



Craft, creativity, collaboration, and connections
Educating talent for Danish television drama series

Redvall, Eva Novrup

Published in:
Production Studies, The Sequel!

Publication date:
2015

Document version
Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (APA):
Redvall, E. N. (2015). Craft, creativity, collaboration, and connections: Educating talent for Danish television drama series. In M. Banks, B. Conor, & V. Mayer (Eds.), *Production Studies, The Sequel!: Cultural Studies of Global Media Industries* (pp. 75-88). New York: Routledge.

Chapter for *Production Studies, The Sequel!*

Edited by Miranda Banks, Bridget Conor and Vicki Mayer.

Routledge. 2015.

By Eva Novrup Redvall

Craft, creativity, collaboration, and connections: Educating talent for Danish television drama series

“One of the secrets behind the recent success.” That is how Piv Bernth, the Head of the in-house production unit DR Fiction at the Danish Broadcasting Corporation (DR), refers to the public service broadcaster’s collaboration on educating new television talent together with the National Film School of Denmark (NFSD).¹ Bernth stresses the importance of collaboration as crucial for understanding the quality and acclaim of DR series such as *Forbrydelsen/The Killing* (2007–2010) and *Borgen* (2010–2013). Her statement is one of several examples of how producers and executives at DR prioritize engagement in talent development when creating new series.

Since the late 1990s, DR and the NFSD have worked closely together on educating writers and producers particularly for high-end television drama series. Since 2004, this collaboration has been institutionalized through the now established ‘TV term,’ where student writers and producers from the NFSD spend half a year developing a potential series for DR together with production designers from The School of Design at The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts. This term has often been highlighted as central to the emergence of a new generation of skilled television talent and of strong series with

a huge domestic mainstream audience and enthusiastic niche viewers around the world. Almost all writers of series from DR are now alumni from the NFSD (including all writers of *The Killing* and *Arvingerne/The Legacy* (2014–) as well as all writers of *Borgen* except creator Adam Price). In a small country of 5.6 million inhabitants, this one institution is having a major impact on the TV drama output.

This chapter explores the rather unique collaboration between DR and the state financed film school, which is the only official institution training screenwriters, directors, cinematographers and other crew for film and television in Denmark. Based on findings from a major research project on the production of drama series from DR,ⁱⁱ I analyze how the NFSD has played a part in the recent rise of Danish television series through the TV term. The chapter traces the teaching of television back to the late 1990s, when the screenwriting department at the NFSD saw the emergence of new quality series from the US and the better job opportunities for writers in the field of television as reasons to include the writing of series to the School's curriculum (rather than focusing exclusively on film). This curricular turn came at an ideal time for the broadcaster. DR was experiencing a lack of talent for their new focus on long-running series and was keen to teach the students their ideas of how to create modern public service television drama.

With a qualitative case study of the TV term of 2012/2013 at the core, this chapter analyzes the structure of the term and the film school conceptions of the skills needed for the industry. The main purpose of the term is to teach the students the craft of creating television series, but the term is also the only time at the School where writers work in teams. Based on observational studies during teaching sessions and of the final pitch of projects for DR as well as interviews with teachers, DR executives, and screenwriting

alumni, this chapter discusses how to understand the interplay of craft and creativity within the context of collaboration that is designed to mirror television industry development.

The education of film and television talent

The education of new talent is a topic that has received limited attention in media industry studies despite the fact that many practitioners regard the formative years of training for a specific professional role as crucial to their work.ⁱⁱⁱ Seminal research on production cultures, on media work as creative labor, or on production processes in the new television economy have provided rich analysis of the professional lives and roles of both above-the-line and below-the-line workers, but do not focus on the topic of training or the educational ‘food chains’ that have traditionally not been central to film and media studies.^{iv} However, the past ten years have seen a new interest in issues of training specifically. Dana Polan’s *Scenes of Instruction* chronicles the first US classes on the art as well as the industry of cinema, and Lee Grieveson and Haidee Wasson’s *Inventing Film Studies* offers insights into the history of film studies as an academic discipline in its own right.^v

A milestone publication in the emerging scholarly literature on the training perspective is the two-volume anthology *The Education of the Filmmaker* edited by Mette Hjort.^{vi} The book addresses a wide range of approaches across the world and constructively widens the scope of thinking about film education to not only dealing with the actual teachings in a particular pedagogical environment, but to also include issues of how the training of filmmakers has more far-reaching implications for other aspects of

culture and society. Who are chosen to train for these roles? What kinds of stories do they tell? How do filmmakers perceive of their role in a specific society? As Hjort states it is worthwhile investigating how a filmmaker becomes a filmmaker, but it is also important to explore how a filmmaker becomes “a particular *kind* of filmmaker, where ‘kind’ encompasses skills, as well as narrative and aesthetic priorities, preferred modes of practice, and understandings of what the ideal roles and *contributions* of film would be”.^{vii} As Hjort demonstrates, different national and institutional contexts tend to encourage different approaches, yet, in terms of what to teach, there are also many similarities across cultures and countries.

A crucial question in terms of all practice-based film education is the fundamental issue of why to teach the making of film and television in the first place—with the ever-present tensions between art and commerce being an important part of this question. As analyzed by Duncan Petrie, most European film schools started out with a clear emphasis on teaching cinema as an art form and training their students as artists.^{viii} Focusing on the theory/practice divide and the British film conservatoire, Petrie has argued how this gradually changed with still more emphasis on the “industry approved vocational skills” needed to succeed in the world of film and media today.^{ix} Most recently, Petrie and Rod Stoneman have discussed this “fetishization of instrumental skills” further in *Educating Film-makers*,^x which contains a history of film schools and case studies of British institutions by Petrie combined with chapters by Stoneman defined as more polemical ‘provocations’. Stoneman’s chapters are intended as a starting point for debates about what the authors call “the shortcomings inherent in the current formation of film schools”.^{xi} I will address some of their thoughts on film schools as more than mere

training providers, when discussing how to understand the TV term of the NFSD within an art school context.

The National Film School of Denmark

The NFSD was founded as an art school in 1966 and is financed by the Danish Ministry of Cultural Affairs. Currently, the School still presents itself first and foremost as “an art school, which means that the teaching aims at developing and supporting each student’s unique talent”.^{xii} However, the description of the school clarifies that it is also important “that our students learn the craft of filmmaking to ensure their future employment”.^{xiii} What can be regarded as an interplay between the creative talent of the student and learning a specific craft needed in the industry is thus at the core of the School’s presentation of itself to the world.

The NFSD is a highly competitive school, accepting around six students for each program (e.g. writing, directing, producing, cinematography, sound) every second year. The state-financed school offers one of the most expensive educations in the country, but students pay no tuition. The chosen few are expected to have a main focus on filmmaking, and the teaching of television writing only became part of the otherwise film-oriented curriculum during the late 1990s – and, as illustrated in the above quote about learning ‘the craft of filmmaking’, television still hasn’t made it into the official description of what students are taught at the School.

In the 2000s, the NFSD was generally regarded as a success story in the production of film. Danish scholars singled out constructive teaching strategies such as ‘scaffolding’ and working with restraints^{xiv} or the importance of creating a shared

language of storytelling between professions.^{xv} International scholars highlighted the NFSD curriculum as part of the explanatory framework for how a number of prolific alumni created the Dogme95 manifesto^{xvi} and for the rise of a ‘new Danish cinema’^{xvii}, with Lars von Trier as its art house star. Meanwhile, national audiences have appreciated the domestic film output, securing the national films an impressive share of the domestic ticket sale (29 per cent in 2012).

The NFSD has continuously been credited as an important reason for this interest in Danish cinema. But after many years of general enthusiasm, the 2010s saw criticism of the School emerge. The critical voices pointed to a lack of diversity in student films and called for changes in what some regarded as a standardizing approach to forming future filmmakers. During the hiring of a new Head of the School in 2013, debates around the School became fiercer^{xviii}, but it was remarkable how the teaching of television was not a part of these discussions. With alumni from the School playing a major part in now internationally renowned series such as *The Killing* and *Borgen*, everyone seemed to silently agree that all was well when teaching for the small rather than the big screen.

Building the television curriculum

The first course on television at the NFSD dates back to 1996. At that time, DR started focusing on long-running series and, according to then DR producer Sven Clausen, experienced “an acute lack of Danish episode writers with experience in writing for the medium and the genre – and an enthusiasm for the format”.^{xix} The teaching at NFSD was seen as a method “to secure future deliveries by being visible – not the least as a source of inspiration – already at the level of education”.^{xx} DR was thus very interested in

collaborating with the School and took part when the first attempt to teach television was offered to writing students at the NFSD in 1996. The course led to making television writing an integrated part of the screenwriting curriculum.

Head of the Screenwriting Department Lars Detlefsen describes how the introduction of television writing was initially met with some resistance at the School. He finds that one of the reasons why this resistance gradually faded was a shared sense of remarkable changes in the nature of television series with a number of international ‘quality series’ becoming popular and well respected, making it more artistically legitimate to focus on television in an art school context.^{xxi} Former students such as the producer Christian Rank have described how the term was at first a revelation in creating a new awareness around television,^{xxii} but quality TV series are now firmly established in the minds of the students. According to screenwriting teacher Hanna Lundblad, the current students are familiar with many television series and quite fluent in basic television storytelling terms and traditions.^{xxiii}

In 2004, the teaching of television found its current form as the so-called TV term, which is organized around groups of writers and producers from NFSD and production designers from The School of Design spending four to five months developing a potential series for DR. Thus, there is no individual program for television; rather, it is integrated into the over-all curriculum for the writers and producers, and the teaching is built around a set assignment for a specific broadcaster, rather than a free assignment, as is the case with the cinematic mid term or final films.

The TV term groups normally consist of two writers, two producers, and one or two production designers, who work together through the process of conceiving an idea

from the beginning of the teaching in August to the delivery of the completed assignment before Christmas, which is then presented to DR during a two-day pitch in January. The students are expected to produce a presentation of a whole concept consisting of pitches for the first six episodes, full scripts for the first and last episode, plus ideas for a second season as well as budgets, production plans, and presentations of the production design and visual identity of the series.

The term runs every two years and serves as the third term out of four for the writing students and third of eight for the producing students (who are at the School for four years).^{xxiv} The 2012 assignment was formulated by then Head of DR Fiction Nadia Kløvedal Reich and Head of Drama Piv Bernth, who represented DR as commissioners in the process and were keen to get ideas from the students on a format that DR had abandoned for quite some years while focusing on the high-end drama fare. In the early years of the TV term, students came up with ideas for the prestigious one-hour DR drama slot for Sunday nights at 8pm. In the TV term of 2012, students developed a weeknight comedy or ‘dramedy’ series of 28.5 minutes targeting younger audiences.

The NFSD offers no assignments that mirror the processes of writer’s rooms or that force the students to enter someone else’s creative vision as episode writers on an existing series. However, the TV term can be regarded as an attempt to teach the students about the gifts and hardships of creative collaboration through working in a small team with a clear goal, and where disagreements will inevitably arise. Based on observational studies of some of the teaching and the pitch of the 2012 TV term combined with qualitative interviews around the term, the following case study outlines the NFSD

objectives for the term as an ideal structure for teaching the craft, encouraging creativity, facilitating collaborations, and creating connections.^{xxv}

Teaching the craft

Since none of the students have been working with television when they start this term, the School gives them a so-called inspirational box before the summer break. Detlefsen describes the box as a tool to “tune into making television series” and emphasizes the value of forming groups before the summer to get initial ideas going before the actual teaching starts in the fall.^{xxvi} The inspirational box always consists of a number of TV series, the book *Successful Television Writing* by Lee Goldberg and William Rabkin, and scripts for national and international series. In 2012, the box contained the first seasons of *2 Broke Girls* (2011–), *Bored to Death* (2009–2011) and *In Treatment* (2008–) as well as *Forbrydelsen II/The Killing II* (2009). The scripts were the first episodes of *Mad Men* (2007–) season one through five, the third episode of *Forbrydelsen II* and the first episode of *Boss* (2011–2012). The students are also given what Detlefsen terms ‘a dummy paper’ or ‘a recipe’ for a TV series concept, which lists a number of things to include when thinking about new series, ranging from considerations of genre, theme, premise, issues of characters, arenas, and storytelling strategies to presentations of casting and crew choices, budgets, mode of production, time slots, and target groups.^{xxvii}

The start of the TV term focuses on creating a shared sense of the specific nature of television drama among the writers, producers, and production designers from that year’s class. During the term they all attend classes on TV series and since the first iteration of the TV term, screenwriter Hanna Lundblad has given all students an

introduction to storytelling for television and to the specific demands for DR series. Over the three days, students analyze the major turning points in all scenes of individual characters in an episode or study classic season openings. The teaching also consists of discussions of good arenas or main characters. Lundblad encourages students to present interesting arenas or characters from their own lives, which are then mixed in attempts to create intriguing combinations.

The cross-disciplinary classes aim at facilitating a shared sense of the nature of creating television across the different professions involved, but there is also a focus on the specific needs of each profession, since they all have unique tasks during the term while working on the mutual project. Each term thus has industry tutors attached for the different professions. For example, in 2012, former DR producer Sven Clausen and Zentropa studio producer Louise Vesth coached producers, the screenwriters Hanna Lundblad and Karina Dam assisted writers, and the *Borgen* production designer Knirke Madelung was the consultant for production designers. The industry tutors follow the projects as they develop and are also part of the final pitch where they provide feedback as a supplement to the opinions of the DR commissioners. The students thus have the opportunity to not only get feedback on the end result, but also on the work processes and the way in which projects and collaborations evolve along the way.

DR and the NFSD do not exchange money in the teaching of the TV term, but DR does allocate substantial time for engaging with the students. The 2012 semester included one week at DR where the students followed productions and talked to professionals at DR. Later in the process, the students also met the in-house media researchers. At the pitch of the final projects, several groups referred to having consulted the researchers on

issues related to the main audiences of certain time slots etc., and in the eyes of DR the groups seemed to have the right sense of the potential audience for their suggested series in terms of both gender, age, and background in relation to content and time slot.

As indicated by ‘the TV dummy paper’, the term is not only based on students learning the craft of storytelling for television, but also on thinking about issues of financing and logistics, positioning projects, and getting an upperhand over competing series. However, while students are asked to take all these industry aspects into account when developing a unique product for a certain broadcaster, instructors encourage them to focus on their personal desires and original ideas in the process. This is based on the DR production concept of ‘one vision.’ While the structure of the course is designed to encourage professionalism, the School places significant focus on the creative voice of each student, in particular that of the screenwriter.

The issue of creativity

Since DR Fiction reorganized their approach to television production in the late 1990s to focus on long-running ‘flagship series,’ screenwriters are at the center of the production framework.^{xxviii} This is markedly different from the more ‘auteur-oriented’ Danish film culture, which places directors in charge of a production. In the so-called ‘production dogmas’ that were formulated in 2003 as guiding principles for in-house DR productions, the first dogma describes the concept of ‘one vision’, stating that the author is the one person who has the vision that drives the narrative fiction.^{xxix} In the DR production framework, this notion of one vision is regarded as crucial to ensure that writers feel ownership of series and that original ideas are developed from the ground up based on the

desire of the creative people in charge. Even in the instance of adapting existing material for television or having executives commission certain kinds of stories, writers' visions are primary. However, there are limits. Writers' ideas have to fit within the public service obligations of DR. The second dogma calls for series with 'double storytelling', meaning that stories should not only be entertaining but also contain ethical and social layers.^{xxx} The DR series are targeted at the mainstream national audiences, but the aim is to provide dramatic content, which can spark wider conversations and reflections about important issues in society. Accordingly, when developing a specific series for DR, students are asked to keep the dogmas in mind and focus on the ideas of one vision and double storytelling, which create a specific DR framework for the process.

In the scholarly literature on creative processes, most definitions of creativity highlight the importance of creators developing something original, of high quality, and appropriate to the task at hand.^{xxxii} In terms of the TV term, the DR commissioners determine what is regarded as creative. Here the strict framework emphasizes creativity within industry constraints: on creating series acceptable to the industry gatekeepers rather than developing more eclectic or artistic ideas. That said, the final pitches from 2012 clearly presented the personal drive and interest behind proposed series. The one vision concept balances this DR framework, encouraging students to follow their individual desires within the industry structure.

The concept of one vision was continuously highlighted as important in the research interviews about the term, and yet the difficult development processes of certain groups showed how a concept focusing on one person having one vision for a project that demands a collaborative process (with two writers involved) presents quite a challenge.

Whereas the professional roles of head writer and episode writers are more clear in an industry context, trying to maintain a shared vision as two writers with equal footing within the collaborative school context can be a complicated task. Different groups handled this in unique ways. For example, one group had the writers splitting up work midway through the term. At the final pitch, the project of one of the writers splitting up found praise for the consistency in the way in which all aspects supported the main idea of the individual writer. As a contrast, the DR evaluation of another project was met with concerns that the group process had created confusion about the core of the idea. The DR commissioners found that the premise for the series of this group was centered on romance, but all A-plotlines for episodes dealt with professional conflicts while the B-plotlines were about romance. The DR commissioners argued that this muddled the premise, and in the following discussions the students commented on the challenges of wanting to take the project in different directions along the way and maybe sometimes settling on compromises rather than having one clear vision.

As illustrated in the above, the TV term is marked by constant negotiations between individual and collective creativity. While the mission of the NFSD as an art school is to nurture each student's unique talent, the more industrial context of the TV term creates a controlled framework for a specific kind of process. According to Detlefsen, the creative process of each student is important, but the TV term is first and foremost "a course on collaborating".^{xxxii} This can be challenging when students have to negotiate their personal ideas and desires with those of the other members of the group, while developing a series that will be considered as original, of high quality, and appropriate by the DR commissioners.

The gifts and hardships of collaborations

The TV term is the only coursework where students within the writing track are asked to work in pairs. For Detlefsen this term is designed to teach about much more than just developing a TV series. Detlefsen argues that important lessons relate to collaborating with writing colleagues as well as with other professional groups, since collaboration is crucial to bringing ideas to fruition. When to compromise or not and what sacrifices might be needed when working with other creative people are lessons that are critical to the program's goals of teaching students how to become writers that not only know their craft but are also able to get work in the industry.^{xxxiii}

Where traditionally the NFSD offers little teaching on collaboration (Redvall 2010), the TV term is unique in its focus on instrumental lessons regarding the risks and rewards of collaboration not only between NFSD students, but also with design students from another institution. In 2012, creativity coach Thea Mikkelsen was attached as an advisor for the students, but Detlefsen argues that the students should not be nursed too much in terms of their collaborations, since they have to learn the way back to the work after things have gone wrong. Accordingly, he tries to allow for some processes to go off track, since students learn more from their “mistakes and disasters than from being guided through so that everything is smooth and fine”.^{xxxiv}

The mutual classes on TV series encourage the sense of being a team by creating a shared set of references and a common way of talking about storytelling or stylistic choices. According to several alumni, there is a great value in getting everyone on the same page from the outset, and alumni such as screenwriter Jeppe Gjervig Gram has

emphasized how learning a certain way to talk about series has had a significant impact on his later work. Shortly after graduating, he became part of writing *Borgen* together with fellow alumni Tobias Lindholm. The series was created by Adam Price who is not from the NFSD, and according to Gram it took a while “to learn how to speak with him”, while this “is different with people from the school; we have the same point of view from the beginning”.^{xxxv} While the TV term has a strong emphasis on learning how to collaborate on a specific project, it may be as much about creating a shared language of communication as it is about learning to collaborate on ideas.

Industry reports on European TV drama practices point to how writers often work alone,^{xxxvi} and scholarly studies have highlighted the traditional skepticism towards team writing in many European production cultures.^{xxxvii} The TV term allows for gaining educational experiences of collaborative writing as well as working with other professions from the outset of an idea, and the current number of screenwriting alumni working at DR as head writers and episode writers point to how the graduates from the school now provide the television writers that DR desperately called for in the 1990s and to a television industry where writing teams have become an established mode of production.^{xxxviii}

The importance of connections

While the TV term provides training in collaboration—an important skill for future employment—the term also provides an opportunity to learn networking skills and to build students’ connections with specific broadcasters. During the term, students meet real-life commissioners – and commissioners use the term as a place to scout for talent.

Over the term, instructors introduce the core values of DR as an example of a specific broadcaster, well before the students ever enter the industry.

The screenwriting alumni now working at DR place great emphasis on the fact that the term is built around pitching to actual decision makers at DR.^{xxxix} Jeppe Gjervig Gram argues that the term is the time at the School, which mirrors what he calls ‘virtual reality’ the most, since you have an assignment that might actually be real and allows you to meet the industry commissioners, whom you want to impress.^{xi} This does not only happen at the final pitch, but also at a mid term so-called “paramount meeting”, where students pitch their initial ideas to the DR commissioners, followed by an evaluation the next day. The paramount meeting mirrors the in-house production structures at DR, where the meeting is regarded as crucial for ensuring that the creative team and the drama executives are one the same page regarding the overall concept for a series.^{xli} In this way, the DR commissioners not only meet the final projects, but are involved in the process. This provides the opportunity to sense how a project has evolved along the way and how the students deal with feedback, mirroring what for instance Caldwell has described as the often challenging industry process of note-giving.^{xlii}

The TV term offers DR the opportunity to scout for talented writers and producers as well as production designers. Particularly the amount of NFSD writers now working at DR has received attention, since the domestic film industry has repeatedly complained about the broadcaster using the term to ‘swallow up’ the best writers before they have even entered the job market.^{xliii} It is hard for the film industry to compete for talent with DR, given the precarious and time-consuming nature of developing and financing film

projects. DR can offer attractive work conditions with longer and more secure terms of employment.

So far, none of the series pitched for DR over the years have made it to the screen, but according to Piv Bernth some ideas are still in play.^{xliv} The lack of produced projects illustrates how the TV term is more about working with a set assignment and about students pitching their interests and skills to a broadcaster than about selling a finished concept. The students sign contracts at the beginning of the term in case any projects should be picked up by DR, but according to Detlefsen the aim of the term is not to sell a perfect project; from the NFSD perspective, he argues that the term should be regarded as a school assignment with an overall educational purpose.^{xlv}

In an industry where jobs are rarely advertised and the flexible labor market is based on professionals forming ‘networks of interdependence’^{xlvi} or ‘Screen Idea Work Groups’^{xlvii}, students building the right connections is a major part of securing a successful career. The TV term is a platform for the School to give students the opportunity to meet influential industry players as more than fleeting guest lecturers.

Conclusions and cliffhangers

The TV term is an example of how a national broadcaster and a film school have established a collaboration, which they both regard as highly successful. I agree with Mette Hjort, who argues that “there can be no one-to-one correspondence between the profile of a given school, on the one hand, and the priorities and values of its graduates, on the other. After all, film schools are subject to the full range of complexities that characterize institutional life”.^{xlviii} Students from the NFSD do not share the same

priorities and values, but the TV term has hugely impacted a small national production culture. As an example, the School's emphasis on 'one vision' and 'double storytelling' has helped graduate industry-ready television makers with an acute awareness of certain DR concepts for creating new series.

The broadcaster-perspective of the TV term gives the teaching an explicit focus on the vocational skills needed in the industry. On paper, the main creative task is to develop a series, which will find the acceptance of the DR commissioners, but – as argued by Detlefsen – one can also regard the term as fundamentally about the nature of collaboration in an industry-like context; a context where one might learn more from failing than from succeeding while still in the rather safe surroundings of an educational institution.

As US quality television and Danish series gained more respect during the 2000s, the School's teaching became less about 'selling' the idea that television can also be an interesting medium to work in and more about creating strong series for a specific context. This happens in a work process that aims at teaching students not only about the craft of television writing, but also about the creative process of trying to negotiate one's artistic vision in a highly collaborative production framework. However, the term is not primarily about expressing the unique talent of each student – as stated in the School's definition of its art-oriented agenda – and the term's industry context does stand out in comparison with the other terms focused on filmmaking.

In their book on film schools, Petrie and Stoneman argue that from a historical perspective "(R)ather than being primarily a site of innovation and new thinking, film schools gradually began to adopt a more overtly professional role, dictated by the needs

of industry, which has served to reproduce commercial forms and arguably discourage genuine creativity”.^{xlix} Thinking along these lines, the TV term has been instrumental in providing much needed talent for DR. The focus on high-end drama and the DR dogmas has encouraged students to build on existing forms and norms, and the years of teaching television have offered little opportunity to approach television drama in completely new ways.

The 2013 conference organized by The International Association of Film and Television Schools (CILECT) – under the title ‘From Education to Business – The Connection between National Film Schools and Broadcasters’ – pointed to how European film schools are now discussing the need for students to learn more about working in new formats for new platforms rather than only being taught to develop expensive drama for traditional broadcasters. However, the NFSD approach to television writing was repeatedly referred to as an example of best practice, and both NFSD and DR representatives were invited to explain the virtues of this particular collaboration. The conference illustrated how several new television training grounds are being established, making it highly relevant to keep asking the core questions of not only how to best teach television writing, but also of why it is being taught in the first place.

The TV term appears to have found a successful recipe for educating talent for the established DR framework. Maybe the coming years will also allow for playing around with other kinds of TV fiction. As discussed by Petrie and Stoneman – and as indicated by the title of the CILECT conference – there is much talk of ‘the industry’ and ‘business’ in film schools today. Petrie and Stoneman argue that this has implications on schools’ tending not to recognize “the possibility of moving image practitioners as curious and

critical thinkers, or of how the cultivation of ideas could serve the successful propagation of creative, vibrant and socially relevant film and television industries”.¹ While the close links to the industry offer great ‘virtual reality’ and calling card opportunities, television education in an art school context might need to look back at its origins. New strategies seem to be needed to find the right balance between educating curious, creative artists *and* skilled, industry-oriented professionals – between teaching the existing ideas of best practice *and* encouraging innovation – for a rapidly changing television landscape.

References

- Berth, Piv. 2014. Interview by the author, October 1.
- Blair, Helen. 2003. ”Winning and Losing in Flexible Labour Markets: The Formation and Operation of Networks of Interdependence in the UK film industry.” *Sociology* 37: 677–694.
- Boorman, John, Fraser MacDonald, and Walter Donohue (eds). 2002. *Projections 12: Film-makers on Film Schools*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Born, Georgina. 2005. *Uncertain Vision: Birt, Dyke and the Reinvention of the BBC*. London: Vintage.
- Caldwell, John T. 2008. *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Clausen, Sven. 2012. Personal email communication with Clausen, September 15.
- Detlefsen, Lars. 2012. Interview by the author, December 11.
- Gabold, Ingolf. 2013. Interview by the author, May 17.
- Goldberg, Lee, and William Rabkin. 2003. *Successful Television Writing*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

- Gram, Jeppe G. 2012. Interview by the author, November 9.
- Gram, Jeppe G. 2013. Presentation at the conference "From Education to Business – The Connection Between National Film Schools and Broadcasters" (a GEECT/CILECT conference) at The National Film School of Denmark, November 28–29.
- Grieverson, Lee, and Haidee Wasson. 2008. *Inventing Film Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hesmondhalgh, David, and Sarah Baker. 2010. *Creative Labour: Media Work in the Cultural Industries*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hjort, Mette, and Ib Bondebjerg. 2003. *The Danish Directors: Dialogues on a Contemporary National Cinema*. Bristol: Intellect Press.
- Hjort, Mette, and Scott MacKenzie. 2003. *Purity and Provocation: Dogme '95*. London: British Film Institute.
- Hjort, Mette, Eva Jørholt, and Eva N. Redvall. 2010. *The Danish Directors 2: Dialogues on the New Danish Fiction Cinema*. Bristol: Intellect Press.
- Hjort, Mette, Ib Bondebjerg, and Eva N. Redvall 2014. *The Danish Directors 3: Dialogues on the New Danish Documentary Cinema*. Bristol: Intellect Press.
- Hjort, Mette. 2005. *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hjort, Mette. 2013a. *The Education of the Filmmaker in Europe, Australia, and Asia*. Vol. 1. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hjort, Mette. 2013b. *The Education of the Filmmaker in Africa, the Middle East, and the Americas*. Vol. 2. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hybel, Kjeld. 2013. "Filmbranchen: Den Danske Filmskole trænger til et los i røven." *Politiken*, November 21.
- Ilsøe, Maya. 2012. Interview by the author, November 13.
- Lundblad, Hanna. 2012. Interview by the author, September 3.
- Macdonald, Ian W. 2010. "'...So It's Not Surprising I'm Neurotic': The Screenwriter and the Screen Idea Work Group." *Journal of Screenwriting* 1: 45–58.
- Mayer, Vicki. 2011. *Below the Line: Producers and Production Studies in the New Television Economy*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Petrie, Duncan. 2010. "Theory, Practice and the Significance of Film Schools." *Scandia* 76: 31–46.
- Petrie, Duncan. 2011. "Theory/Practice and the British Film Conservatoire." *Journal of Media Practice* 12: 125–138.
- Petrie, Duncan, and Rod Stoneman. 2014. *Educating Film-Makers: Past, Present and Future*. Bristol: Intellect Press.
- Pham, Annika. 2012. "DR's Queens of Drama Give the Ingredients to Their Winning Recipe." News from Nordisk Film and TV Fond, May 11. Accessed September 22, 2014.
http://www.nordiskfilmogtvfond.com/news_story.php?cid=3356&sid=10&ptid=4
- Philipsen, Heidi. 2005. "Dansk films nye bølge: Afsæt og aftryk fra Den Danske Filmskole." PhD diss., Odense: University of Southern Denmark.
- Philipsen, Heidi. 2009. 'Spilleregler i filmskabelse: Behjælpelige begrænsninger.' In *Dansk film i krydsfeltet mellem samarbejde og konkurrence*, edited by Chris Mathieu, and Jesper Strandgaard, 145–173. Sverige: Arkiv förlag.

Polan, Dana. 2007. *Scenes of Instruction: The Beginnings of the U.S. Study of Film*.

Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rank, Christian. 2012. Interview by the author, November 22.

Redvall, Eva N. 2012. *European TV Drama Series Lab. Summary of Module 1*. Berlin:

Erich Pommer Institut.

Redvall, Eva N. 2010. "Teaching Screenwriting in a Time of Storytelling Blindness: The

Meeting of the Auteur and the Screenwriting Tradition in Danish Film-Making."

Journal of Screenwriting 1: 57–79.

Redvall, Eva N. 2013. *Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark: From The*

Kingdom to The Killing. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sternberg, Robert J., and Todd I. Lubart. 1999. "The Concept of Creativity: Prospects

and Paradigms." In *Handbook of Creativity*, edited by Robert J. Sternberg, 3–31.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ⁱ Piv Bernth in Annika Pham, "DR's Queens of Drama Give the Ingredients to Their Winning Recipe," News from Nordisk Film and TV Fond, May 11, 2012, accessed September 22, 2014. <http://www.nordiskfilmogtvfond.com/index.php/news/stories/drs-queens-drama-give-ingredients-their-winning-recipe/>

ⁱⁱ Eva N. Redvall, *Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark: From The Kingdom to The Killing* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

ⁱⁱⁱ See John Boorman, Fraser MacDonald, and Walter Donohue (eds), *Projections 12: Film-makers on Film Schools* (London: Faber and Faber, 2002). For opinions of the NFSD, see the three interview books with Danish feature film and documentary directors: Mette Hjort, and Ib Bondebjerg, *The Danish Directors: Dialogues on a Contemporary National Cinema* (Bristol: Intellect Press, 2003). Mette Hjort, Eva Jørholt, and Eva N. Redvall, *The Danish Directors 2: Dialogues on the New Danish Fiction Cinema* (Bristol: Intellect Press, 2010). Mette Hjort, Ib Bondebjerg, and Eva N. Redvall, *The Danish*

Directors 3: Dialogues on the New Danish Documentary Cinema (Bristol: Intellect Press, 2014).

^{iv} John T. Caldwell, *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008). David Hesmondhalgh, and Sarah Baker, *Creative Labour: Media Work in the Cultural Industries* (New York and Abingdon: Routledge, 2011). Vicki Mayer, *Below the Line: Producers and Production Studies in the New Television Economy* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2011).

^v Dana Polan, *Scenes of Instruction: The Beginnings of the U.S. Study of Film* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007). Lee Grieveson, and Haidee Wasson, *Inventing Film Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

^{vi} Mette Hjort, *The Education of the Filmmaker in Europe, Australia, and Asia*, vol. 1 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013a). Mette Hjort, *The Education of the Filmmaker in Africa, the Middle East, and the Americas*, vol. 2 (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013b).

^{vii} Hjort, *The Education of the Filmmaker in Europe, Australia, and Asia*, 1.

^{viii} Duncan Petrie, "Theory, Practice and the Significance of Film Schools," *Scandia* 76 (2010): 31–46.

^{ix} Duncan Petrie, "Theory/Practice and the British Film Conservatoire," *Journal of Media Practice* 12 (2011): 125–138.

^x Duncan Petrie, and Rod Stoneman, *Educating Film-Makers: Past, Present and Future*, (Bristol: Intellect Press, 2014), 9.

^{xi} Petrie and Stoneman, *Educating Film-Makers*, 10.

^{xii} Filmskolen.dk, accessed April 13, 2013.

^{xiii} Filmskolen.dk.

^{xiv} Philipsen, Heidi, "Dansk films nye bølge: Afsæt og aftryk fra Den Danske Filmskole," (PhD diss., University of Southern Denmark, 2005).

-
- ^{xv} Eva N. Redvall, "Teaching Screenwriting in a Time of Storytelling Blindness: The Meeting of the Auteur and the Screenwriting Tradition in Danish Film-Making," *Journal of Screenwriting* 1 (2010): 57–79.
- ^{xvi} Mette Hjort, and Scott MacKenzie, *Purity and Provocation: Dogme '95* (London: British Film Institute, 2003).
- ^{xvii} Mette Hjort, *Small Nation, Global Cinema: The New Danish Cinema* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2005).
- ^{xviii} E.g. Kjeld Hybel, "Filmbranchen: Den Danske Filmskole trænger til et los i røven," *Politiken*, November 21, 2013.
- ^{xix} Sven Clausen, Personal email communication with Clausen, September 15, 2012.
- ^{xx} Clausen, Personal email, 2012.
- ^{xxi} Lars Detlefsen, Interview by the author, December 11, 2012.
- ^{xxii} Christian, Rank, Interview by the author, November 22, 2012.
- ^{xxiii} Hanna Lundblad, Interview by the author, September 3, 2012.
- ^{xxiv} This is likely to change in the future, since the NFSD screenwriting students will also have a four-year education from 2015.
- ^{xxv} The interviews are referred to with the last name of the respondent and the year of the interview. They are included in the list of references.
- ^{xxvi} Detlefsen, interview, 2012.
- ^{xxvii} An arena refers to the main setting for a series, sometimes called a 'precinct'.
- ^{xxviii} Redvall, *Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark*.
- ^{xxix} Redvall, *Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark*, 69.
- ^{xxx} Redvall, *Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark*, 69.
- ^{xxxi} E.g. Robert J. Sternberg, and Todd I. Lubart, "The Concept of Creativity: Prospects and Paradigms," in *Handbook of Creativity*, ed. Robert J. Sternberg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 3–31.
- ^{xxxii} Detlefsen, Interview, 2012.
- ^{xxxiii} Detlefsen, Interview, 2012.
- ^{xxxiv} Detlefsen, Interview, 2012.

^{xxxv} Jeppe G. Gram, Presentation at the conference "From Education to Business – The Connection Between National Film Schools and Broadcasters" (a GEECT/CILECT conference) at The National Film School of Denmark, November 28–29, 2013.

^{xxxvi} E.g. Eva N. Redvall, *European TV Drama Series Lab: Summary of Module 1* (Berlin: Erich Pommer Institut, 2012).

^{xxxvii} Georgina Born, *Uncertain Vision: Birt, Dyke and the Reinvention of the BBC* (London: Vintage, 2005).

^{xxxviii} Redvall, *Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark*.

^{xxxix} E.g. Maya Ilsøe, Interview by the author, November 13, 2013.

^{xl} Jeppe G. Gram, Interview by the author, November 9, 2012.

^{xli} Ingolf, Gabold, Interview by the author, May 17, 2013.

^{xlii} Caldwell, *Production Culture*, 221.

^{xliii} Redvall, *Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark*.

^{xliv} Piv Bernth, Interview by the author, October 1, 2014.

^{xliv} Detlefsen, Interview, 2012.

^{xlvi} Helen Blair, "Winning and Losing in Flexible Labour Markets: The Formation and Operation of Networks of Interdependence in the UK film industry," *Sociology* 37 (2003): 677–694.

^{xlvi} Ian W. Macdonald, "'...So It's Not Surprising I'm Neurotic': The Screenwriter and the Screen Idea Work Group," *Journal of Screenwriting* 1 (2010): 45–58.

^{xlvi} Hjort, *The Education of the Filmmaker in Europe, Australia, and Asia*, 4.

^{xlvi} Petrie and Stoneman, *Educating Film-Makers*, 106.

^l Petrie and Stoneman, *Educating Film-Makers*, 8.