. 113).

A recent report from Film i Väst Analysis titled *Public Film Funding at a Crossroads* invites the components to reconsider the role and significance of public funds in the film industry and evaluates the discussions in European public film funding (Eskilsson, 2022, p. 5). The author of the report, Tomas Eskilsson (founder and former CEO of Film i Väst) sums up the main principles (which are called “ideology” in the report) of the policies of public film bodies in Europe as follows:

- cultural/artistic idiosyncrasies with territorial reference,
- film as an art/culture form,
- diversity in all its senses,
- European ownership,
- independent production companies that own the underlying rights, and along with the filmmakers have artistic freedom and creative control,
- rights handled territory by territory,
- and cinemas as a central place for shared experiences. (Eskilsson, 2022, p. 6)

Bo- Erik Gyberg (Chairman of the Swedish Film Academy, former film consultant at Swedish Film Institute) comments on the fragmented system in Europe saying “In the 1990s when

I was part of the commissioning consultant group at the [Swedish] Film Institute, we were worried about that because it seems like an insurance system for decision makers who cannot make decisions” (B. Gyberg, personal communication, June 02, 2021). In other words, decision makers feel obligated to prioritize certain projects, over many others, because they had already received funding. Nadi Tofighian (board member of Swedish Film Institute and film scholar) makes some similar comments on the funding scheme saying, “it’s like a stamp of quality” (N. Tofighian, personal communication, April 29, 2021).

The Swedish Film Institute

The Swedish Film Institute fund was initially gathered from the state and industry components obtained through what was called the Film Agreement to establish a national film support system. In 1993, a consultant system started, and Swedish Film Institute stopped in-house productions. Also, performance subsidies were introduced with the 1993 Film Agreement, along with the replacement of the quality film requirement with valuable film. (Vermeulen, 1997, pp. 24-29) According to Bo- Erik Gyberg:

The purpose paragraph in the film agreement said that ‘the purpose is to support valuable Swedish film’, but then there was discussion on the companies and economy. That was changed to ‘valuable Swedish film production’. That’s an interesting shift in content and

that made it sort of a more commercial agreement. (B. Gyberg, personal communication, June 02, 2021).

The subsidies were retroactively given to specific films according to the artistic criteria of a selection committee. The selection system preferred dramatic films by auteurs or first-time filmmakers—often with a literary or critical background—taken into consideration. Films that were described as having “new political and social bias”, criticizing the current politics, and having a social agenda were in the foreground (Hedling, 2016, p. 64). The nature of selective funding and the need for balance has always been one of the most criticized topics and controversies. For the increasing need for balance Gyberg comments that: “the shift should be a little bit more towards the artistic side, given that it's very difficult to define what is an arthouse film, what is a commercial film. But we cannot leave the so-called commercial films outside the system.” (B. Gyberg, personal communication, June 02, 2021).

When the Film Agreement was in effect, it was unusual in that it was an agreement in which the film industry itself was involved with a national film institute. In the 2013 Agreement, a clear vision for Swedish cinema was expressed with the aim: “to promote Swedish film production of high quality and high attractiveness, in both a national and an international perspective, and a strong and dynamic film industry where the production should be distinguished by both continuity and renewal.” (Ministry of Culture Sweden, 2012, p. 1). Additionally, Swedish

films should participate in the international film festival competitions in Berlin and Cannes, and Sweden should lead Europe in production and distribution, also with documentaries, children's films, and youth films. Men and women should each receive an equal share of the funding, which should be distributed according to diversity considerations (Swedish Film Institute, 2012, p. 24).

In May 2015, the Swedish government chose to cancel the Film Agreement to initiate a new national film policy. The 10% cinema ticket contribution would be eliminated, and the VAT on movie tickets would increase from 6% to 25%. The new film policy was put into effect on January 1st, 2017 (Swedish Film Institute Official Website, 2015) and this time the film industry was no longer involved.

Katja Björklund (Senior Advisor at the Ministry of Culture) was involved in the transition from film agreement to film policy and she has the following comments:

One of the weaknesses of the agreement was that not everybody in the film industry or film area was participating. Among others, the creators and artistic persons in society weren't at all involved in the film agreement. Also, it was a democratic problem because the parliament wasn't really involved in the film policy. (K. Björklund, personal communication, June 24, 2021)

Kristina Colliander (then head of production and film funding at the Swedish Film Institute) describes the function of the Swedish Film Institute in a fragmented funding scheme as “creating support systems that follow what’s happening in the world in a reasonable tempo, so that

the industry can develop and become strong” (K. Colliander, personal communication, May 05, 2021).

For the Swedish Film Institute, the primary evaluation criteria are: “artistic qualities, artistic and financial long-term partnership between Swedish and foreign producer, the proportion of artistic, technical, and financial Swedish participation in the production, distribution (theatrical or/and full coverage national television distribution/VOD).” (Nordisk Film & TV Fond, 2021b, p. 17) Today the Swedish Film Institute offers funding for development, production, automatic funding, and box office related funding on the national level and is involved international co-productions.

Petri Kemppinen (former CEO of Nordisk Film and TV Fond and board member of Swedish Film Institute) asserts that, “the Swedish Film Institute has been, if I compare the Nordic Film Institutes for example, absolutely the most—I’m not saying avant-garde—but most courageous film institute in the Nordic countries in terms of what kind of films they have been financing.” (P. Kemppinen, personal communication, May 14, 2021). Malin Wahlberg (former board member of Swedish Film Institute and film scholar) supports the idea of making the Swedish Film Institute more “in the function of a cultural institute” and says, “We should not work for the benefit of industry. There must be some space for experimentation, and to support risky projects

that will not make it to a big audience.” (M. Wahlberg, personal communication, May 10, 2021).

With similar reasons, Tobias Janson (producer) stresses on the development support in Sweden:

I think that’s the difference between us in Sweden and Scandinavia, or let’s say North-western Europe than other parts of the world. We can actually rely on our very early development ideas having some energy through public funding early on, and that’s a vital and interesting climate for films. (T. Janson, personal communication, April 23, 2021).

Among the requirements for getting funding from the Swedish Film Institute, there are also performance criteria such as “the film’s ability to reach an audience across the country” or “the ability to reach an international audience” (European Audiovisual Observatory, 2019, p. 480) and also industry “should be characterized by gender equality and diversity. Promoting diversity means that support should be granted to stories with different perspectives and expressions as well as a variety of societal voices, both in front of and behind the camera.” (European Audiovisual Observatory, 2019, p. 484)

Public Broadcasting and TV

Since the 1960s, public broadcasting has actively participated in Swedish cinema, particularly in documentary films. As part of the Film Agreement, the public and private broadcasters agreed to not only contribute money to the Swedish Film Institute but also to make direct investments in Swedish films.

Film productions were commonly co-financed by Swedish public service television stations (SVT). As a result of a reorganization in 1987, SVT was divided into two organizations: one located in Stockholm (Channel 1) and the other concentrating on regional production and programming (TV2). As for TV2, various regional divisions were in charge of taking part in the financing and production of feature films. Channel 1 Drama served as both a producer and a financier. A production was frequently financed by Channel 1 Drama and SVT 2, for securing television distribution rights. And private channel TV 4 co-produced Swedish productions since 1991 (Vermeulen, 1997, pp. 33-34). After the cancellation of the Film Agreement in 2017, public broadcaster SVT stopped contributing to the Swedish Film Institute funding pool. However, broadcasters such as SVT and TV4 have long supported film projects in various stages.

Nordisk Film & TV Fond

Nordisk Film and TV Fond is a pan-Nordic fund that encouraged cooperation in the area since 1990s. The funding comes from various parts of the industry and the institutions in the Nordic countries. (Nordisk Film & TV Fond Official Website, n.d.)

In Nordisk Film and TV Fond Guidelines, project evaluation criteria are indicated as:

The Fund will undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the project on the basis of artistic- and audience-related criteria, as well as an evaluation of the project's financial needs (production needs). Furthermore, it will be evaluated whether the economic conditions for the execution of the project are realistic, both in regard to production, marketing and distribution. (Nordisk Film & TV Fond, 2021a, p. 4)

Regional Film Funds

Since the middle of the 1990s, regional structures have emerged to support the film industry. There are 19 regional resource centres. Some of their activities include backing the production of short and documentary films, educating children and teenagers about films, and promoting film viewing. As a rule, regional funds always “require the production, the film, or the script” to have a relationship with the region to obtain the funding. In the 2019 European Audiovisual Observatory report:

The regions' share of the financing of Swedish feature film has increased from one percent in the mid-1990s to about 10 percent over the 2010s. Today, there are few feature films produced without funding from the Film Institute, a television company or a regional fund. (European Audiovisual Observatory, 2019, p. 475)

Among the most important regional funds is *Film i Väst*, in Trollhättan, which looks for “projects that can compete at the most prestigious film festivals and/or be seen by a large international audience” (Nordisk Film & TV Fond, 2021b, p. 19). With a criterion of 100% local spending, *Film i Väst* provides money for both pre- and post-production. *Film i Skåne*, based in Ystad, co-produces feature films and their goal is to produce films with a wide audience and the

potential to win prizes at film festivals. Priority is given to films that have a significant link to the area. *Filmpool Nord*, in Luleå, actively participate in the region's youth and children's programs and co-productions. *Film Stockholm* is the regional fund in Stockholm. Short films, documentaries, feature films, and television dramas are all co-produced and funded. Production must take place in the area (at least in part). (Nordisk Film & TV Fond, 2021b, p. 19)

Tomas Eskilsson expresses strong opinions about Film i Väst, stating that they see their fund as quite different from the Swedish Film Institute's. They have sought to focus on young talents since their inception in the late 1990s, and they believe this is related to the long-term cooperations that they have established with the talents over time (T. Eskilsson, personal communication, May 12, 2021). Eskilsson also discusses regional film funding in Europe:

Nearly all regional film funds in all over Europe have two logics: one is linked to the cultural field, and one is linked to the economical field. If you look at Film i Väst, we have a very typical Scandinavian regional body. Main motive is to present people stories and settings from the specific territory, not dealing so much with films as an art form or something for the substantial audience. We have made films in this region that has taken place all over the world. I think we have been a strong driving source since we have been able to put aside more substantial money than any of the Nordic film institutes for international co-productions. (T. Eskilsson, personal communication, May 12, 2021).

In his corpus of work on the subject, Olof Hedling recognises that one of the most important changes in Swedish film finance has been the large contribution made by these regional film centres. The first major change was the introduction of public film support for the first time in

1963. The second is Nordisk Film and TV Fond, when “film support lost its earlier, entirely national character through the introduction of a pan-Nordic support fund in 1990”. Then with the third change, regional funds became more dominant and “a major part of the physical film production moved away from Stockholm” (Hedling, 2016, p. 61). Dahlström and Hermelin make a similar description geographically: “While the national film policy is part of the *cultural policy*, the regional film policy is part of a wider *regional development policy* encompassing both the cultural and economic development fields, with an emphasis on the latter.” (Dahlström and Hermelin, 2007, p. 113, original emphasis) As Hedling confirms:

the objectives of these regional centres on one hand tend to be mostly economic. On the other, one may argue, they have retained some of their artistic values, like a high regard for art cinema and auteurs, long associated with official Swedish film policy. (Hedling, 2010, p. 336)

But Eskilsson goes further as he is explaining more on Film i Väst assessment criteria, which is directly related ‘getting the money back’:

A lot of funding bodies only focusing on two elements in my opinion: they are focusing on the script and who is going to make this movie. We also talk a lot about what are the ambitions with this film, and in what way should this film be positioned, how should it be understood in the market by the audience. (T. Eskilsson, personal communication, May 12, 2021).

The need for quality film with circulation potential

In Statskontoret (Swedish Agency for Public Management) Report on the policy, it's been expressed that the new film policy is not different in terms of content, since the objectives are the same as the Agreement. "Some of the Swedish Film Institute's activities have previously been managed and financed by the state, but for the film industry, the governmental film policy represents something entirely new." (Statskontoret, 2019) It is also stated in the report that the assessments need to represent the criteria clearly. It is vital for the consultant system. Tomas Eskilsson evaluates it from a historical perspective and offers some criticisms of today's film policies saying: "I think the objectives are not sharp enough. There is no specific objective link to the industry." (T. Eskilsson, personal communication, May 12, 2021). In addition to Eskilsson, the respondents, especially the industry professionals experienced in the production field, such as Petri Kemppinen and Tobias Janson expressed this lack of connection with the industry.

It's been repeatedly expressed that, today, even the most commercial projects require support from public sources. Kemppinen thinks there needs to be a balance between the commercial concerns and artistic aspects of the projects when it comes to funding:

I think more commercial, more audience-oriented production companies and distributors think that there is not enough financing for their commercial projects. They would want to have the funding to be more automatic, in a way. I think there is a problem with reaching

the audiences with these commercial projects. I would say that the commercial, market-oriented producers and distributors would want the Swedish Film Institute maybe to invest less into arthouse production, which is in a way their political mandate as well. So, it's a bit of a dilemma. (P. Kemppinen, personal communication, May 14, 2021).

In the 2016 MEDICI² Workshop Report it's also stated that in previous years, Swedish Film Institute prioritized art-house films over mainstream ones, but they are currently working with the commissioners to develop the guidelines and goals for a quality mainstream plan. Ruben Östlund's *Force Majeure* (2014), with its box office success and artistic quality, is an example of such a film (FOCAL, 2016). A celebrity director from the area, Östlund is a representative of the regional phenomenon "Göteborg auteurs" that emerged with the help of the University of Göteborg School of Film Directing program,³ and regional funds. Anna Westerståhl Stenport explains this: "The small-scale and auteur approach partly aligns with industry logics for art films, which are rarely commercially viable and so depend on an individual's drive and often on personal sacrifice." (Westerståhl Stenport, 2013, p. 90). This also aligns with the objectives Eskilsson stated such as discovering young talents and having long-term cooperation.

As noted in the Seventh Workshop Report in 2017 MEDICI, then the Head of Film Funding at the Swedish Film Institute, Kristina Borjeson answers an audience question on new terms and requirements after the implementation of the new film policy, and whether they would be tougher:

It will be asked that if the supported films attract more audience. The problem in Sweden is that domestic films don't stay in cinemas (between 2 to 3 weeks). Thus, producers will have

to come up with a detailed distribution strategy and explain much better how they are going to spend the money we grant them. (FOCAL, 2017)

In 2018 Göteborg Film Festival, a full-day conference was held with 40 prominent local and national politicians. Former CEO of the Swedish Film Institute, Anna Serner mentions the period right after the implementation of the new film policy as:

Right now, the quality of Swedish cinema is higher than ever before; looking at the last five years, we are up on critics' prizes, also attendance, selection for top festivals. I also see this as a result of the Institute's recommending projects from filmmakers because of their relevance, originality and craftsmanship. (Jensen, 2018)

She also talks about the increasing number of projects by women and points out the success of *Sami Blood* (Amanda Kernell 2016) in international film festivals.

The Film i Väst Analysis report makes unequivocal statements about the types of films that are supported. European public film funds are debating the issue of an excess of 'small' feature films being produced. These films struggle to find an audience and will struggle even more in the future. The national film brand is negatively impacted by overproducing films that have no artistic or audience potential. According to several respondents they interviewed, there is also a chance that a quality film with a large potential audience may be overlooked. The emphasis on quantity above quality is also sharply criticised by the study's respondents. (Eskilsson, 2022, p. 57). According to Wahlberg, "It should be both: broadly appealing but of high quality. Both interesting

to a wide audience and still, of course, high quality. It's pretty much the public service conception, but it's also to support business interests." (M. Wahlberg, personal communication, May 10, 2021).

Eskilsson thinks that it's very important for public bodies to have widespread content. He says:

You should create everything from those really artistically star movies to the ones that goes to the big festivals. But also, the ones that experiments with the form of how you tell a story, the laboratory. And you also need to upheld production of films that can attract a substantial audience. (T. Eskilsson, personal communication, May 12, 2021).

The need for experimentation was mentioned by many respondents in various contexts. Nadi Tofighian, Bo-Erik Gyberg, Malin Wahlberg and Tobias Janson discussed it in terms of cultural policy and for the sake of improving Swedish cinema.

Streaming Platforms and the future of public funding

Another current topic is, understandably, the ever-growing effects of the global streamers that are active in Sweden. This issue has been addressed by all the respondents as a threat both nationally and on a European scale, but also as an unavoidable change in today's audiovisual sector. Eskilsson states his impressions on global streamers as a game changer, through the European study they did, as follows: "It hasn't been like that before because the Americans haven't been so interested in our type of content. But today they are. So, if we want to keep our

independence, it's important. We need to work together” (T. Eskilsson, personal communication, May 12, 2021). He explains it as something that happened during the pandemic, because it was an easy period for the streamers to attract talents and suddenly a lot of big directors want to work with the global streamers. (T. Eskilsson, personal communication, May 12, 2021). In *Film i Väst* Analysis report, they are advocating a more flexible approach for the future to reach the audience: “In our view, public film agencies should be open to be involved in one-off high-quality projects in connection to global streaming services but should not develop organized long-term collaborations with them regarding production.” (Eskilsson, 2022, p. 71).

Nostradamus Reports, a Göteborg Film Festival initiative to evaluate the film industry and make future projections, highlighted public funds and global streaming services in their 2022 Report. Public cinema funding and public broadcasting have democratic and cultural objectives, something global streaming services do not have. For a public fund, a global audience for local storytelling is regarded as a significant accomplishment. However, selective funding is distributed based on both merit and need. Some public funds only support independent producers, but the future projection is that they may eventually be engaging with the same projects as the global streamers (Koljonen, 2022, p. 34).

In *Film i Väst Analysis Report*, Eskilsson argues that they “strongly believe that public film funding has a crucial and important role to play in the future. But film and audiovisual policies need to be reformulated, and the operational models for public film funds changed.” (Eskilsson, 2022, p. 11). With the threat of global giants, the traditional European methods of public funding are losing their power. “Only cultural policy and selective public film funding hinged on a modern, reformulated, version of existing ‘ideological’ principles can secure and guarantee sustainable production of content with a distinct cultural reference for the territory.” (Eskilsson, 2022, p. 11).

As stated by Kemppinen, the dialogue between the different players in the industry needs to be increased to protect local industries from the global streamers of today. “The whole industry in Sweden needs to be strong together for the funding. It can't be only the task of the Swedish Film Institute to speak for all the need of this area. They have to somehow rejoin forces again.” And he says that the film policy “should be more of an audiovisual policy, for example, not just film policy.” (P. Kemppinen, personal communication, May 14, 2021).

According to the 2021 SFI Facts and Figures report, digital streaming services are a big part of Swedes’ viewing habits, and that “Swedish film continued to lose its audience at the cinema, and the market share fell to 12.6%. The market share for Swedish film was twice as high on TV, a share that increased from last year.” (Swedish Film Institute, 2022, p. 19) The impact of digital

streaming platforms on national cinema is a topic that will continue to be discussed more and more. The films that are supported will be just as important as the institutions and structures that support them. These discussions will require a completely different assessment of issues such as quality, accessibility, and circulation potential in the future.

Concluding remarks

When discussing the financial resources and film funding bodies for Swedish arthouse cinema, we can't leave commercial films out of the conversation because such sources are equally required for them. The dilemma of what kinds of movies should be sponsored today and in the future is made more challenging by the industry's increasing reliance on international streaming platforms. The study reveals that every participant touches on these themes, albeit from various perspectives. A shared vision of the future, though, calls for greater collaboration and communication.

On the other hand, Sweden has a film funding environment with national and regional funds, and broadcasting channels that have supported cinema for many years, similar to many

other European countries. Even if there have been changes, it is clear that people still have confidence in these organisations and systems, which is reassuring.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank John Sundholm and Malin Wahlberg for their support and encouragement during my research visit at the Stockholm University Department of Media Studies in March–June 2021.

REFERENCES

- Bondebjerg, I., & Novrup Redvall, E. (2011). *A Small Region in a Global World. Patterns in Scandinavian Film and Media Culture*, CEMES Working Papers, No. 1. University of Copenhagen, ISSN: ISSN 1904-8025.
- Dahlström, M., & Hermelin, B. (2007). Creative industries, spatiality and flexibility: The example of film production. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 61 (3), 111-121. Retrieved September 16, 2022, from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00291950701553863>
- Eskilsson, T. (2022). *Public Film Funding at a Crossroads: A Film i Väst Analysis Report*. Retrieved December 21, 2022, from <https://analysis.filmivast.se/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Public-Film-Financing-at-a-Crossroads-download.pdf>.
- European Audiovisual Observatory. (2019). *Mapping of film and audiovisual public funding criteria in the EU*. Retrieved April 10, 2021, from <https://rm.coe.int/mapping-of-film-and-audiovisual-public-funding-criteria-in-the-eu/1680947b6c>
- FOCAL. (2016). *MEDICI, The Film Funding Journey, Sixth Workshop Report*. Retrieved April 10, 2021, from https://focal.ch/medici-training-2012-2019/reports/docs/MEDICI_Sixth_Workshop_Report.pdf.
- FOCAL. (2017). *MEDICI, The Film Funding Journey, Seventh Workshop Report*. Retrieved April 10, 2021, from https://focal.ch/medici-training-2012-2019/reports/docs/MEDICI_Seventh_Workshop_Report.pdf.
- Furhammar, L. (1998). *Filmen i Sverige: En historia i tio kapitel*. Stockholm: Bra böcker i Samarbete med Filminstitutet.
- Hedling, O. (2010). The Regional Turn: Developments in Scandinavian Film Production' in *Swedish Film: An Introduction and a Reader* (M. Larsson & A. Marklund, Eds.) (pp. 334-345). Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Hedling, O. (2016). 'Cinema in the Welfare State: Notes on Public Support, Regional Film Funds, and Swedish Film Policy' in *A Companion to Nordic Cinema* (M. Hjort & U. Lindqvist, Eds.) (pp. 60-77). West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.

- Hill, J., & Kawashima, N. (2016). Introduction: Film policy in a globalised cultural economy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 22(5), 667-672. Retrieved December 25, 2021 from <https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2016.1223649>
- Jansson, M., Papadopoulou, F., Stigsdotter, I., & Wallenberg, L. (2021). The final cut™: Directors, producers and the gender regime of the Swedish film industry. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 28(6), 2010-2025.
- Jensen, J. R. (2018, January 27). Göteborg: Swedish Industry Debates New Government Movie Policy. *Variety*. Retrieved December 25, 2021, from <https://variety.com/2018/film/festivals/goteborg-swedish-industry-debates-new-government-movie-policy-1202678992/>
- Koljonen, J. (2022). Nostradamus Report: Imagining a Sustainable Industry. In *Göteborg: Göteborg Film Festival*. Retrieved December 21, 2022, from <https://goteborgfilmfestival.se/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/GFF22-nostradamus-digital.pdf>.
- McElroy, R., & Noonan, C. (2022). Film Policy, Social Value, and the Mediating Role of Screen Agencies. *A Companion to Motion Pictures and Public Value*, 382-400.
- Ministry of Culture Sweden. (2012). *The 2013 Film Agreement*, Stockholm: Ministry of Culture,. Retrieved January 25, 2023, from <https://www.filminstitutet.se/globalassets/4.-om-oss/svenska-filminstitutet/engelsk-media/the-2013-film-agreement.pdf>
- Nordisk Film & TV Fond Official Website (n.d.). *Nordisk Film & TV Fond- Partners and Board*. Retrieved January 25, 2023, from <https://nordiskfilmogtvfond.com/about-us/partners>
- Nordisk Film & TV Fond. (2021a). *Guidelines [English] 2021*. Retrieved April 10, 2021, from https://nordiskfilmogtvfond.com/assets/download/Guidelines_English_2021.pdf.
- Nordisk Film & TV Fond. (2021b). *Co-Producing with the Nordic Countries, 2021*. Retrieved April 10, 2022, from https://www.ses.fi/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/NFTVF_Co-producing-with-the-Nordic-countries_2021.pdf.
- Statskontoret . (2019). *From the Film Agreement to a governmental film policy. An analysis of the activities of the Swedish Film Institute (2019:9)*. Retrieved April 10, 2022, from <https://www.statskontoret.se/in-english/publications/2019/from-the-film-agreement-to-a-governmental-film-policy.-an-analysis-of-the-activities-of-the-swedish-film-institute-20199/>

- Swedish Film Institute Official Website. (2007). 'Harry Scheins kvalitetsbegrepp'. Retrieved January 25, 2023, from <https://www.filminstitutet.se/sv/nyheter/2007/harry-scheins-kvalitetsbegrepp>
- Swedish Film Institute. (2012). *Financing of Film: A comparison of public film funding in eight European countries*. Retrieved April 10, 2021, from https://www.filminstitutet.se/globalassets/2.-fa-kunskap-om-film/analys-och-statistik/publications/other-publications/financing_of_film_a_comparative_overview_final.pdf.
- Swedish Film Institute Official Website (2015). *The New Film Policy*. Retrieved January 25, 2023, from <https://www.filminstitutet.se/en/ovrigt/the-new-film-policy/>.
- Swedish Film Institute. (2022). *Facts and Figures 2021*. Retrieved September 10, 2022, from <https://www.filminstitutet.se/contentassets/2a75657eb0ab4a2c9b44cb2dc642fcd0/facts-and-figures-2021.pdf>.
- Vermeulen, R. (1997). *Swedish National Cinema: The Dynamics of a National Film Industry in the 1990s* [Master's thesis, Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam].
- Vesterlund, P. (2010). Quality in the welfare state: Some remarks on a document from the archive of Harry Schein. *Journal of Scandinavian Cinema*, 1(1), 25–28. Retrieved December 21, 2021, from https://doi.org/10.1386/jsca.1.1.25_1
- Westerståhl Stenport, A. (2013). “‘We Train Auteurs’: Education, Decentralization, Regional Funding, and Niche Marketing in the New Swedish Cinema”, in *The Education of the Filmmaker in Europe, Australia, and Asia* (M. Hjort, Ed.) (pp. 85-104). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

ENDNOTES:

¹ Renewal of the film's means of expression and formal language, the relevance of the subject matter of the film, the intensity or freshness of its perception of reality or social criticism, the degree of psychological insight and spiritual level, playful imagination or visionary strength, epic dramatic or lyrical values, the technical skill of the script, direction, acting and other artistic components of the film (Swedish Film Institute Official Website, 2007).

² MEDICI Workshops are organized by Focal (Foundation for professional training in cinema and audiovisual media) in Switzerland to bring film professionals and institutions together to discuss film funding and interact.

³ Today it's known as HDK-Valand - Academy of Art and Design, at the University of Göteborg.