

APPENDIX:

**RESPONSES TO THE OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS:
RANDOMLY SELECTED VERBATIM COMMENTS**

How would you describe current situation of film critics in your country?2
How do you see the future of film criticism in your country?.....19

-

How would you describe current situation of film critics in your country?

Crisis of the profession

1. Difficult/ impossible to earn one's living from cinema criticism
2. No full time jobs, redundancies, freelancers
3. Change of the professional role model, combining roles
4. Niche specialisation
5. Status differences
6. Low impact of critics on the audience/ readers, low credibility

Crisis of the media

7. Negative change of the media/ film industry environment
8. No space to publish about film
9. Commercial content / current news replace film criticism

Internet and social media

10. Competition: blogs, Internet

Positive

11. Young talented generation
12. Positive evaluation: stabilised profession, high level criticism, interested audience
13. New opportunities in changing media environment
14. Positive (general answers)

15. Negative (general answers)
16. Other
17. Do not know/ no comment

How would you describe current situation of film critics in your country?

Passion drives plenty of us to do good work for nothing, but it's ultimately unsustainable.

A dying profession

Everybody could be film critic now...

We`ve becoming much more involved in other activities to survive.

There are many good film critics, but not enough places to write and get paid

Fortunately, there is still a group of filmgoers who appreciate our job.

Crisis of the profession

1. Difficult/ Impossible to earn one's living from cinema criticism

*Film criticism is thriving but, generally speaking, people are **not paid or paid enough** anymore to make a living*

*Others have profited from the fact that articles are **hardly ever paid**, so everyone was welcome to volunteer, however inexperienced or tasteless.*

*Very **hard to make a living from criticism** as it is seriously underpaid (I live in a different country and work from afar as costs are much less that way). Basically it's still a profession for older white males who act as gatekeepers and reduce the relevancy of what is commissioned, though this is changing. Extremely commercialised by now - hard to write on anything that doesn't generate masses of hits.*

*Film criticism **is no longer a regular job** in so far as it has become close to impossible **to earn a living** writing on film.*

*. **The amount of paid work in the field of film criticism has been declining** steadily in the past ten years, with magazines disappearing or and cultural institutes downsizing their film/culture departments. Even established (papers, television programme mags and the one film magazine still standing) critics look for gigs everywhere.*

*For the younger generation (this applies to me as well, as I came late to the profession), film journalism **cannot earn us a living**. Many media have disappeared and the new ones mostly attract writes on a volunteers' basis. This makes the profession very accessible for newcomers, but it offers little opportunity for experienced writers to stay in the profession.*

*Professional film criticism **is becoming a very rare occupation**. I would say in all Germany there are less than 50 colleagues who can make a living primarily on film criticism. **There is very little concern from non-payd writers/bloggers about the social-economic consequences of their doing**. Film reviewing has become a hobby to those who can afford it. There is little to no concern about the fade of film criticism from the movie industry or the public film funds. Most film producers consider their work a popular art form that is evaluated by the masses rather than the educated few.*

*Strong, but troubled. There are many film critics, and many film bloggers, doing great work. There's **no money in it**, though. What little money there is also isn't enough to fund quality work.*

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

It is very **difficult to make a living as a criticism**, but I personally prefer to strike a balance between reviews and other film reporting in my work. The main problem as I see it with the decline in film critique is that the media outlets no longer have the resources to commission reviews of all films with Swedish cinema distribution, thus making many films go unnoticed by the general public.

Strong but uncertain, at least **in terms of professional representation**. Canada has a robust film community and a strong critical tradition, but it's growing **increasingly difficult to make a living** and professional publication opportunities are fewer and fewer. Passion drives plenty of us to do good work for nothing, but it's ultimately unsustainable.

It is so-so. I think that one of the problems is that new critics do not have a knowledge of film history. I also do not see people venturing into this suicidal career choice; I **have worked more or less for free for so many years**.

It is **impossible to make film criticism a full time job** in Croatia and make a living off of it. It is a job that is often taken for granted by those commissioning the expertise of a film critic (It is not rare for the Croatian National Television to engage a film critic without pay). There are currently two printed film magazines on the scene. They are financially supported through various governmental and cultural institutions. However, there is a large number of active critics on web (various portals, film sites, etc). There is a variety of voices in Croatian film criticism and the quality is generally good, although it varies as anywhere else.

Declining rapidly. Compared to 10 years ago, . most are gone, a small handful still survive, the rest struggle and try to change to other fields of employment.

2. No full time jobs, redundancies, freelancers

Many of the members of the UK Critics' Circle have had increased challenges in recent years, due to both tighter budgets and an increase in the number of films being released each week. Several **full time critics have been made redundant** and a significant portion of freelancers are finding it harder to earn a full time living. That said, others are thriving, in part due to contributing to a large number of outlets.

Not so good - there are **not enough jobs**, newspapers are saving money, everywhere.

It is pretty **poor**. Major newspapers, dailies and weeklies are laying off most film staff and most freelancers **write for nothing** (not me). It is a shambles and bloggers are our main competition

In general there is **less space for film criticism in written, traditional media**. For a few reasons. Economic as the result of fall of advertisements. Political because of wright wings, conservative government pressure and censorship in Polish media. Still relatively free are those who are in private or foreign hands. **Also there are a great wave of young, new freelancers who have more difficult access to written media. Their editors often pay more than symbolic money** and are constantly afraid of readers drop. The situation in internet is not better. However it's easier to put your criticism here but that doesn't mean you will get any money.

The situation is getting worse every year. Young critics do **not have a chance to get permanent job**, they are all (95 %) freelancers. Media devote less space to culture and fire journalists. Good critics are often replaced by those who are cheaper. And everybody is underpaid

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

As secretary of the Belgian Filmpress association I see that it is hard for young filmcritics to make their way. The last 35 years there is a kind of **pauperisation of the profession**. In the beginning more than 75% of the professional journalist could live (well) from their work.. now it is **about 20% full time and the rest is parttime and have to do other things**. A lot of young filmcritics start with blogs and website.. the criteria for the professional film association (and also for Fipresci I suppose) is that the people are paid for the work. Even being a very good critic but publishing for free is not in the interest of our Association because it exists in defending the profession

Less and less important, space and work has diminished, very few daylies still have cinema-critics on a **low percentage-level** (or they write about a broader spectrum of culture) some - fewer - **freelancers who are writing for very low income**, more young beginners, who change jobs after a short time of because of no income. Some bloggers "work" for free: the profession is becoming a hobby

Except a couple of journalists from mainstream media, **the majority of the film critics must do it as a part-time job**, and with not a lot of money for their work. Many are also **volunteer** in non-profit radio or different cultural publications - some of them are still financially supported by the government, but for how long? The passion is still there for most of my colleagues, but there's no bright future for a film critic in Canada. People read less and less, and culture in general, and film culture in particular, is less and less covered in mainstream media. Even the public broadcasters across the country (tv, radio, Internet) don't give a lot space to the arts, a very small part to real criticism and analyse.

Since film criticism barely exists as a "mainstream" profession (it's more like a hobby!) in my country, film critics are not doing well. They do not earning well, they do not have a satisfactory space in newspapers to fill and most of the **film critics are working as not-so-busy freelancers**

Film critics are becoming **increasingly marginalized**. Fewer paid positions exist. Culture writers in general are being phased out in favor of journalists who cover the "media industry" from a perspective favorable to advertisers and publishers. Even established veterans have been bought out of contracts or summarily fired, suddenly joining the ranks of freelancers. We are being regarded **as "content-generators," not experts** in a valued field. Need I continue?

In my country (Spain) film critics **are not considering relevant in the main medias**, so some of them have been fired. Anyway becoming freelance is a kind of "committing suicide" (worse conditions, salary, instability...)

3. Change of the professional role model, combining roles

Few film critics have opportunities to be published in media **so they switch to related jobs** - as festival selectors, teachers, PR managers, producers etc. There no influential printed magazine about cinema in Ukraine, but there are some new web sites that try to do film criticism.

One remark on bloggers: in our national section we apply the criterium that aspiring members should write/broadcast for a medium that has a board of editors deciding on the content and quality of the publications/contributions. This is a basic and non-arbitrary quality requirement. It excludes the majority of bloggers, who mostly work on their own; but it **is not a peremptory rejection of bloggers.**"

Film critic' as a profession **does not really exists** in my country - I don't think that it has ever really existed here. I think there are only a very-very few colleagues who does this as

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

their main jobs. Most of the media outlets (print, online, radio, TV) don't employ persons to do only film/TV related work, **usually it is part of general cultural journalism**. The very few newspapers that publish actual film criticism contract freelancers for the work, and usually pay rather ridiculous fees. Most of the people who have degrees in film studies and do film criticism, do it basically as a hobby, and usually **has their main jobs at secondary or higher education as teachers, or work at different cultural institutions**

Film criticism is still under the pressure of economic situation and shrinking of printed press. It's difficult **to work only as a film critic and the profession is usually linked to other ones and combined with academic activities or working among film industry.**

In Cuba there are really 10-15 persons which are truly active in this profession. Many other members teach or **work as journalists in other fields**, and only occasionally write about films.

In Romania, the situation of the film critic is somewhat unstable, always shifting between ways to situate itself against its target public, the new media and the new cinematic formulas. It is a profession that assumes **the risk of constantly searching for your own identity in a perpetually changing environment**, while at the same time addressing both the requirements of film-makers and those of film-consumers.

We've becoming much more **involved in other activities** to survive.

Film criticism in India is not a life supporting profession. It is **an intellectual persuasion than a career**. Most of the journalists do write only film reviews and as such even for a film journalist it is difficult to pursue film criticism as a professional choice. Most of us who practice film criticism are **occasional writers and some have become known through publishing of books and writing articles in culture columns** rather than writing in newspapers on a regular basis.

It depends on personal work, career, preference of readers or viewers on critic. Most of journalists are covered with the critics space. **Only with the other jobs**, critics manage to live for a living. So they have no time to join the film festivals except only school vacations. Critics exist only with a jury, film critics of special article of newspapers, magazine, film book writers.

They have **to do a lot of jobs connected with film criticism** if they want to survive (selections, teaching, liabilities in production and industry area, etc.)

I left film criticism in 2013 **to take a job as the editor** of a Canadian arts magazine, that only occasionally covers film in the context of music and sound art.

It's not really possible to make a living only as a film critic, **most critics have other jobs**. At the same time, critics are more active in **other fields** such as meeting with readers in different events, and giving lectures. That makes a more lively film criticism. **not only to sit and write but also makes you be more involved with the audiences and its interesting.** at the same time it is very difficult to write longer pieces or to write about films or events that are not very very mainstream. there is not much interest of media in topics that are more specialized or artistic. only Hollywood and very mainstream Hollywood.

The second is that there is few newspapers and few quality internet sites (and a lot of poor sites) that have people that writes about cinema but don't do film criticism. This problem help the publishers to have **a lot of underpayment journalists.**

4. Niche specialisation

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

People have lost interest in serious anything, let alone film criticism, especially in the age of new media. They are more interested in Friday reviews, very few in number may be less than 10%, scholars, film studies students, teachers are still interested.

Film criticism is also increasingly divided between hobby bloggers, not professionally writing, and "academic criticism", the latter being addressed to readers with academic knowledge, not being able to reach a broader audience. Instead of focusing on how to make film journalism a paid profession again, our national FIPRESCI section seems to rather focus on "ivory tower discussion" about what film criticism is supposed to be like. There is a very narrow definition of what film criticism is or should be like, restricted to the before mentioned "academic criticism".

It is just for the few "chosen" readers. Younger generations don't have time to read reviews, let alone serious criticism

Film critics in India are much respected by readers, though responses they get vary according to the subjects and films they choose to deal with and according to the influences of the media outlet. The space available in minstream media is dwindling for serious film criticism. It is in academic journals and internet publications where true film criticism continues to flourish. Some little magazines are also willing to accommodate in-depth writing on films, but they lack a healthy readership to sustain regular publication. Film criticism in India finds a meaningful space in blogs and social media of late. It is very much thriving on a growing divide of mainstream and alternative media.

I believe that there is an audience for real, quality film criticism - although it is a rather tiny audience, but still it exists. The masses in general do not need the orientation provided by film criticism for choosing the film on a Saturday night, and most of them are not interested in reading an analysis after that. Although, the audience for "artistic" films are tend to be interested in reading about film and also discussing film. I have a feeling - based on my experience - that film clubs can become an important place again. For some time film clubs were not popular in my country, but lately we have seen a certain resurgence of interest. And film critics can play a very important role in organising such occasions, and leading discussions. I have the feeling that this is actually the film version of the "live gig" of popular music. It is the format that gives the audience the live experience, the possibility of participation. It is a small segment of the cultural market but it is an important field for film critics to participate in.

In Ukraine there is the only specialized magazine - the monthly "KinoTeatr". On television, reviews of the film repertoire appear only accidentally, they are given space in the print media mostly in the advertising sections. Film critics find an opportunity for professional implementation in scientific periodicals and so do I.

Quality film reviews, longer texts or analytical matter are left to passionate writers (obviously not paid) who give their thoughts in specialized internet/paper media."

5. Status differences

Young film critics are not payed well at all, but they still have many chances to get published. Critics who work full-time for newspapers usually have good salaries.

Non-established critics like myself just look for work. With the decrease and decline comes less upward mobility and even though I've been working as a critic for over ten years and have passed 30 years of age, I still feel like a young critic/beginner. It feels like only a few manage to network the right way to get ahead and find a place within the "establishment" of reasonably paid critics. Which are mostly are 40- and 50-somethings who understandably

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

hold on to the work they still have. Now, of course, my view is influenced by my failure to 'break through', so to speak, which is of course also partly my own fault - either I'm simply not that good a writer or not as good at getting my writing noticed by the right people at the right time, or just not that good at networking. So that could skew my point of view, I suppose."

There's also a disconnect between older writers - who hang onto their jobs tooth and nail via seniority, and often not through talent - and young writers. The old writers grow increasingly out of touch with the world around them, while young writers with valid points of view often give up out of frustration despite passion, talent, education, and relevant experience."

Under stress, largely because of the syndication of critics based in the key cities: Melbourne & Sydney. They're good writers, mostly, but their domination of print media leaves little room for others.

I am not very connected with other film critics in my country, but my impression is that the only people who can make a living from this career are those who work for large national newspapers, and who are therefore required to review every film that comes out, whether or not they are of critical interest. This kind of career is not what I had in mind, and I am doing less and less criticism as I find that it is not a financially viable career option - it is only for cinephiles with time on their hands who enjoy the opportunity to share their ideas and build up a portfolio of published work, perhaps with a goal of eventually becoming a newspaper reviewer.

Not bad at all. I am fortunate to have been the major film critic for the last 30 years of Israel's major daily newspaper, which publishes a daily supplement devoted to arts and leisure, to which I contribute weekly reviews, and a weekly weekend magazine devoted to the arts. to which I contribute a review of the week's major film and a personal column dealing with cinema. Of course, the activity on line has become more important than the printed edition. My texts appear usually first on line and then in print and most of my readers read me on the internet. The situation I described is not common to all news media in Israel, my case is extreme, but the internet is filled with film criticism by young film critics, mostly graduates of film schools, that unfortunately not all of them know cinema, have firm opinions and know how to write. But c'est la vie.

6. Low impact of critics on the audience/ readers, low credibility

The have less and less influence .

Importance is shrinking, especially in newspapers and all print media.

Too many film critics like to play it safe and not upset anyone, so all films are good, all directors are geniuses. That is unfortunately not the case.

Nobody ever reads, aside from the friends and family of the authors and sometimes the filmmakers."

Mostly devoted to industry interest

I'm member of the German section of FIPRESCI because I'm based in Berlin but I'm working for newspaper in the frenchspeaking part of Switzerland (and Internet): I see that it becomes more and more difficult to work, that we are the less important part for the industry. The room of their PR desk to promote their films is increasing and we are treated like something that one has still to tolerate but not for long. In addition, the bloggers are

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

regarded on the same level as we are, which is somehow relevant in the 21st Century but with a lack of tools to differentiate the bloggers who are working as film critic from the one who just want to give their opinion or be able to be accredited in festivals.

Public mislead about line between publicity and reviews, and many critics (not to mention "critics") too willingly fall in to line. This is particularly true in regards to locally-produced films where it has become a rarity to offer any kind of negative opinion. Unfortunately, so-called "free-spirits" such as bloggers increasingly see regurgitating PR materials or what the industry wants to hear as the way to become professional.

Brazil is passing through political changes that affect the way education and culture are portrayed and consumed. In such context, film criticism is seen as less important, and so are any subjects related to culture and arts. Many film critics produce for their own websites, with no profit, for the love of movies. The ones who works for magazines, newspapers etc. are not well paid. The film critic formation is also generally informal.

There is a lot of moaning, but quite a few so-called critics walk out in the middle of press screenings, have a coffee, a fag, a wee, and a chat before they saunter back in. Afterwards they have no problem lecturing others on that particular film. They are busy digging the graves for our profession.

Read film criticism. It is not valued or taken as an art

Bad. Editorial items, especially when they are too reflexive, do not pay. The profession goes a bit narcissitic and empty in France : punch lines prevent on ideas and love of movies. When it comes to a film critic, the average level of cinema culture is terrible. Everybody could be film critic now..

Maybe not as signifcant as it used to be (as is the rest of the writing about culture :-/)

It is regarded as not important, or as a pain

Over the years there are less and less film critics. Good freelancers are hard to find.

Too few good, dedicated writers, much of great film analysis is submitted by people from outside the cinema, other disciplines. Film journalists are often lazy and don't care about research etc. But the good ones are really valuable and great.

Wide spread on paper and internet but not very influential as it used to be. Quality of films has changed and many, artistically middle ground films, are over praised to attract audience and express opinion.

Crisis of the media

7. Negative change of the media/ film industry environment

It's getting worse, print magazines are closed down, film criticism goes to the web and miggles with film reviews that are not criticism. Are we still curious to read real reviews? Or would we like just to know what the film is about? And get stars of valoristation? Film criticism is in danger.

It's very complex, but the big changes that journalism and media in general are undergoing are of course very relevant to film critics. The space and the variety of paid contributions diminish, which makes an always precarious profession even more precarious for the many

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

not employed as film critics. For the ones employed the difficulties are of a different nature, but felt as well: they spend less time as critics and more times in different positions, as proofreaders, working on different subjects, "producing" multimedia and pages etc.

Media, specialized on culture, is disappearing, as are specific segments in daily newspapers. There is only one professional film journal, Ekran, if you don't count the essayistic KINO!. On the other side (film) criticism is moving online, f.e. with the still young projects Koridor and FilmFlow. Television and radio have almost no specific programmes or they are seldom on air.

Too complacent for the local productions. Some good bloggers, many inaccurate. Profession affected by the crisis in the media.

Very poor, less than a handful professional film reporters and film critics, not much space for quality film journalism and criticism. Also, the space for culture in general is shrinking in both traditional and digital media, most of them do not even have culture sections.

The situation in Russia now is sad, because our national film industry (due to the corrupted bureaucrats and non-professional producers) hasn't shown any commercial or art results comparable with Soviet period. All this weakens the public interest towards Russian film industry. As regards the trans-national film production distributed by global giants, it is not (and never was, and never will be) a significant part of the public life in Russia.

Since journalism is at high risk any media related job is in bad shape and economically it is impossible to earn a living as a film critic.

The situation in Germany is not easy, especially in print there are a lot of cuts. And most of the internet publications didn't manage to develop a working business model. I expect a significant number of publications will disappear during the next few years.

Newspapers and magazines are declining rapidly due to the digital revolution. It is also changing radio and television dramatically. There is serious criticism online as well as fan driven guff. FIPRESCI should recognise this, even though most critics don't make a loving this way. It is a situation analogous to that of little magazines and journals written and published for love of cinema in the 20th century

8. No space to publish about film

Stable, but fighting to get more space, especially on written press.

"My situation is quite specific and is not representative of the situation in country in general. The fact is that daily newspapers, weekly and monthly published magazines have significantly reduced space for film criticism and culture in general (literature, theater) or completely omitted it. There are only 2 printed film magazines in Croatia - one is a scientific quarterly with I'm editing that has a role of being film studies journal as well as film magazine with reviews of current repertoire. It has somewhat stronger tradition and gathers critics of all generations. Other, which I am a regular contributor to, is published from time to time, This one gathers mostly critics from younger generations, has more defined style and attitude. It is published usually no more than 2 times a year since it gathers very little funding. Together they are printed in less than 1000 copies and cannot be bought in kiosks but only in specialized bookstores in downtown of major cities.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

Film critic is a dying profession, and fewer young journalists want to follow in the footsteps of experienced colleagues. They also have fewer seats and the opportunity to present their views. They operate mainly on the Internet.

It is getting poorer due to diminishing space for all kind of cultural journalism. Specialized magazines face trouble, because government subsidies are also getting smaller. It is also discouraging that many heads of newspapers/ magazines seem to think that nobody cares about criticism in the age of social media.

In general there is less space for film criticism in written, traditional media. For a few reasons. Economic as the result of fall of advertisements. Political because of right wings, conservative government pressure and censorship in Polish media. Still relatively free are those who are in private or foreign hands. Also there are a great wave of young, new freelancers who have more difficult access to written media. Their editors often pay more than symbolic money and are constantly afraid of readers drop. The situation in internet is not better. However it's easier to put your criticism here but that doesn't mean you will get any money.

Film criticism became more unprofessional. There is no special print media about cinema and only one TV program dedicated to film criticism.

Not that good. On the bright side, there is a lot of good, talented film critics. On the other side, there are only two magazines that specialize in cinema and they go out four times per year, if even so. There is less and less art and culture sections in daily newspapers or magazines. Film criticism is often seen as something redundant, since mostly people find information and ratings about a certain movie on platforms like IMDB, or equivalent. Croatian is a small language, so film critics don't reach a big audience, specially considering that publishing sector is disintegrated. Very rare is the situation that one can make a living from film criticism, or even close to that.

The situation becomes worse and worse, since more and more papers print only reviews delivered by agencies and even broadcast presents less reviews by freelancers in order to save money. Among the German spoken film magazines I appreciate only the Austrian Ray Magazine as an independent publication without connections to church and with fair paid salaries.

In major newspapers one can read short articles about the film two times a week by always the same long time established critics.

Less and less film criticism in newspapers, more in internet but not popular. Good thing we have couple of film magazines specialized in film, but they are for small number of readers (film scholars, film buffs)

9. Commercial content/ current news replace film criticism

Working for prestigious and popular media we have some influence on viewer's choices and opinions - not in a case of blockbusters, of course. But the whole culture is pushing on a margins in newspapers and the general role of the films is diminishing (and so is ours).

More and more young critics start to write. And they have all kinds of interests covering different fields of moviemaking. But as a whole the media gives less and less space to serious film criticism. And it is more and more replaced by much lighter approaches. Such as stars' private lives, gossip about love stories or box-office numbers, etc.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

The space for serious film criticism in the mainstream media has shrunk in the country. An interested film buff needs to generally go to film related websites since the **mainstream media focuses much more on commercial cinema**. Such space for scholarly writing on cinema does exist but how wide the readership is, is anybody's guess.

In most of the Indian news papers and journals, unlike say Europe, **serious film criticisms are not solicited as much they solicit spicy write-ups on popular Hindi Films produced in Mumbai Film Industry**. Serious film critics in India therefore has to fight a lone battle so as to publish serious study on cinema in mainstream media and as such, they publish most of their works either in specialized web portals or publications, which in fact gives them much needed succour and relief

Weak - less space devoted to deeper, analytical pieces about cinema, mainstream media usually brims with **PR-ish articles while a small community publishes in specialized magazines**. I, personally, publish 90% of my writing outside my country because there is not simply a demand.

Film criticism is a part of journalism but from another perspective. It's not a reportage and it's not "news collector". So the quality of writing, the personal style and the aweless and in depth opinion of the author must be the norm. **But a lot of writers of film criticism are satisfied simplyfying this work in manner of depth**. This is one problem.

Internet and social media

10. Competition: blogs, Internet

Too many, since **bloggers have become film critics**.

Bloggers are becoming a bigger voice along with social media. Paid reviewers are diminishing and film criticism is becoming an amateur hobby, not an occupation.

First, a note about the question above about bloggers: **How does one define bloggers?** There are plenty of bloggers out there who are fine writers, but also plenty who aren't. I know of one in Seattle who blogged for years, but didn't get taken serious as critic until he and some friends/bloggers founded their own website. Now they get screeners of films a week or so after they premiered at the Berlinale in the main competition.

I live between Serbia and Croatia. In Croatia, the film criticism scene is well-developed, there are 7-8 critics who regularly write in daily papers, a bunch of websites, and two film magazines. In Serbia there's **just a bunch of bloggers**, one or two daily paper critics, and sometimes there are attempts to start new magazines but they usually give up quickly. Belgrade Cinematheque now has a new publication that will probably survive thanks to state subsidy.

Besides we are drown in a ocean of opinions and "reviews" authors from the net - **everybody could be a so called critic** and the hierarchy gets blurred.

Bloggers have often no theoretical background, and their viewing experienced is limited to the mainstream films of the last 5, 10 years tops.

Very few full time professional. **Many freelancers and quite a lot of bloggers**. Some are **very amateur** and populist **and some are quite professional**. If bloggers should become part of FIPRESCI I think it is very important to decipher what kind of film blog they run...

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

Very chaotic and miserable. The media prefer to hire very young and unexpected editors and columnists what leads to de-professionalisation of film criticism. **The situation with websites is much worse.** I have immediate impressions from young people, hired by websites to write about cinema so far as most of them are my students. They start publishing/posting without any systematic knowledge of film-history and film-theory, and their opinions are more than unprofessional. Moreover, most of these websites are funded by big distribution-companies and the reviews are more than biased.

It's difficult because the situation is precarious and unstable for young and new critics in newspapers and magazines. They **prefer to publish in blogs and Facebook.** In radio and TV no critics, only one (Ricardo Bedoya)

In Romania film critics are not considered important anymore - sadly, by the audience and also by the distributors. **The audience is putting together film critics with bloggers, while the distributors, when they are announcing a premiere, are more willing to invite and give credit to the bloggers,** who are writing for free and are always writing nice (&dumb) things in order to pay for an invitation. So the role of film criticism is slightly and surely vanishing. When a domestic film is released, people are suddenly remembering that there are film critics still alive somewhere, so they invite them to screenings and press conferences, but for big distributors who are releasing commercial American films, film critics are not important at all. However, it can happen that if a film critic writes a bad review about an American film, he/she might not be invited to the next press screening. So in this sense, film critics are still important somehow, but it depends on the mood of the distributors.

Everybody thinks he's a film critic, so why would newspapers actually pay somebody for doing it? **Nowadays, bloggers, instagramers and youtubers receive more consideration than film critics.** The only thing that matters is how many people you can reach with your articles. And of course real serious magazines reach really less readers than fashion instagrams or blogs. It also seems that more and more PR expect film critics to "communicate" about films and not write real critics any more. That is why they like so much bloggers and other youtubers.

Poor. Decline of print media outlets is pronounced. **Weak blog and online environment** that hasn't compensated for the loss

Bad to very bad - no film critic employed on regular basis by any media, **plenty of bloggers of dubious expertise.**

It is hard to live as a film critic, except if we write for a daily newspaper. **Internet has more and more influence on cinema and viewers.** Some bloggers are good, other ones are bad.

Maintained their visibility. By the other hand, the **film bloggers and amateurish film sites, as well as the cultural informational web sites, despite their good visibility, provide a weak quality of film materials,** based on the system copy/paste (cloning the information from the official press releases) and have almost no analytical resources. So, the few film critics that are still active have still a word to say. Some of my chronicles, especially on films with serious ethic and humanitarian theses, had very good ratings, despite the fact that the newspaper that originally published them hasn't the best visibility and isn't specialised on cinema.

These are exceptions, but they work. The position of film critics in Italy is becoming weaker. Meanwhile **blogging cinephilia is mushrooming on the net.** Film writers and reporters have battled tooth and nail to defend a professional status despite the lack of benefits in their role.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

Positive

11. Young talented generation

Good. Exist a **new group of young critics** and many space to write about cinema and other audiovisual media.

The number of skillful and well-educated young writers is growing, but the media space is increasingly narrowing.

A new generation of young critics trying to provide good cash movement contrary to what prevailed before

The dailies are not very interested in filmcritic, **anyway many young critics write for two specialised magazines** Film a doba and Cinepur and some of them for the on-line media and the radio. . About 100 of them are members of the Association of Czech Filmcritics which declares every year the Awards for the czech films. The Czech Television broadcast the ceremony of the critics awards.

For many years people got **used to the very same voices** in the same media and none of them were telling nothing relevant about cinema than reviewing premieres, poorly. There is an interesting situation **right now with younger film critics** who are trying to find their space in print but specially through online vehicles. They´re also trying to reach audiences that approach to cinema in different ways.

12. Positive evaluation: stabilised profession, high level criticism, interested audience

It's not as bad as it seems in other countries. Argentina **still has regular film critics** working on a daily basis in newspapers (although the payment is low) and also very serious websites and blogs devoted to cinema, which are widely read in the whole region.

but **we need a criticism** weekly magazine

I can't speak for rest of Canada, but I know Toronto well. And as President of the Toronto Film Critics Association for 10 years (2006-2016), I saw **our membership become larger and more robust, and the pedigree and quality of our critics improve** – even though the number of full-time jobs for film critics in mainstream media steadily declined.

Interestingly, people **still seem to want to know what the critics think**, but the economics of arts coverage makes this more difficult every day.

Fortunately, **there is still a group of filmgoers** who appreciate our job.

Vibrant, spezialized and divided (superficial reviews in large print media whereas **valuable criticism is reserved for cinephile** online publications or spezialized magazines)

The situation is **stabilized. Cinema is on the rise, the number of viewers grows**, interest in archival films as well. We have stable journals, periodicals devoted to film, internet magazines... Film critics can be a good guides in different cine-countries of the world...

I think that there is **still space where to publish** serious and longer critics/analysis etc. If not in the press then on the internet for sure. We have 2 specialised film revues (Film a doba, Cinepur) - and I think that is ok for a nation of 10 million people. The space for reviews in dailies is the same for many years now.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

The same as it was years ago. There are some newspapers with serious film reviews and serious film critics, who have significant influence upon viewer's choices of a particular sort of film (art).

It tries to survive against media interests. But people still read it, fortunately.

Concerning the biggest daily morning newspapers in Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö the situation is still quite good with enough space and several critics. When it comes to smaller local newspapers it is worse with hardly any serious film critique. Some monthly magazines are doing a good job, We have a new magazine on the net POV which is really interesting. The public service radio covers film excellently while the public service tv has not one serious film program which is really poor. Their weekly reviews are ok. I have an impression that film critique does not have as high a standard today compared with let's say 20 - 25 years ago.

The film criticism in Poland nowadays has more influence on the film production than in the communist era because some film critics are the experts in Polish Film Institute and in the regional film funds. On the other hand I have an impression than they have lost their influence on the viewers because there is less film magazines in Poland now.

Film criticism is of high quality in broadsheet newspapers and specialist magazines such as 'Sight and Sound' It is also of reliable standard in more commercial publications such as 'Empire' and 'Little White Lies'. It also plays an important role in DVD essays and extras particularly in such niche labels as Second Run, Eureka, BFI, and Arrow. Internet publications are of increased importance for the promotion and exchange of information particularly, in a British context, for non English language product. Here the criticism is often reliable although not necessarily in depth. 'Electric Sheep' magazine is a particularly reliable internet magazine

13. New opportunities in changing media environment

The Internet has opened up new opportunities for writers but the declining profit margins of traditional media mean that on balance it has probably become harder to make a living. There are some talented writers but on the whole the intellectual landscape is not very exciting.

Very difficult in the newspapers and press in general, good in the WEB.

In Quebec, film critics in big outlets (newspapers mainly) are doing ok, though with less and less space for their reviews, but specialized film magazines are losing a lot of readers. These readers can be reach through a web site, but then it's very difficult for the critics to get paid (in part because government subventions are still difficult to get for web sites).

Dazed and confused... There is an high level of specialization in the webmagazines and in the residual printed magazines. In dailies and in magazines of divulgation, the level is occasionally good, but often quite poor too.

Conventional, paper based film journals - together with film criticism - are slowly disappearing here; however, the number of both professional and non-professional blogs in the Internet is ever growing.

The critics of Cinema in Brazil follow an international standard: spaces have diminished in the newspapers and printed magazines, but they have increased the number of spaces for cinema in the Internet. Due to the large number of film festivals across the country, there

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

is a coverage of the programming that allows even movies that cannot be released after participating in festivals, end up having critical texts about it.

Recently the effect of social media and internet is playing a good role in delivering the reviews and critic's articles to the viewers, which expanding the effect of criticism more more. We can see some readers/ viewers sending to the critics that they are waiting for they reviews to decide which film to watch.

Reduction of film criticism present in paper daily journals, raise of a number of film critics publishing on internet pages, raise of a number of scholarly contributions to the one specialised (paper) film magazine

14. Positive (general answers)

Good but not great.

Current situation of film critics in Ukraine is not bad.

It is not too good, but is still OK.

Worse than some years before, but not yet desperate

15. Negative (general answers)

Not very cheerful.

A dying profession

Difficult but has been worse

Terrible. None of us can make a living just with film criticism.

Ggoing down the drain, slowly but surely.

Highly limited. It's not quite satisfactory

Very difficult

In It is suffering quite a lot.

Poor in quality and vision but enthusiastic.

disappearance!

Disappointing

Not so well.

Terrible.

Less space, increasing restrictions by distributors. In general, the situation became worse and worse during the last five years.

Difficult, but not impossible

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

16. Other

17. Do not know/ no comment

Honestly I don't know

i don't know

I can't tell

How do you see the future of film criticism in your country?

Positive

1. The young generation will find solutions
2. New opportunities in changing media environment
3. Other positive

Negative

4. End of profession, impossible to earn one's living from cinema criticism
5. Low impact of critics on the audience/ readers, low credibility
6. Negative change of the media/ film industry environment
7. No space to publish
8. Niche specialisation
9. More commercial/ news content replace film criticism
10. Competition: blogs, Internet
11. Pessimism (general answers)

Neutral

12. Continuity (general answers)
13. Need for good criticism does exist
14. Need for change of the professional role model

15. Other
16. Do not know/ no comment

How do you see the future of film criticism in your country?

Let's discuss this in Bari!

Question is too big

POSITIVE

The new generation will find solutions

There are more studies and analysis about the mainstream and parallel cinema are appearing and new online writers are also coming from young people. I hope more serious studies are also appearing

Hopefully, old guys will finally retire and new blood and points of view will finally be heard.

It's finding its feet, some new blood and new perspectives. A certain change of generations is taking place, so we're hopeful.

But fortunately some young critics are doing well in internet (there are good blogs)

I see it with much expectation. There is a new generation of critics and new media about film criticism Death of print, young generation taking over via digital media, more video essays rather than written reviews.

Many of the country's well-known critics are either retiring or moving to online media, leaving room for a new generation. But this new generation has to receive the proper training or practice, which is not always easy.

I think the situation will remain as it is, at least until the generations of real film critics (which are now middle-aged or older) are still active. But there are also younger generations of film-critics, grouped around the few specialised cinema publications, that are still active. Even the quality of their texts is usually lower than that those of the older generations of film-critics, whose general culture and capacity of expression is much higher.

There is a hope that young critics will appear in the next 5 years

Hopefully there's a new generation coming from universities which is more interested and motivated in cinema as art. Only thing is most of them leave the country sooner or later after graduation, looking for new horizons. In any case, future belongs to digital media, be it blogs or mags, written criticism or uploaded video-essays.

In recent years there has been a positive development in Croatian cinema, a kind of boom instigated by the arrival of talented young authors. The same can be said for film criticism. There are many problems regarding the status of filmmakers and film critics alike that need to be dealt with, but the digital age has helped usher in a positive shift both for critics and film workers. Internet has made film criticism more available to the average consumer. At the same time, the quantity has made qualitative selection harder. There is something to be said for serious film criticism, which is not lacking, but can often be drowned in a sea of lazy writing. All in all, the number of young, qualified film critics and

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

enthusiasts is on the rise, giving hope for the optimistic view of the future of film criticism in Croatia.

I'm not afraid for new generations - young writers are emerging every day. On the other hand, this profession certainly lost all of its grandeur and respect it had earlier - young people will not write in major newspapers, will not come to TV to discuss film and will not be considered as esteemed members of society, that I am sure of. They can only create some sort of digital ghetto for such content followed by few interested in less superficial observations of cinema.

New opportunities in changing media environment

I expect online criticism to keep expanding, but at a slower rate. It's a small market so there's not that much actual room and readers. Very difficult to say.

We will see more criticism online and less criticism in other medium

Hopefully the media outlets will find new ways to make money off of its content

Will be more via electronic media and online videos and might involve cinema goes more.

Blogs give the potential for a more diverse range of voices to be heard, but again, when it is unpaid work, it is not sustainable. My only hope is that streaming platforms may eventually diversify their offer and allow young people the opportunity to discover, watching at home, the interesting films that they may not have an opportunity to see at the cinema in the region where they live.

I don't think that it is seen as a proper job so I really do not see much of a future in terms of a profession but internet makes it possible that you have your own channel and so probably there'll be a new direction towards there. Only hope for the film criticism is the social media.

The big newspaper publishers will probably still provide film criticism in the foreseeable future. More specialized coverage, consisting of longer pieces and in depth analysis, will find its target audience online and not in the shape of regularly printed magazines.

Less in traditional media, more in blogs and specialized sites.

Predominantly Internet oriented.

The future of film criticism is getting brighter on each passing day as gradually many of the mainstream media opens up their space for serious discussion on cinema mostly in their specialized supplement and Sunday magazines. While magazines devoted to cinema are very few, the birth of many web portals devoted entirely to cinema is a very welcome development which has substantially created much-needed space for serious discourse on cinema.

I feel it's going to get worse before it gets better. But Webzines and serious blogs are giving me hope that this may be where the future lies, though money remains an issue even for these media (even though it seems slightly less dramatic than for printed publications).

Film criticism is in danger. Internet publishing might be the answer if it respects rules of serious journalism and the tradition of criticism that refers to ideas of aesthetics, politics, film history and good writing.

Other positive

I believe there's an unexplored potential for private funding

A further growth and thereby democratizing of film criticism is expected the future.

With optimism.

I hope it will improve

It is not bad but it could be better.

I hope to see it something better

NEGATIVE

End of profession, impossible to earn one's living from cinema criticism

Dying out. A "hobby" pastime for those who can afford it, not a profession

It will become a hobby

With one or two exceptions, it will only be done as a hobby by people who don't expect to be paid.

The future is bleak. It will persist mainly on hobby level, and as a side interest to "cultural journalists" - if the media will still have something like cultural departments ...

Fine as long as it isn't a paying profession. In terms of work market: An activity that can be in the best case combined to others, but in no case be the sole/main professional activity.

I think that we are the last serious generation about this work. I'll disappear.

Some fans blog as a hobby about the movies they like..... for free of course

It seems like, in the case of a more specialized writing, it will survive through passionate critics who have the time and the resources to write basically for free, and it's gonna be found mainly on the Internet, maybe in different and new formats (video essay for example).

Hard to see a collective "future". I think a handful of writers will keep doing interesting work, whether they're paid for it or not.

In a non-paid environment it's difficult to talk about professional standards. Where film criticism and audience reviews become more and more alike (I see this happening a lot), we will ultimately lose our reason for existence.

Probably there will be fewer paid critics in coming years.

Eventually there will be about 17 well-compensated young men who write glowing thinkpieces about the latest installment in the Marvel multiverse from their basements.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

The rest of us will be sadly **hauling our Criterion DVDs to the pawn shop for grocery money**, trying to avoid eye contact with one another.

I think it will be **an increasingly rarified sphere**, at least in terms of what we think of as professional work. A handful of people will be paid for it, and hundreds or thousands of other people will do it for free, producing work of wildly varying quality. I feel very lucky to have steady employment, even if the nature of my job has changed dramatically in the last year or so. It's still film criticism.

It will be **a hobby of independently wealthy people**, whether they are staff contributors of the medias or bloggers. Audience will follow the recommendations of just these ones who appear on prime-time tv.

Low impact on the audience/ readers, low credibility

Film criticism has **become a dirty word** in our country because it only reflects films status in international festivals and consumer information with disturbingly little analysis. Mostly, film criticism in our country is an extended **PR tool**. We need to rework our priorities and what film criticism could be.

Until a free media environment is not re-established in Hungary, there will be no improvement. The rhetoric that suggests that unprofessional, simple viewers can have similarly valid insights on films, makes **critics' influence weaker every day**. One of the main effects of social media on film consumption is that people decide more and more based on their friends' suggestions. Very short twitter "reviews" have also damaged the role and impact of traditional film reviews.

It is **losing its strength** over the years but initiative is there to revive it.

Bleaker and bleaker as film becomes **less and less important** (in contrast to TV with its series)

Same **evolution**, same **decline**, more buzz about film people, because same **interest for films in a rather non sophisticated way**.

Film journalists have become **tragically convergent in their critiques**. It seems as if by trying to hold on to our little niche we have turned it into an echo chamber. Participating in national and international juries, I have often experienced much more diverse opinions on films; for that reason I am suspicious of this display of public consent... For part of our readers, it might invoke confidence in our professional gaze, but for others it will make us boring and mostly redundant (why read 5 reviews if they all state m

Clique mentality, aggregate web sites and group consensus have subverted criticism ore or less the same?)"

Negative change of the media/ film industry environment

I tend to think that these times are particularly demanding and **new ways for media to earn money** - and spend on the arts - will be found within the next ten years

I expect a significant **number of publications will disappear** during the next few years.

In newspapers there will be 4 or 5 film critics by 2020. All others will be gone because of **massive media crisis**.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

I don't know. Not only film criticism is changing. **Cinema is changing** dramatically: from the production point of view to the audience point of view.

The same **as the future of mainstream media** - very poor

I'm not optimistic about it. In general, the **quality of the media** in Poland is deteriorating. Film criticism is just one of many victims here. Fortunately, there are still a few websites and blogs that publish interesting film-related content. If the film criticism will survive, it will be on the Internet (both in written and video forms.)

In the **global village**, the differences between various countries is becoming insignificant. Here, like in most other places in the world, **critics are becoming a sort of luxury** on its way to extinction.

The current **financial state of the media** is the biggest threat to film criticism.

Unless the **crisis that the newspapers suffer** from will increase, I don't forecast a major change, but of course the internet will play a more more major role in communication, as time goes by. Even my newspaper describes itself as a website with a printed edition by its side.

If nothing is done regarding **recouping and defending the art of cinema**, if the world still in its financial dilemma, and if the social media stays so powerful as it's now, there is a bleak future. We might not be able to create the 60s and 70s again (the golden era of artistic filmmaking), but we should believe that we can still do

The **decline of film criticism runs parallel to a general decline in film** – that may be a whole other conversation. But as cinema in North America moves toward tent pole spectacle and away from smaller, more engaging human stories, the critic's role becomes superfluous.

No space to publish

There are young critics writing pretty well and really interested in film history, but there's **not even a single film magazine on paper**.

It is getting more difficult especially with **reducing the writing spaces** for the film critics.

Only a few will survive ... **magazines or small reviews** as part of entertainments guides.

Pessimistically (**no place to publish**).

Pessimistically, it will be **boiled down to short reviews** and (flash) news on film industry

In my opinion, film criticism will further **disappear from print** media, maybe even from other media. Therefore the future of serious film criticism in Slovenia is unfortunately the internet and/or writing for international media abroad.

It seems to have no future. In the main newspaper, for example **there is no critics anymore only reviews** oficina the films in the commercial circuit and gossiping on actors.

I'm not very optimistic. Probably there will survive **a few biggest, national newspapers (with not much space for film criticism)**, maybe one or two who specialize in cinema and the rest titles will appear on-line only.

In the internet space. **Less and less newspapers or magazines published.**

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

There's **less and less space** for film criticism in big media outlets. There's little to no influence of film critics in the audience, however, there might be a shift in trade analyst and film box office data.

Niche specialisation

It will survive in **niches**

Film 'knowledge' is likely to become increasingly **specialised and targetted at niche interest** however defined.

Bleak. We - the critics, the editors- need to **re-think the media**. there could be some **hope in niche publications or related** -somewhat- to online platforms. Do somebody still want to hear from us? how could put our contribution available to the interested public?

In terms of space and relevance: increasingly **reserved for an interested audience**, and less and less relevant for a general audience and industry.

Unfortunately, it will be something that will be in **specialized magazines/ on-line on one hand, maybe one daily newspaper** will stick with critics. On the other: The rest will be bought content marketing by distributors disguised as criticism.

I don't see any future for film criticism in my country. I guess in a few years we won't have professional critics any more of if we have them, they will write for a **very small and particular audience interested in highly academic**, complicated, cryptic and pretentious writing instead of understanding movies as a cultural product in a broader sociological context. Even the bloggers get fewer and fewer because they realized there is no money anymore in film criticism, so I guess that even them will stop eventually.

Difficult. We should be able to maintain a couple of **specialized magazines (with government subsidies) and the main newspapers** are likely to keep publishing criticism. Yet some newspapers and magazines are very likely to cut more space from cultural journalism and critics naturally suffer from this too.

Only **a few will survive**. :(

I think it will survive for a while, for **a little group** of people.

it will concentrate on a **very, very specialized public sphere**.

It is not a significant part of the culture. It will continue to be concentrated in the hands of a white, mainly male **elite** who, while they may have an **excellent knowledge of film**, exist at a great remove from public whose knowledge of film, outside the metropolises and university cities, is mainly restricted to Hollywood blockbusters.

The change I have described above has already come about, and I believe it will continue along these lines. Commercial cinema in India is all powerful, and while independent cinema is certainly made, the **outlets for it are far fewer**; and since only **a small section of society watches** such films anyway, a critique of such films is necessarily relegated to specialised magazines and websites

The shift has been more towards **writing books on cinema and the literature on film studies** in the form of scholastic and well-researched books is increasing at a steady rate because film criticism as a journalistic profession is not getting the kind of space and attention and money it deserves and needs. Every year, dozens of books on film studies and film criticism are being published and those that are written by critics and film scholars are generally of

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

an above average standard. Unless more cinema journals of a serious nature enter the scene both on the NET and in print, the scenario seems to be rather dim in terms of quantity though not in terms of quality.

Commercial/ news content replaces traditional film criticism

*Film writing will continue in other, **less specialist** forms.*

*In the traditional media I have noticed a gradual **shift towards entertainment journalism** in favor of film critique. The industry's pr-efforts (sales agents, distributors, film festivals) often determine which titles get big coverage. Often the decision to publish an interview precedes the viewing (i.e. the qualitative evaluation) of the film that will be honored with this type of coverage. By leaning too close towards the industry, we will lose relevance even faster.*

*Apart from 2 or 3 magazines, film criticism is virtually inexistent. In my opinion, prominence will be **given to pop-articles** about celebrity/showbiz/Hollywood similar to millennial outlets such as Vice, BuzzFeed etc.*

*Criticism is becoming more and more **dependent on market and economic needs of media**. It is less and **less about quality and in depth analysis** of film and more and **more about entertainment**. Eventually film critics might find themselves changing the stereotypical view of the critic as introvert intellectual, and have to create a new image that can be more than a writer and become a mix of an intellectual and an entertainer. Following his written pieces with videos and public appearances.*

*I always thought about film criticism more in line of enriching viewers experience than in that of selective recommending. Some critics will be able to survive if they **present themselves as entertainers**, and not as scholars, which happens to be the main mode in which writers on film represent themselves here. Some criticism will survive out of pure traditionalism in culture.*

*I believe it's going to be worse. Almost **all the media (excluding few publications which are only covering film) is concerning itself with the current political situation** in my country. On the other hand people are not watching films that film critics like. So if we consider the ongoing neoliberal politics, as supply and demand suggests, it's going to be worse.*

Competition: blogs, Internet

Going down while all the time being replaced by infotainment.

We may not like it, but blogging may be the future.

Hopeful because of increasing film blogs online

*I think we will **see shift to Internet** as is already happening. Independent **criticism will become harder**.*

*More of the above - **more amateur online and less professional voices** it is difficult to know.*

Challenged by the internet.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

Not very brilliant because of influent of **some social** medias like Twitter that summarizes the contribution to only 140 writings, while more and more people are **not demanding specific and rigorous film criticism**.

Less influence **more amateur** work in Internet

I have some sense of concern from the absence of high criticism standards because of **blogs and electronic channels** in the same time of reducing the criticism space in newspapers and magazines. Bad.

As Truffaut mentioned « **Everybody is a critic...** », something like that. And he was right. With the emergence of Internet, FAKE critics (in fact, promoters, or very bad writers) have invaded our profession. Sad.

Everyone will be a critic/ expert, blogger, professional, scholars and virtually anyone with a computer. not good.

Now that **the internet has meant that everyone is a critic**, a few well-known voices on film will still be heard (and syndicated) but.

I also worry that if criticism becomes **a purely web based affair** (mainly handled by independent bloggers) it will lose its journalistic integrity.

Bloggers will get more opportunity to develop. But thier professional level won't be the same. Film ctitics will be in minority . I guess that most of the bloggers will wirite just because of thier hobby, passion towards cinema, but without academic background and wider knowledge. So it is difficult to say wether they shoud become FIPRESCI members. Some of them yes, but some not.

Newspaper criticism is likely to be of less significance as **more and more information exchange passes to the internet**. It is likely that print journalism in general will suffer and only a few print magazines are likely to survive.

Pessimism (general answers)

Not with great hope.

I don't see the future.

Hardly.

Precarious

Rather pessimistic. but you never know - things are changing quickly.

Black.

Even worse

Gloomy

Unstable.

Difficult to survive

NEUTRAL

No change (general answers)

The same as now, struggling to survive

I don't think that the situation will change.

It will continue to exist but not in the same way and in fewer numbers.

Struggling but remaining vital.

Need for good criticism does exist

Quality will always win out.

Secure, as long as people remember that beyond reviewing there's also the chance to write at greater length for serious magazines, at least on-line.

More or less the same. We will always need for film criticism, as we need other kind of art criticism.

There are so many media like newspapers, magazines, radio stations, TV stations in my country. Also so many reporters are in my country. They have no experiences, feelings, moods in real film productions (assistant film director) and film study (university, graduate university). But the wise readers or viewers can choose and consider the deep real article and meaningful comment. According to the media increase, the needs on film criticisms also will be increased in my country.

Hopefully, readers and publishers will believe more strongly in film journalism, but I'm not really positive about it...

I don't want to be negative. Although I think the tendency will be still the same: in the mainstream media, the pressure to be "fast and furious" will be still persisting/rising, thanks to digitalisation, there will be also possibility for new kinds of TV/web programmes/web sites etc. I don't think there will be many full time critics in the future (but it is already the case now, in the Czech Rep.) but it does not mean that there will be no serious critics. People (film critics) will still feel the need to write/talk about films - and the public will be still interested in the same way as nowadays. (That means not too much but once you reach your public, it will be faithful to you)

Cinema will still need introducing, reflections, controversy, criticism, dialogue -- It is never-ending process of (film) culture...

"In the short term - 10 or 15 years .. i see the role of film criticism as important.. because a lot of films will become available in all kinds of media .. and here film criticism can play a role - more and more- in giving professional guidance.. explaining and telling what is interesting, why, and how, and so on.

This profession will not die, because people like to see movies and sometimes need comments on what they see, or recommendations on what to see. And bloggers can't respond to these exigencies. And a film column always increases the rating of a publication.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

My perspective is positive with moderation: **there are still room** and there will be due there's not any sign against on what it's taking place now. The problem in the future is not regarding our profession if not the country economic system. Whatever problem will face is just for the weakness of its economics. Therefore, it doesn't matter if you are a film critic or an astronaut. It might surprising, but In Argentina **people care on cinema and there is a strong film culture.**

I see that very well. We have various amateur film festivals in the country to which we have been invited and **we notice the growing interest** of young people

I don't really expect drastic changes of the situation in the foreseeable future. I don't really believe for example, that the internet, social media etc. have changed the whole situation that much. These are new channels for communicating information and value judgements, but **the amount of quality film criticism available has not really changed.** Who is interested in well informed, quality film criticism those will recognise it and will read/watch it in any format (blog, youtube etc.). So this is why I do not really understand the earlier question in this survey about "bloggers". Blogger, blogging (for me) is not a category of film criticism, it is a technology for communication, and can be used in so many ways. David Bordwell for example is blogging regularly, is he a blogger? Anyway, I think film criticism/film critics have already integrated into the fields what they naturally belong: art/culture journalism and research/academia. And it is nothing extraordinary, at least not in my country, "art critic", "literary critic" does not exists as a distinct professions, why "film critic" would be different

I was raised on film criticism in the 1970ies. Now, nearing the age of fifty, I am not ready to live without it. And this is not from a maker's point of view but **from a film lover's perspective.** Thankfully **there are others of my age or above who feel the same and hope** to live for some time in this world. So, yes, it is getting difficult. But as long as there are film lovers there will be an interest in intelligent writing about film.

Film criticism in India, if considered in its overall impact and the spaces it enjoys, is going through a **transition phase. Its future is bright as far as its visibility is concerned.** Although the highly influencing media outlets are less concerned about 'film criticism', it is a respected intellectual trait that delivers keeping its future in bright spot.

Need for change of the professional role model

The traditional film journalist working from 9 to 5 will be **sees its end.** **Freelance** is now more and more the rule ...

Probably likely to be even **more freelancers (...)** in the future and less full time professionals

But the work **must conquer**

It's hard to say. I see future of film criticism same as I see the future of arts and culture writing in general: uncertain. I don't think that any time soon there will be new magazines or newspapers dedicated to film criticism and film education (bloggers might be an exception). I don't think that financial situation will change, in a sense that there will be more money present in our field. **Film critics might try starting writing on English or some other language** in order to reach wider audience. I don't think a lot of things will change in next 5 years or so, for better or worse.

We'll need **to change the way we see the profession** and find a new way to express ourselves.

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

Critics **should act as cultivated barkers and ambassadors** of the movie theater ritual intended as the sensual pleasure of watching films on the big screen in a dark room. Professionals should set the right example by not abusing stay-at-home opportunities (video streaming, home video etc.). This would certainly help in avoiding professional decadence.

It is really difficult to say. **Maybe it will be more concentrated to film magazines as the future for the press is not possible to say. Anyhow, it will not disappear.** That's for sure as well as there will always be literature, music and art critique.

There are only a handful of major dailies which write serious articles/reviews on films. These papers also have weekly Film /TV editions that carry some substance. There are over fifty private TV networks, one hundred FM stations and four channels of Government TV. To live with 24/7 TV and radio transmissions, **Film Criticism would find its rightful space.**

As long as we are able to diversify and write not only about the regular, weekly releases (mostly of them pretty poor) **but also about festivals, retrospectives and films on website platforms** (Netflix, Amazon, Qubit.TV, etc.), we have plenty to say about cinema. In fact, as audiences have now much more films available in different formats, we also have the chance to do our best job: map the territory, discover hidden gems, open the dialogue to our readers about forgotten films from the past that remerge or about new films from new national cinemas.

The future is dire if we don't embrace the future and give the next generation a chance and stop looking down upon people often deemed "bloggers." It should be based on talent, dedication, validity of the work, strength of voice, and the amount of man hours put in. In a crowded marketplace, the smaller voices are often the ones that ring truest.

The situation is difficult, but not hopeless. We are not condemned to extinction - at least some of us. I **guess we should do our best to improve the quality of our writing and to be independent** as much it's possible. Being a **REAL film critic** will be more and more elitist job.

I fear, the specific profession will die out. In time, film critics will be expected to write **in other entertainment areas.**

I know very few film critics making a living only writing about film. Most of my colleagues in the Toronto Films critics Association have **other jobs** -- some in film (teaching, programming, producing) or the arts but some are in non-arts jobs, so film criticism is more of a secondary job coming out of their interest not as a career focus or academic/artistic interest . . . film as entertainment and reviews a forum to express your own ideas, as opposed to evaluation and context etc.

I think the film criticism is going to survive in the most important newspapers in Mexico, BUT... the film critics must **do another job** (for example, eaching) in order to earn some money.

There's no shortage of talented writers and cinephiles who wish to pursue the profession, even as its economic status becomes increasingly precarious. "Film critic" is a dangerously specialized occupation, and the jobs are declining. Those who wish to pursue the metier **should diversify**, taking their journalism beyond the narrow confines of the film review, or even film.

Film criticism remains a subset of journalism, and **serious writers should always be expanding their terrain**—to the rest of the arts and beyond. Not to mention working with film, festivals, academic publications, film schools, rep theatres, etc. Diversifying one's focus doesn't make for a weaker film critic. At least that's my bias: I came to film criticism

APPENDIX: VERBATIM COMMENTS

from magazine and newspaper journalism—covering everything imaginable—I've always found the narrow lens of a film critic suspect. The roots of film criticism in inseparable from the social and political upheavals of the 20th century. Cinema is about the world and everything in it.. Film criticism should follow suit if it hopes to survive and thrive and remain intellectual pertinent – it needs to toggle between the close-up of the review and the wide angle of context, while avoiding the humdrum pitfalls of consumer-guide reviewing. The film critic has the rare privilege of being able to write about everything. And the future of film criticism in Canada, or anywhere else, does depend on commercial opportunity, but also on the critic's ability to make the work resonant and compelling.

It has been changing for a while. On the internet, something, more dedicated to images (videos, gifs, aka real connexion to images presented to the viewers and less words describing words upon images) is happening. The profession is not ready to make this change. Film critics are too self-centered to anticipate and participate to this move. What a pity!

Other

Do not know/ no answer

I am unsure if there is a future. Next 5 years, yes but next 10 years? Not so sure.

Is there a future you think? I don't know

I don't know

uncertain