

Monika Rawska

University of Lodz

A Dangerous Method? The Use of Film in the Therapeutic Process

Preliminary Remarks

Even though films were used in therapy as early as in the case of World War II traumatised American soldiers,¹ cinema therapy is one of the newest methods applied in art therapy (especially in Poland²). This may be attributed to the fact that its efficiency has not yet been confirmed, partly because of the lack of suitable research methodology. Nevertheless, in the United States, where cinema therapy has been developing most extensively, a self-evaluation survey conducted among therapists³ revealed that 67% have observed positive effects of cinema therapy. It should be noted, however, that cinema therapy is used as an additional resource, and thus it should not be treated as an independent therapeutic method, not withstanding the enthusiasm of some experts who promote the idea of miracles of self-therapy.

¹ The first article on the subject can be found in the *Journal of Clinical Psychology* of 1946. It was the first recorded attempt to use film in psychotherapy – in treating depression in this particular case (Rubin, Katz, 1946; Kozubek, 2016b, p. 31). I would like to express my thanks to Małgorzata Kozubek for sharing the book *Filmoterapia. Teoria i praktyka* [Cinema therapy. Theory and Practice] before it was released by the publisher as *Filmoterapia* [Cinema therapy].

² Despite the fact that the term “cinema therapy” was used by Marek Haltof in his article *Kinoterapia – przeżyjmy katastrofę* [Cinema Therapy. Let's Survive a Catastrophe] (1985), Polish academic texts on the topic have only begun appearing recently. It is worth noticing the terminological difference: even though the terms “*filmoterapia*” [film therapy] and “*kinoterapia*” [cinema therapy] are often used interchangeably, Haltof defined the latter as pertaining to the entirety of the cinematic experience, including the aspect of watching films together with other members of the audience.

³ The group consisted of 827 psychologists belonging to the American Psychological Association (APA). Requirements for participation were listed as follows: working within the US, being a certified psychotherapist and declaring clinical practice as the main source of income (Ejsmont, Mańkowski, 2014).

First of all, it is essential to specify the meaning of the term. Cinema therapy requires the presence of a psychologist, who, as Małgorzata Kozubek notices, “performs an analysis of film characters as if they were real people”. As Kozubek explains, “everything that can be said about the socialising, educating, rehabilitating and model-providing role of films can be expressed without referring to cinema therapy” (Kozubek, 2014). This is a very relevant remark, as it seems that in Poland we can observe a tendency to simplify matters and label many film-related activities as cinema therapy, which thus becomes an umbrella term for many different activities exploring the educational potential of films. These activities are often conducted by foundations, culture centres and social welfare centres, but school teachers are also encouraged to use films in their work. I would like to review the scale of activities identified as cinema therapy, drawing attention to the fact that the term is often used in an unjustified manner, which may misinform those interested in this method. My description will be limited for obvious reasons and I will mostly focus on enumerating various initiatives, as the film therapeutic process and working with film should be perceived as incidental and ephemeral in nature.

Subsequently, I will offer some reflections on the ideological implications of this method, placing it in the context of a wider therapeutic culture. I will refer to a number of texts available on the topic, as these can be treated as potential guideposts for those interested in this issue. It should be noted, however, that not all of these texts are easily obtainable, which may also have influenced the way in which cinema therapy is perceived in Poland. Much popularisation work in this respect has been done by online projects but these are also occasionally guilty of unnecessary simplifications. Even though educators are usually equipped with a different set of skills and competences than psychologists or professional therapists, most readily available materials refer to using films in working with teenagers and children and have been developed for the purpose of being used by schools. These materials will be my main focus in the present article. I will describe dangers involved in uninformed usage of the method, which usually stems from relying on simplified and insufficiently developed lesson plans. This leads to the reflection that cinema therapy can be framed in the broader context of film and media education in Poland, which is dominated by a utilitarian and reductionist approach to film. Internet message boards expose a dire need for educating viewers, which is a phenomenon related to a broader issue (which I am only going to touch upon), namely that of education in humanities in general.

How to Work with Films?

It is usually said that the method of working with film as one of the branches of art therapy has been developed largely based on bibliotherapy, which means that it also inherited some of the inadequacies of the earlier technique. The origins of cinema therapy ran in parallel with those of film studies as an academic discipline

in Poland. Significantly, the latter also sprang from literary studies and adopted methods of literary analysis. But although over the years film studies have become an independent area of study (even if still perceived as “less demanding”), cinema therapy is still much entangled in literary analysis. Therefore, it is worth referring to its bibliotherapeutic roots and reviewing various stages of the therapeutic use of literature:

1. Independent reading, watching and listening to suitably selected bibliotherapeutic units (books, excerpts, alternative reading materials, theatre and film adaptations etc.).
2. Identification with the protagonist, inducing a certain emotional response (either positive or negative). This can result in either relaxation or emotional stimulation.
3. Catharsis, or purification – inducing a state which culminates in experiencing relief and allowing the reader to release tension.
4. Insight – the reader analyses their problems on their own or with the assistance of a therapist.
5. The desired outcome of bibliotherapy is a change in behaviours or attitudes of the person undergoing therapy (Borecka, Wontarowska-Roter, 2003, p. 49).

The above description – which, obviously, presents bibliotherapeutic process in a shortened and slightly simplified way – is undoubtedly somewhat naïve, which perhaps can be attributed to the authors’ desire to present the method in such a way as to convince the readers of its efficiency and encourage them to use it. Still, the authors’ optimism seems slightly exaggerated – it is hard to imagine that reading books would really induce shifts in a person’s attitudes.

Cinema therapists insist that using films in the therapeutic process is often easier than using books; it is also often more efficient, as films are “less time-consuming and more easily available to a large number of viewers” (Dermer, 2000; Ejsmont, Mańkowski, 2014). Here again, even if it is done with good intentions, we can trace a suggestion that film is a less demanding medium than literature.

Krzysztof Wawrzyn notices that:

first and foremost, the work in question needs to appeal to a viewer’s emotions. Through their therapeutic influence, films help viewers understand the world and various problems, including their own. Visualisation leads to the realisation of one’s needs and desires as well as assisting in accepting oneself and others. Due to their multisensory representation of reality, films stimulate our senses. In-depth analysis of films leads to a deeper understanding of the world, social issues and interpersonal relations; it develops one’s personality, facilitates self-expression and assists in interpreting and solving various dilemmas (Wawrzyn, 2007).

In contrast to art therapy methods based on music and visual arts, in the case of narrative-based works (e.g. feature films) the crucial element is that of catharsis, mostly based on projection-identification mechanisms.⁴ The pivotal role of catharsis in the process has frequently been commented upon.⁵ Dawid Bałutowski (following Fuat Ulus) defines projection as mapping one's own feelings, thoughts and beliefs onto a fictional character, combined with identification, i.e. noticing similarities between oneself and the character in question, accepting "some elements of that character as one's own" (Bałutowski, 2010, p. 35). The author believes that there is also another possibility, namely that of rejecting the character. An emotional approach is important with respect to the processing of information, conditioning the viewers' conclusions and reflections (Bałutowski, 2010, p. 35). On the one hand, viewers/patients can use this mechanism to distance themselves from their problems – therapists using this method admit that patients often find it easier to discuss film characters than themselves (Zembowicz, 2016; Bałutowski, 2010, p. 36). On the other hand, becoming involved in a film plot decreases the feeling of isolation and uniqueness of one's situation, which in turn can help the patient to confront their problem (Ejsmont, Mańkowski, 2014). Bałutowski enumerates mechanisms occurring while watching films, starting from dissociation (i.e. the distance mentioned above), through identification to internalisation ("we are no longer deploring the fate of the protagonist but rather lament over our own situation") (Bałutowski, 2010, p. 36). The essential role in the process is ascribed to the specialist who assists the viewer in handling emotions awoken by the film, in such a way as to make them not repressed but rather processed: "the role of a cinema therapist consists of assisting in the latter stages of the process discussed above, namely transference, which here can be understood as transgressing from our bond with a fictional character into reality" (Bałutowski, 2010, p. 37). A qualified person – a therapist, psychologist, educator – performs an essential role in the process and therefore they should be equipped with the right set of skills and tools. This is not just about preparing a good plan for a cinema therapy session; it is also about certain personality traits, such as empathy and willingness to understand others, but also, in my opinion, about a capacity for critical reasoning and distancing oneself from both the film and the issue under discussion. The key word here seems to be attentiveness – referring both to selecting the right film for a given set of people and to the actual analysis of that film. A therapist should be capable of identifying a problem but they should also know the viewers' expectations, temperaments,

⁴ As Małgorzata Kozubek rightly points out, in the context of cinema therapy these concepts are usually interpreted in a more common way as identification with the protagonist, contrary to the film theory discourse which is firmly rooted in Lacan's psychoanalysis. "In the psychoanalytic approach, the emphasis is put on the viewer's identification with themselves as a pure act of perception. While watching, the viewer initially projects their incorporeal perceptive potential onto the film, only to subsequently identify with it in order to participate in its transition into the world of the film" (Kozubek, 2016b, p. 301).

⁵ During a meeting of the ThinkFilm discussion club on 6 May 2016, Małgorzata Kozubek explained that using avant-garde cinema is a rather tricky way of working with one's subconscious. Such an approach would require a large team of researchers, including music therapists and people who would analyse non-narrative elements.

personalities and moods, as these are crucial in terms of eliciting a positive response (Wawrzyn, 2007). As Wawrzyn points out, in some cases “professional diagnosis followed by the right kind of assistance, including psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy, is indispensable. Watching films cannot replace any of the aforementioned treatments, but it can bring positive therapeutic results in terms of easing the patient’s anxiety” (Wawrzyn, 2007). We should also remember that cinema therapy is not limited to after-screening discussions – its efforts need to be continued and extended through persistent work (Kozubek, 2016a).

Agata Ejsmont and Łukasz Majkowski enumerate the following steps necessary for the right selection of film material:

- Identify the problem and therapeutic goals.
- Identify the patients’ strong sides.
- Identify similarities and differences between the patients and film protagonists as well as their corresponding problems. Consider whether your patients would understand the issues tackled by the film.
- Consider the differences (in terms of culture, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, gender and sexual orientation).
- Select the right film.⁶

The next task should be determining who should watch the film (parents, children, the entire family) and making sure that the patients have access to the necessary equipment as well as the film itself. This is the application stage. Here are specific suggestions concerning this stage:

- The therapist needs to watch the film before showing it to their patients.
- If for some reason the patients cannot access the film in question, the therapist should assist them in obtaining a copy (although this issue is controversial in the light of copyright issues).
- The therapist should decide where and with whom the film should be watched.
- After the film has been watched, it is the therapist’s task to observe the reaction of the patient or the family (Ejsmont, Mańkowski, 2014).

The points listed above summarise how one needs to prepare for work based on film materials but also for all kinds of therapeutic work. They reveal the complexity of the process and stress the need for suitable preparation.

⁶ “Because of the process of projection-identification, which is a crucial condition for cinema therapy, it is especially important to select the right film based on the main characters; it is the therapist’s/ educator’s task to make the right choice. Usually film characters are similar in some respect to the people undergoing therapy” (Kozubek, 2016b, p. 230).

Practical Application and Terminological Problem

Cinema therapy is an interdisciplinary method that should draw from combined experiences of specialists in various fields: psychologists and educators, film scholars, cultural managers, therapists and psychiatrists as well as filmmakers. This is well understood by educators contributing to the website Kinoterapia.pl, who cooperate with various foundations, including the very active Generator Foundation. The website includes many interviews with psychologists, psychiatrists, film studies specialists, film critics and filmmakers. The specialists invited by Filmoteka Szkolna [Film Library] to cooperate, created a set of lesson plans (supplemented with teaching aids) based on films made available through the programme.

Lesson plans made available on the Film Library's website are divided into the following categories:

“Interpersonal Intelligence” – materials on films that stimulate self-reflection, develop self-awareness and allow students to confront their real needs and desires. [...]

“Interpersonal Competences” – [...] developing skills such as listening, empathy, cooperation, identification and problem solving.

“Prevention” [...] (Filmotekaszkolna.pl).

The lesson plans are labelled according to category and explained in detail. They are attributed to specific educational levels (lower- and upper-secondary school) and occasionally include an educator's commentary – for instance, in the case of a lesson on marriage and relationships, where attention is drawn to the fact that the film includes nudity and illustration of sex. It is the role of the teacher to explore the potential of the film in a discussion, directing the students' attention so as to avoid them concentrating merely on the sexual content (Badziukiewicz). Other items of information include: time needed, educational goals (or sometimes key words), teaching techniques (such as brainstorming, moderated discussion, group work, discussion in groups, as well as role playing and photography projects); sometimes teaching aids are provided as well. Many lesson plans include suggested homework. It should be noted that selected films are very varied (including documentaries, animated films, short and full-length films); sometimes these films are very demanding, for instance *Tango* (1980, dir. Zbigniew Rybczyński) suggested for a discussion on identity and social roles, or controversial, e.g. *Wesele* [The Wedding] (2004, dir. Wojciech Smarzowski), paired with a discussion on values. The author of this particular lesson plan, Dawid Bałutowski, puts forward the following educational goals to be fulfilled during the class:

- to become more aware of the importance of realising one's set of values;
- to realise one's hierarchy of values as well as the origins and meanings of one's values;
- to pinpoint real examples of following values in one's life;

- to foster the attitude of tolerance and openness towards different sets of values (Bałutowski).

Each lesson is broken down into several parts (each part is set for a specific duration) and follows a clear pattern; nevertheless, the plans also leave scope for teachers' individual creativity and identifying unpredictable issues which could emerge during the discussion. But what seems most important is the attentiveness with respect to films that serve as points of departure for some serious discussions, often transgressing the scope of issues addressed by the films. Proposed teaching techniques and topics for discussion are supposed to foster deep reflection instead of superficial readings. As a result, a lesson on ageing will tackle not only the passing of time and death but also the problem of ageism. Significantly, however, film content is being discussed rather than cinematic forms. Of course, it should be remembered that in this particular case films are used as educational tools, and the lessons are meant to expand students' social skills rather than their knowledge on film; nevertheless, it seems that it would be a good idea to supplement lesson plans with questions regarding what form is used, and why this particular one, to address the film's issues – rather than stop at just identifying the main problems presented in the film. Such an approach would no doubt require presenting certain formal issues in lesson plans in order to assist teachers who may not feel sufficiently competent in film analysis. I am by no means suggesting that educational sessions should be replaced with lessons on film analysis. I am well aware that this is not the point. Still, addressing issues such as subjectification or formal devices used for exposing or hiding it may not only help students understand certain films but also provide an interesting point of departure for further discussion.

With relation to the abovementioned programme, it is worth asking the questions which I delineated in the introduction. Can school lessons exploring the educational potential of films be described as cinema therapy? Are teachers sufficiently prepared to supervise cinema therapy sessions? My guess would be that usually they are not. In some cases, the authors of lesson plans suggest that requesting the presence of a school psychologist would be useful. Lesson topics may correspond with problems actually occurring within a given group; still, it seems to me that describing form period (which is normally dedicated to emotional education or preventing various problems arising, rather than solving those that actually exist, as is done in therapy) using films as a teaching aid as “cinema therapy” is an exaggeration.

A project similar to the one discussed above is *Filmowe pogotowie wychowawcze* [Educational Film Ambulance], which consists of a series of educational materials made available on the website of *Edukacja Filmowa* [Film Education]. There are 13 lesson plans focused on issues frequently occurring in class. This is how the project is described by its coordinators:

What to do when serious problems arise in class? There's a surge of emotions after some recent Facebook posts or someone got into a fistfight? In case of

emergency (and in all other situations) please feel free to use the Educational Film Ambulance. What we recommend is the well-proven method (used in education as well as psychology) of visualising problems and distancing oneself from it through analysing the actions of fictional characters (EdukacjaFilmowa.pl).

Importantly, the authors appeal to techniques used in psychology, which is treated as a field of expert knowledge. Every lesson plan is recommended for a specific subject (e.g. form period, knowledge about society, ethics or religion). All films used in the project are either available online or included in the Film Library film set. The materials involve the recommended age group, important details concerning the film (genre, director and director's bio, year of production and country of origin, duration and important awards won), its description, topics for discussion, suggested questions and teaching techniques. Here, lesson plans are more sketchy and rely to a greater degree on teachers' competences; even so, they include not only general issues and questions exploring the problems addressed by the films, but also such aspects as genre conventions, film techniques applied by artists or the role of music. As we can see, film form is also taken into consideration and films are supposed to not only trigger discussions on plots and addressed issues but also to educate students to be conscious film viewers. Interestingly, films are supposed to ease tensions and solve problems. Of course, this is the common denominator of all projects under consideration here; still, in this case we are dealing with an initiative that does not call itself cinema therapy (which, in the light of my abovementioned objections, is an achievement in itself), even if it relies on a presupposition that films can be used as helpful tools in addressing complex issues such as teenage sex and adoption. This optimistic assumption helps popularise the use of film in schools – and is not only limited to film adaptations of books on the compulsory reading list.

Another interesting example, and very different from the previous ones, is *Filmoterapia planowa* [Film Set Cinema Therapy] conducted by Marcin Kondraciuk as part of the activities of WROTA Gliwice Film Club and the Occupational Therapy Workshop. Since 2007, Kondraciuk has been working with people with disabilities whose situation inspired him to take action. It was Kondraciuk's reflection that even though the activities usually performed by people with disabilities as part of the workshop are undoubtedly useful, "these activities do not take them outside. As a result, people with disabilities are still isolated from the rest of society" (Kondraciuk). Hence the idea to encourage workshop participants to create their own film with the assistance of professionals. Each stage of these projects – e.g. writing screenplays, acting, composing frames, shooting and editing – requires cooperation. This is how Kondraciuk himself describes the initiative:

film set cinema therapy is a response to therapy that is limited to indoor sessions – our sessions require field trips to film sets and force cooperation between filmmakers, volunteers, actors, technicians, etc., both with and without disabilities. [...] [Our] work on the film set is meant to socialise

people both ways; it is a process in which people with and without disabilities have an impact on one another through shared work. The creative process and looking for answers together allows participants to bond and understand one another. In situations that require teamwork and mutual dependence, there is a chance for building respect and working towards a desired final outcome, which is a healthy situation in which a person with disability can clearly express their needs and find themselves in various situations (Kondraciuk, 2014).

In the aftermath of the initiative, the Door Film Festival (Festiwal Filmowy Drzwi) was created. The Festival incorporates independent and student films and opens up space for young filmmakers confronting disability (Kondraciuk). Kondraciuk, who is the Festival's artistic director, lists two main objectives of the event: first, active participation of people with disabilities in the organisation of the festival, and their actual presence during the event; second, an atmosphere that minimises the distance between organisers, guests, viewers and volunteers (Kondraciuk, 2014). He notices that very often the main problem for people with disabilities are the people around them who limit their opportunities and insist on assisting them (which is often the case with overprotective parents). Even though these people are motivated by willingness to help and prevent painful experiences, in Kondraciuk's view such behaviour can often bring more harm than good. The Festival's mission also lies in informing healthy people about diseases and encouraging them to change their perception of disability. The term cinema therapy is here associated with occupational therapy consisting of social and professional rehabilitation. It assists people's development in order to help them "regain lost functions and skills, or, in the case of incurable diseases, replace them with other sets of skills. Occupational therapy is one of the forms of rehabilitation treatment" (Milanowska, 2003). It should be remembered, however, that cinema therapy requires the presence of a psychologist or educator; again, it is a case of abusing the term. It seems that many film-related activities – either practical or focused solely on viewing (even in the case of individual watching, presented as self-therapy) – usurp the right to this label.

The Issue of Therapeutic Culture and "Prescription Films"

As Małgorzata Kozubek suggests, cinema therapy is usually applied as self-therapy, and it is recommended as such in numerous self-help books (Kozubek, 2016b, p. 79), including (occasionally absurd) lists of "prescription films", which are said to solve virtually all one's problems without any need of consulting a therapist or leaving one's home. Such books usually include thematic lists and sample questions for individual reflection, which are supposed to miraculously "heal your life".⁷ The first book of this kind was Gary Solomon's *The Motion Picture Prescription. Watch This Movie and Call Me in the Morning. 200 Movies*

⁷ I am referring to the popular self-help book by Louise L. Hay, *You Can Heal Your Life* (1984).

to *Help You Heal Life's Problems* (1995). This title started a whole series of books by the same author, but also gave rise to a whole genre (according to Kozubek, since then over 30 other similar books have been published!). Solomon himself assumed the title of the Movie Doctor (which he turned into a registered trademark).

The rise in the number of such titles, which is of course worth considering, does not translate into greater originality: most books are modelled on those previously published, replicating ideas and “healing film” lists. All texts quote the same benefits of cinema therapy: finding tips and patterns of behavior one could follow in one’s own life, stimulating exploration of selected problems, gaining more insight into one’s own problems (based on considering alternative solutions), viewing one’s problems from a distance, reformulating them and changing their definitions, learning to solve conflicts, gaining a better understanding of one’s behaviour and emotions, increasing motivation, understanding others better, developing empathy, etc. Significantly, these benefits are both generally perceived as valuable and vague enough to elude any specific verification (Kozubek, 2016b, p. 81).

Analysing the covers of cinema therapy self-help books, Kozubek draws our attention to blurbs used by the publishers, which appeal to potential buyers through the promise of a method that is new and tested at the same time; on top of that, the method is presented as simple and efficient (Kozubek, 2016b, p. 83). Self-help books and therapeutic culture provide the broadest context for cinema therapy, as described by Kozubek. Therapeutics, grounded in a complex system of counselling and expert opinions, is a direct product of culture founded on individualism (Jacyno, 2007) and composed of techniques of self-realisation, i.e. pursuing identity as a project. Viewed from such a perspective, life is managed like a business venture. As Małgorzata Jacyno explains, being a subject requires becoming increasingly professionalised; “individuals need to take care of themselves and manage themselves – no one can take this over for them” (Jacyno, 2007, p. 217). Allegedly to broaden the autonomy, new self-discipline techniques are applied and everyone is obliged to obtain better and better qualifications in being oneself: “planning one’s life, performing introspection, and living in the light of the truth about oneself” (Jacyno, 2007, p. 211). This is all, of course, done by means of suggestion, “velvet violence”, which is much more efficient than actual coercion. “Business culture forces a differentiation between ordinary, self-reliant, responsible individuals and those lacking in every respect” (Jacyno, 2007, p. 211) and who should be resocialised – “the actual subject of many training sessions and workshops are not so much new professional qualifications but rather gaining skills in being a subject” (Jacyno, 2007, p. 213). Jacyno concludes that therapy has become a marker of all healthy relationships (as every relationship undergoes constant “observation and diagnosis” [Jacyno, 2007, p. 224]), which should assist the process of “self-fulfilment and auto-transformation of every individual” (Jacyno, 2007, p. 225) and be based on communication. Communication is viewed as therapeutic and

beneficial; it offers hope for recreating true connections (Jacyno, 2007, p. 231). As a result, it has become a “universal treatment” for isolation and alienation; it is supposed to “assist individualisation and at the same time eliminate all damage which it involves” (Jacyno, 2007, p. 231). Still, as Jacyno insists, communication is often overrated in therapeutic discourse – it often “replaces a relationship rather than heals it” (Jacyno, 2007, p. 233). Jacyno also draws our attention to a shift which can be detected in recent self-help books:

the promise of reinforcing the ego and transforming neurosis into ordinary human unhappiness is replaced by a promise of successful – and, when needs be, also miraculous – solving of all problems. Love, money, health and an end to all oppression are within the reach of everyone approaching themselves in the correct way. This correct approach can be expressed through undergoing self-therapy or therapy. The most important element is self-acceptance, which fuels actions aimed at obtaining various things: love, money, health and freedom; it can also “magically attract” these qualities. Starting a new life from scratch, healing from an incurable disease, meeting the love of one’s life, averting bad luck – it is all within one’s reach. The correct attitude to oneself can work miracles and becomes the starting point for changes whose scope or pace can come as a surprise “even to therapists” (Jacyno, 2007, p. 229).

Renata Salecl shows that the most fundamental belief in modern society is that “happiness and self-fulfilment should be our uppermost goals” (Salecl, 2013, p. 30). In Salecl’s view, it is capitalism that, feeding on people’s sense of imperfection, forces them to keep making choices in order to improve their lives. “[E]verything has become the subject of informed decisions, which should be made in such a way as to come as close as possible to the ideal of happiness and fulfilment promoted by society [...]. We are all encouraged to behave like corporations – we should have long-term goals, undertake long-term economic actions, be flexible, and keep restructuring our life enterprise, undertaking risks with the view to gaining larger profits” (Salecl, 2013, pp. 35–36). In such a framework, life becomes “a series of choices and potential changes” (Salecl, 2013, p. 31). Salecl refers to the story of an IT company manager who had to lay off all his interns. During the final conversation, one of the interns sat with a notepad in hand: he wanted to know what he had done wrong so that he could avoid making the same mistake in his future job and become a better employee. “Not so long ago, a person who was fired from their job would blame that situation on external circumstances. Today, we feel forced to attribute responsibility to ourselves; we want to understand why we were unable to keep that job”, explains Salecl, emphasising the role of evaluation, or rather self-evaluation, also outside the workplace (Salecl, 2013, p. 37). The process of evaluation and supervision, crucial for industrial production processes, has become internalised as a way of controlling our behaviour”; as a result, people become their own juries, sustaining the belief that they need to keep doing better and better, reprogramming themselves and treating life as

a perpetual investment (Salecl, 2013, pp. 37–38). Therapeutic culture also invades the sphere of relationships and emotions, creating a sense that these, too, can be rationally managed. “When more and more people believe that everything that happens in our lives is a matter of the choices we make, and as we keep making our choices ourselves, we are beginning to think that love and sex can be managed just as easily as, for instance, a career or holidays” (Salecl, 2013, p. 40).

This ideology has been so successfully internalised that we become anxious whenever our lives seem insufficiently close to our “ideal” – we instantly feel the need to do something about it, to improve it somehow, even if it is not necessary from the individual’s point of view. In his book *Kultura manii* [A Culture of Mania], Tomasz Olchanowski explains that “under cover of psychology and several psychologically-sounding terms (such as taking responsibility for one’s life, entitlement mentality, focusing on the task), we in fact receive politics (conservative and repressing)” (Olchanowski, 2016, p. 47). Psychotherapy has become a system of external discipline and coercion in the service of a political power; as a result, individuals “fall into the trap of self-exploitation and exhausting self-discipline, exploiting one’s body and spirit”, at the same time losing the ability to “sustain tensions and frustrations” (Olchanowski, 2016, p. 49). Self-fulfilment is sought for in numerous consumer products which promise satisfaction but cannot give any – the same description applies to the overabundance of self-help books, which actually do not solve any problems. Psychology has become an ideology in its own right, turning psychotherapy into a way of “producing obedient consumers and workers” (Olchanowski, 2016, p. 61). In the era of the tyranny of choice, we need not only directions but also experts who can lead us by the hand, taking over some responsibility for our decisions – it can be argued that this explains the immense popularity of self-help books, offering fast and supposedly efficient solutions to people’s problems (Kędzierska, 2005). It goes without saying that all narratives of this kind should be taken with a pinch of salt – including those concerning the role of films and their healing potential.

Cinema Therapy Literature in Poland

Specialists working with film recommend Dawid Bałutowski’s book *Jak oglądać filmy z młodzieżą: film fabularny w psychoedukacji, terapii, profilaktyce* [How to Watch Films with Teenagers. Feature Films in Psychoeducation, Therapy and Prevention]. The book was published in 2010 by Fraszka Edukacyjna and it is not easily available (according to the NUKAT database, it is available in only 19 libraries throughout the country; even the National Library hasn’t got a copy);⁸ as

⁸ I would like to express my thanks to the Library of the Faculty of Education at the University of Warsaw for allowing me to access their shelves during summer holidays. I am also indebted to Lucyna Ziembowicz from the Generator Foundation for recommending this book to me. I also recommend Dawid Bałutowski’s article *Jak oglądać filmy z młodzieżą. Perspektywa psychologiczna* [How to Watch Films with Teenagers. A Psychological Perspective], available through the Film Library (Filmoteka Szkolna).

a result this title is less well known than two others by Ewa Warmuz-Warmuzińska on the same subject. Bałutowski's book is a perfect reference book for all those working with young people. It helps develop lesson plans, explains how to deal with difficult behaviours, control the situation during discussion sessions and encourage participants to be more involved. The book also contains an appendix listing suggested films/TV series grouped according to different values connected with being within a group (acceptance, openness, good communication, support, expressing emotions, honesty, cooperation). The author does not provide an extensive list of titles; instead, he shows how to decipher film texts so as to discover and explore various topics (not always obvious – for instance, the issue of cooperation is discussed on the example of *The Good, the Bad and the Ugly* [1966, dir. Sergio Leone]). Bałutowski encourages teachers to examine scenes in detail and ask questions concerning the participants' experience as well as those related directly to the context (for instance, "how can we foster cooperation in our class"? [Bałutowski, 2010, p. 116]). As we can see, Bałutowski's book is addressed at people working with teenagers. It helps them face various challenges potentially triggered by discussing tough topics and stimulates successful communication. Importantly, again, the book does not refer to cinema therapy in its title, even though it contains a whole chapter devoted to this issue. In the chapter, the author relates the origins and development of the cinema therapeutic process, stresses the importance of well-chosen film material and finally enumerates two essential conditions that need to be met by people undergoing cinema therapy: an ability to assimilate and process information as well as emotional integration, enabling them to "emotionally experience films without any risk of nervous breakdown or decompensation" (Bałutowski, 2010, p. 37). It is, of course, difficult to predict to what extent experiences described by Bałutowski occur at subsequent stages;⁹ still, it can be seen that the author is very hopeful about the proposed method. He explains that watching films may trigger many complex emotional processes, which, he believes, is related to the viewers' emotional involvement in the plot. In his book, Bałutowski does not refer to any formal devices.

In Poland, the most easily obtainable book on cinema therapy is Ewa Warmuz-Warmuzińska's *Filmoterapia w edukacji i terapii dzieci i młodzieży szkolnej oraz dorosłych* [Cinema Therapy in Education and the Therapy of Children, Students and Adults] (2013). Warmuz-Warmuzińska also published another book: *Filmoterapia. Scenariusze zajęć w edukacji filmowej dzieci i dorosłych* [Cinema Therapy. Session Plans for Film Education Addressed at Children and Adults] (2015). The first one provides an introduction to the topic and follows the American pattern, including an extensive list of titles divided according to topics, as well as a number of sample lesson plans. My reservations concern the very sketchy description of films and short lists of questions for discussion. Film

⁹ For instance, "when watching a romantic comedy [...] we are in fact cheering for ourselves, because we are beginning to hope that our lives may also change. Similarly, our anger towards a film parent neglecting their child may in fact be directed at our own parents who perhaps did not give us the attention we needed" (Bałutowski, 2010, p. 36).

summaries, copied off the portal Filmweb.pl, are very limited (one or two sentences at most); they either lack important information about the plot or even misrepresent it (film summaries published on Filmweb.pl can be added by all website users). Here I would like to discuss two films mentioned by Warmuz-Warmuzińska, which exemplify the issues plaguing cinema therapy today.

The topic “Fulfilling dreams, searching for the meaning of life” is paired with the film *Billy Elliot* (2000, dir. Stephen Daldry). The lesson is meant to be devoted to discussing the “hidden talents we all have”, and its correspondence with the school curriculum (which in itself is a rather mysterious category, since there is no information regarding which school subject can be supplemented with this material, whether it is meant for form period or perhaps Polish language lessons) is presented as a stream of issues: “talent, tolerance, fulfilling one’s dreams”. The author also provides key words: “talent, determination, music”. Nevertheless, these are not very helpful as there is no index included in the book – readers are obliged to browse the entire text anyway.

Questions prepared by the author (there are fourteen of them) concentrate on family relationships (for instance, the expectations of Billy’s father, personalities of family members and the way their perception of Billy changes). Two questions are more general in character: “Is it common that children are obliged to pursue activities they actually dislike?” and “Are there any hobbies that are still stereotyped, e.g. dancing?”. Warmuz-Warmuzińska proposes the following task after watching the film: “The film tells you that everyone has a hidden talent. And what is your dream? Think of a talent you could develop and do it” (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2013, pp. 138–139). To put it mildly, this is not a simple task, neither for a school student, nor for an adult person. It is only natural to encourage young people to pursue their passions but the form adopted by the author does not seem right. Firstly, the task is formulated in the imperative – which suggests that not only everything is possible but also it is all in the hands of the person undergoing cinema therapy. It seems that a much more useful approach would be to ask what hinders the person from fulfilling their dream and to assist them in overcoming that obstacle. But coming back to the methods of film analysis – they are not detailed enough, there is no clear goal determining the scope of a particular lesson. Questions suggested by the author are such as any teacher could prepare on their own, without the assistance of a professional. They are mostly plot-related and on the whole, they narrow the potential for discussion rather than provoke it.

One may observe similar issues analysing the case of the film *Kate & Leopold* (2001, dir. James Mangold), paired with the category of “Love”. The topic of the film is presented as “love in different epochs”, and the issues listed as corresponding with the school curriculum are “love, passing of time, romance”. There are many more questions in this case (twenty). Some of them are not really related to the main topic: for instance, the author suggests a question on useful and useless inventions or whether it is possible “to stop the rush of our modern lives”. Most questions concern the characters, for instance: “How does Leopold behave towards

other people? What is his way of speaking? What are his manners?"; "What is Kate's attitude towards love?"; "Why does he like Kate?"; "Do women like to be treated as Leopold treats Kate?". Some are linked with a rather biased contrasting of the two eras ("Could we learn much from people from that era?"; "Which epoch seems better to you?"). Rather than discuss love, the author focuses on the motif of time travel. The task to be performed after watching the film is formulated as follows: "Which epoch would you like to live in? Who would you be and what would you do? Which historical period is the most romantic in your opinion?" (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2013, pp. 82–83).

As in the case of *Billy Elliot*, referring to the materials included in the book as a "lesson plan" is an abuse of the term. The questions are randomly arranged and they have nothing in common with careful and detailed planning represented by the materials made available by the Film Library (Filmoteka Szkolna). This inconsistency puts the value of the whole book into question. In the case of both films discussed above, Warmuz-Warmuzińska treats film as a medium in a superficial manner. It is only used as a tool for introducing poignant, but rather general and vague questions; moreover, the suggested interpretation is a naïve one. In the case of *Billy Elliot*, tackling such issues as stereotypes and pursuing one's dreams against the generally accepted model of masculinity, the author addresses these problems in her questions. In contrast, in the case of the romantic comedy reinforcing stereotypical images of femininity and masculinity, the question of stereotypes is never raised. It would seem that addressing this problem while discussing the film with young people is recommended; all the same, the questions proposed by Warmuz-Warmuzińska evade the issue altogether. After all, it is worthwhile just to sensitise students to the fact that even seemingly innocent films can reinforce certain ideologies. The author's questions mostly refer to film texts, i.e. plots (with no reference to the way in which stories are told). Consequently, she achieves effects contrary to those she intended: instead of fostering openness in sharing one's views and opinions, proposed sessions are mostly focused on summarising the plot rather than confronting issues raised by particular films.

Rather puzzlingly, Ewa Warmuz-Warmuzińska's second book is titled *Filmoterapia. Scenariusze zajęć w edukacji filmowej dzieci i dorosłych* [Cinema Therapy. Session Plans for Film Education Addressed at Children and Adults], despite the fact that in the introduction the author quotes Małgorzata Kozubek's comment on pointlessly extending the category so as to encompass educational activities; the book also includes a lengthy chapter devoted to film education in Poland (suffice it to mention the title of the first subchapter: "Film Education – Useful or Not" [Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2015, p. 18]). The author confuses various terms – cinema therapy is used interchangeably with therapeutic cinema focused on self-therapy; she also quotes articles and interviews stressing the importance of emotional reception of films (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2015, pp. 15–17). The author cooperates with PLANETE+ DOC Academy and she presents her session plans based on the films included in the project, stressing that "of course, any detailed discussion,

multimedia, photos and music can only be accessed during an introductory talk” performed as part of the project (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2015, p. 36). Session plans included in the book only list one point on the necessity of explaining what a documentary is and several issues linked to a few selected examples. These are surprisingly low in number – sometimes as few as two questions are listed, which suggests that the entire chapter on the Academy is more of a sample of the author’s activities in education than a set of valuable teaching materials. Only one entry includes a question tackling the form of the film (*See Something, Say Something* [2010, dir. Martin Orton, Greg Villalobos]: “Do you have any ideas why the film is animated rather than using real actors?”). The following subchapter includes frame session plans prepared for the Youth Film Academy (Młodzieżowa Akademia Filmowa) in Amok cinema. They include suggested films (together with topics) and many more questions for discussion, divided into three main categories: introductory lecture, discussion after screening, tasks to be performed after seeing the film/topics that can be raised in relation to the film. In addition, some session plans include a list of films on a similar topic. After reading the materials carefully, one may have the impression that these are some notes jotted down by the author rather than materials that could be of help to those interested in conducting such a session. If these were meant to be used merely as a sample of a well-organised session, Warmuz-Warmuzińska would not have listed so many examples – she would have provided titles in a table (just like she did in her previous book), expanding individual sections into individual session (as was done by Dawid Bałutowski or the Film Library authors). As it is, the entire chapter resembles the author’s resume, encouraging participation in her lessons.

Warmuz-Warmuzińska also proposes films for self-therapy. In the following chapter, she creates thematic lists (“Films for Spleen and Not Only”, “Outsider-Protagonist”, “Films on Relationships and Being Alone”, “Films on Family Values” and “Problems Concerning Us and Our Society”), explaining that “the films do not present only those selected topics; all films are multidimensional and include many plots, so the topic should only be interpreted as a guideline in what kind of life situation this particular film can help us in self-therapy and analysing our problems” (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2015, p. 64). Still, apart from descriptions quoted from Filmweb.pl, she does not elaborate on these films; there is no list of questions for individual reflection. Only the next chapter is, as the author herself names it, “practical” in character. Importantly, the chapter concerns film education (of small children, teenagers and adults). In this chapter, Warmuz-Warmuzińska proposes several cycles together with film examples and tasks. The material is even more general in character than that presented in her previous book. The cycle for the youngest viewers, entitled “Otherness in fairy tales” lists 6 titles (with descriptions quoted from Filmweb.pl) and only four tasks – three questions and a suggestion to draw a poster representing the otherness of film characters (e.g. *Shrek* [2001, dir. Andrew Adamson, Vicky Jensen] or *Beauty and the Beast* [1991, dir. Kirk Wise and Gary Trousdale]) (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2015, p. 85).

The cycles for teenagers (lower- and upper-secondary school students) and adults are supplemented with quotes (related to particular issues and of varied level of intellectual challenge, ranging from Virginia Woolf to Paulo Coelho and the website Demotywatory.pl¹⁰), introducing new topics; sometimes, there are also quotes from films (e.g. for *Lasting* [2013] directed by Jacek Borcuch there is a quote from the director), whose usefulness can be easily questioned. Proposed tasks include, for example: “Write a fairy tale for children on tolerance and otherness. Select the character/story yourself”. Given that this is addressed at teenagers at the peak of the difficult period of puberty, Warmuz-Warmuzińska’s proposition seems rather unsuitable. Selected films and accompanying questions vary in terms of seriousness and difficulty. For instance, in the case of *The Hunt* (2012, dir. Thomas Vinterberg), the questions – apart from those related to the motivation of the characters – also include such dilemmas as: “How should paedophiles be punished? Should they be allowed back into society after they have served their sentence?” (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2015, p. 113). Dry enumerating of questions, devoid of any additional commentary or introduction, especially with respect to such serious issues, seems potentially dangerous – the question above being a case in point. The author does not address the issue of the role and responsibility of the person conducting the session; she does not teach how to moderate a discussion and yet she proposes questions which are likely to provoke a rather stormy exchange of views, which could potentially culminate in verbal aggression. In this respect, not only the teacher is left alone here, helpless in the face of various ways of addressing the issue, but also students who may be forced to process difficult matters entirely on their own.

The layout of the chapter seems rather chaotic. Some films are supplemented with their own sets of questions, others are grouped. The author proposes the same questions for several films and/or entire cycles. New topics are not visually marked and finding them often requires browsing whole sections of the book. In addition, much space on the page is occupied by film posters or photos, which also makes the book difficult to navigate. The graphic design of the final subchapter, devoted to the topic of (self-)therapy of adults, is more reader-friendly, even though the division into cycles is repeated here. Still, questions proposed by the author can be confusing. Let me quote the example of *Lucy* (2014, dir. Luc Besson): “Do you believe that we only use one tiny portion of our brains?”, “What do you think about the director’s vision? Is this what a person using 100% of their brain power would do?”. “Do contemporary education and digitalisation kill creativity?” (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2015, p. 135). It is hard to say what purpose these questions are supposed to serve and how exactly they should support self-therapy. The author is also guilty of the serious mistake of making most of her questions “yes/no” type of questions, which limits their potential to stimulate reflection, or, in the case of group discussion, poses the risk that the conversation will die out after just a few remarks like “yes”, “no”, or “I don’t know”. The book ends with a list of

¹⁰ Demotywatory.pl – Polish website posting memes parodying motivational posters.

films which the author watched in 2014 and those that she anticipated. She also offers a commentary that film is a brilliant tool for therapy and education, because it is easily available (new productions coming to cinemas every week) and diverse; “it combines all kinds of art” and may raise many issues (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2015, p. 173).

Ewa Warmuz-Warmuzińska is by no means incompetent or inexperienced in working with film – she conducts the sessions of the Film Club in the Centre of Mental Health and Therapy of Addictions in Gliwice; in 2014 she also distinguished herself in the Central Cabinet for Film Education’s contest for film-based lesson plans. Both her books are obviously addressed at school teachers rather than therapists and educators – thus, the fact that both of them use the term “cinema therapy” and even combine two separate issues (cinema therapy and education) within one work seems to confirm my theory that it is a category often applied very freely in the Polish context. Additionally, both titles reveal the same dangers connected with this method. First of all, generally speaking, they belong in therapeutic discourse and self-help culture – also due to the fact that they are meant as guide books on how to educate children, teenagers and adults. To make matters worse, they do so in a very clumsy manner, not preparing the users to face potential difficulties resulting from raising complex and controversial issues. The second danger is connected precisely with undertaking such a task without having adequate education – and the two books discussed here certainly do not provide the reader with it, in spite of their promising titles.

Conclusion and the Problem of *Amelia* (2001, dir. Jean-Pierre Jeunet)

The examples discussed above reveal the terminological dilemmas surrounding the subject of cinema therapy. Most of them expose the problems plaguing not only the use of film as a therapeutic tool but also film education in Poland in general – films are generally treated as visual representations of stories. But focusing solely on plots and neglecting cinematic forms, treating them as random storytelling tools, results in a naïve interpretation of films. Interestingly, aesthetic devices making it more difficult to follow the plot usually earn films a bad reputation.¹¹ Significantly, in the 100 top rated films on Filmweb.pl some aspire to the status of masterpieces merely because they touch upon such tough subjects as intolerance, sacrifice, suffering, death and redemption. This seems to prove my point that it is especially important to educate young people to be conscious and critical viewers, especially in a world dominated by audiovisual media. Understanding formal devices applied by film artists such as framing, editing, use of colour, music and genre clichés rather than focusing solely on the storyline would surely reorganise that list.

¹¹ One example is *Spring Breakers* (2012) directed by Harmony Korine, whose average rating on Filmweb.pl is 4.8 out of 10 (62,502 votes in total). Apart from some enthusiastic commentaries, it is possible to find very negative reviews: “The film is just awful. It’s hard to watch and it’s plain boring on top of that. Plots end after some ten seconds, before they even begin” (Filmweb.pl, 2013).

Amelia was one of the films selected by Małgorzata Kozubek together with volunteers and workers of Youth Socioterapy Centres in Wrocław for cinema therapy sessions. It was part of a group of films using fairy-tale-like storytelling techniques, along with *Penelope* (2006, dir. Mark Palansky), *Kytice* (2000, dir. F. A. Brabec) and *Spirited Away* (2001, dir. Hayao Miyazaki) (Kozubek, 2016b, p. 270). As Kozubek declared herself when she presented an evaluation of the entire project during a Think!Film discussion club session at the Faculty of Philology at the University of Łódź, organised by Koło Naukowe Filmoznawców [Film Studies Student Society] on 6 May 2016, the selection proved a failure. Formal devices disturbing realistic narrative turned out to be so problematic for the young viewers that the sessions only culminated in the group's dislike of the protagonist. The teenage viewers decided that Amelia "isn't nice and sweet at all, because she meddles in other people's affairs without being asked to do so". On the one hand, such arguments can be viewed as a therapeutic failure – there is no projection-identification, which is a prerequisite of the process. On the other hand, we should remember about the possibility of distancing oneself and rejecting the protagonist, which was described by Bałutowski – such a reaction can also lead to a fruitful discussion. What interested me most, however, was the fact that young and socially unadjusted people showed great intuition. They were not fooled by film devices that present the story of a (let's be honest) rather unlikeable character in such a way that the viewer becomes immersed in the half-magical world of the protagonist and judges Amelia in a very straightforward manner. What they concentrated on was the protagonist's ambivalence – a shift of focus which occurred probably because of the rather unusual storytelling technique and against the earlier assumptions of the therapist. Such an outcome is not taken into account at all in the questions proposed by Warmuz-Warmuzińska, who also included this film in one of her books, taking naïve interpretation for granted:

- How would you describe Amelia and her life?
- Why hasn't she got any friends?
- Does she feel lonely?
- What changes her life?
- How does she react after finding the box?
- How does she make people happy?
- What was Amelia's childhood like?
- Why did her parents isolate her?
- What is Amelia's father like?
- What changes after Amelia meets Nino?

- What is the atmosphere and setting of the film?
- Is the film fairytale-like? Does it help viewers forget reality for a bit? Do you think that small gestures can change people's lives? (Warmuz-Warmuzińska, 2013, p. 93)

We thus return to the question which I have already signalled. Of course, cinema therapy (or, in the light of the above examples, understanding cinema therapy as action) uses audiovisual messages merely as a tool; nevertheless, it is important to prepare viewers in such a way that they can approach the material in a critical manner and explore it fully. As a result, they will also educate their students/patients to be more conscious viewers. Films proposed by Warmuz-Warmuzińska (e. g. *Seven Pounds* [2008, dir. Gabriele Muccino], *Radio* [2003, dir. Michael Tollin], *The Boy in the Striped Pyjamas* [2008, dir. Mark Herman]) offer catharsis but through manipulating viewers' emotions, appealing to their sensitivity. This article is not the place, however, for debating ethicality of using certain clichés and simplifications in storytelling (such as figures of a dying child or an ostracised disabled man); nevertheless, it is worth reflecting what results using such films for therapeutic purposes may bring. As it can be seen from the example of *Amelia*, we should do our best to foster young people's attentiveness and sensitivity, relying on the works which can offer deeper critical experiences (than just those founded on cathartic models of emotionality) or prove intellectually stimulating. We can find positive examples in Poland – thanks to the Film Library, Educational Film Ambulance, Generator Foundation, Kinoterapia.pl and Marcin Kondraciuk with his Door Festival. We should remember that apart from performing educational functions, all these activities refer to the therapeutic role of films – as such, they belong to therapeutic culture and are not free from its ideological implications. Aside from performing the socialising function of a fairytale, films become a tool of the discourse of health and norms.

Here yet another issue arises: cinema therapy exposes the dire need for film education in Poland. Even though the users of Filmweb.pl can hardly be treated as representing the whole of society, it is worth taking a look at some of their discussions. Very often users are unable to justify their judgements (either positive or negative) in any constructive manner and, consequently, they are unable to conduct a discussion on films that wouldn't culminate in *ad hominem* arguments. Of course, it is difficult to decide whether this should be attributed to their lack of knowledge on films or rather inability to discuss and formulate arguments on any topic. It seems that both explanations are correct and both these mechanisms coexist, varying only in proportion. My intuition suggests that the problem of film education represents a larger problem of education in humanities in Poland. Focusing on canonical works and their prescriptive interpretations limits the possibility of expressing individual opinions, simultaneously fostering paradoxical solipsism. The system, based on state exams evaluating the student's progress at every level of education, relies on individual written answers which are supposed to comply with a non-negotiable answer key. In schools there is

not much scope for teaching students how to debate and discuss various issues – just as there is not much space for film and media education. In the era of the Internet and electronic communication these shortcomings are easily noticeable. They not only deepen social inequalities but also contribute to visual and media illiteracy.

Bibliography:

- Bałutowski, D. (2010). *Jak oglądać filmy z młodzieżą: film fabularny w psychoedukacji, terapii, profilaktyce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Fraszka Edukacyjna.
- Bałutowski, D. "Co ważne, a co ważne nie jest" – lekcja wychowawcza poświęcona problematyce wartości w oparciu o film Wojciecha Smarzowskiego *Wesele*. Filmotekaszkolna.pl. <http://www.filmotekaszkolna.pl/edukacja-filmowa-szczegoly,2172,from,71> (access: 15.07.2016).
- Badziukiewicz, B. *O związkach i małżeństwie – lekcja wychowawcza w oparciu o film Pas de deux Kingi Lewińskiej*. Filmotekaszkolna.pl. <http://www.filmotekaszkolna.pl/edukacja-filmowa-szczegoly,2179,from,71> (access: 15.07.2016).
- Borecka, I., Wontarowska-Roter, S. (2003). *Biblioterapia w edukacji dziecka niepełnosprawnego intelektualnie*. Wałbrzych: Wydawnictwo UNUS.
- Dermer, S. B. (2000). "Utilizing Movies in Family Therapy: Applications for Individuals, Couples and Families." *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, no. 28.
- EdukacjaFilmowa.pl. <http://www.edukacjaFilmowa.pl>.
- Ejsmont, A., Mańkowski, Ł. (2014). *Czym jest filmoterapia?* Kinoterapia.pl, 24 March. <http://kinoterapia.pl/2014/03/24/czym-jest-filmoterapia/> (access: 10.07.2016).
- Filmotekaszkolna.pl. <http://www.filmotekaszkolna.pl>.
- Filmweb.pl. <http://www.filmweb.pl/>. <http://www.filmweb.pl/film/Spring+Breakers-2012-639024/discussion/H%C4%98,2177646>, (access: 16.10.2016).
- Haltof, M. (1985). "Kinoterapia – przeżyjmy katastrofę." *Kino*, no. 9.
- Hay, L. L. (1992). *Możesz uzdrowić swoje życie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Medium.
- Jacyno, M. (2007). *Kultura indywidualizmu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Kędzierska, J. (2005). "Fenomen współczesnych poradników: przyczyny społeczno-kulturowe." *Kultura współczesna*, no. 3 (45).
- Kondraciuk, M. *Krótką historia*. <http://filmoterapia.gkf.com.pl/page,6,strona,filmoterapia.html> (access: 16.07.2016).
- Kondraciuk, M. (2014). *Największą przeszkodą dla osoby niepełnosprawnej jest osoba zdrowa* (interview). Kinoterapia.pl, 1 February. <http://kinoterapia.pl/2014/02/01/najwieksza-przeszkoda-dla-osoby-niepelnosprawnej-jest-osoba-zdrowa/> (access: 16.07.2016).
- Kozubek, M. (2014). *Filmoterapia – teoria i praktyka* (interview). Kinoterapia.pl, 26 March. <http://kinoterapia.pl/2014/03/26/filmoterapia-teoria-i-praktyka/> (access: 15.09.2016).
- Kozubek, M. (2016a). Discussion during a ThinkFilm discussion club meeting, 6 May.
- Kozubek, M. (2016b). *Filmoterapia*. Gdańsk: Słowo/obraz terytoria.
- Milanowska, K. (2003). *Kinezyterapia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Lekarskie PZWL.
- Olchanowski, T. (2016). *Kultura manii*. Warszawa: Eneteia.
- Rubin, H. E., Katz, E. (1946). "Auraton Films for the Treatment of Psychotic Depressions in an Army General Hospital." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, no. 2.

Salecl, R. (2013). *Tyrania wyboru* (transl. Barbara Szalewa). Warszawa: Krytyka Polityczna.

Warmuz-Warmuzińska, E. (2013). *Filmoterapia w edukacji i terapii dzieci i młodzieży szkolnej oraz dorosłych*. Warszawa: Difin.

Warmuz-Warmuzińska, E. (2015). *Filmoterapia. Scenariusze zajęć w edukacji filmowej dzieci i dorosłych*. Warszawa: Difin.

Wawrzyn, K. (2007). "Film jako materiał terapeutyczny wykorzystywany w pedagogice specjalnej." Psychiatry and Film Conference, Department of Special Education, University of Lower Silesia (23–24 November 2007), 23 November. <http://www.dzieciecegraffiti.pl/index.php?action=readmore&idc=15&id=168&print=1> (access: 15.07.2016).

Zembowicz, L. (2016). *Filmoterapia, czyli psychoedukacja poprzez film*. Meeting during the Transatlantyk Festival, 30 June.

Summary

The author analyses activities described as film therapy in Poland, emphasising the fact that in their description the term is often overused (most of them use film as a tool in school and social education or even rehabilitation, without any connection to therapy as a psychological and psychiatric method), which can cause some perplexity among those interested in the topic. The author also discusses the ideological implications of the method, inscribing it in the context of therapeutic culture and referring to Polish publications about film therapy, as they are potential signposts for those looking for information on the issue. This leads to the conclusion that film therapy can be seen as a part of film and media education in Poland, that favours the utilisable and reducing approach to cinema. Visible, especially on internet film forums, is an urgent need to educate the viewers, which reveals an even broader problem (that will be only briefly mentioned) – humanities education in general.

Keywords: film literacy, film education