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Every time a film is shot, privacy is violated.
(Jean Rouch, 2003, p. 88)

Abstract

This thesis focus on ethical issues within documentary filmmaking in the largest broadcasting institution in Denmark. It is a case study of the documentary serial Generation Hollywood, produced by Danmarks Radio (DR) in 2016. DR has produced many documentaries, using same style and format as in Generation Hollywood. But something is different with this one, and the thesis aims to find out why this one stands out, from the presumption that ethical issues are involved. It examines the participants’ motives and expectations, DR’s intentions and how ethical issues affected the final product. In the attempt to understand the complexity of ethics, a small sample of interviews are conducted and analyzed and presented together with a partial content analysis. The notions of truth, authenticity, and representation are applied as the theoretical framework to understand: not merely ethical procedures, but underlying feelings possessed by the participants.

The thesis brings to light that ethical issues are not only embedded in already established procedures but also caused by unforeseen circumstances and participants’ motives in relation to the project. The research shows how ethical issues affect the final representation, especially concerning authenticity. It also shows how a discrepancy between intentions and expectations, and the understanding of truth (in its start-up phase) impacts the process. Furthermore, it concludes that entertainment demands and modern technology can affect how filmmakers treat people when representing them and it explains how the line between the modern ‘everyday life’ documentary and Reality TV is seemingly blurred.
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1. Introduction

I have watched the majority of the documentaries from DR3 (Danish Radio’s youth channel) with great interest as they succeed in seducing me with their subjects and themes. They appear truthful and authentic in their representation of the subjects in their journeys and struggles to reach their goal, whether it is personal or professional. But even though I have enjoyed watching, I have always wondered, what makes them so special? And the biggest wonder: How do these young people feel about participating and the way they are represented in the final product? My primary motivation for writing on this topic comes from having observed, from the sideline, parts of the creation of one of these documentaries. I have worked as an actor, and I was a part of an acting agency called Panorama Agency. My colleagues and I were asked if we wanted to participate in a documentary that later got the title Generation Hollywood. I was not part of it, but I saw my colleagues’ eagerness and excitement for the project, but also the frustrations and skepticism. This insight has fostered my motivation for examining the topic further. In extension to my earlier wonder regarding the documentaries, there was something odd about this particular serial, something that was not right or as believable as the others. After discussing the program with several people, my wonder was confirmed, thus not caused by my relationship to the participants. This made my interest even greater: What made this one stand out?

With my thesis, I aim to research the relationship between the production team and the participants in Generation Hollywood. More specifically, I want to know if there are any ethical issues involved in the production and representation of the subjects. The topic is relevant as DR is the most significant public service institution we have in Denmark and with this comes responsibility. DR3 tends to create stories about young people who either want to achieve a somewhat difficult goal or are in a turbulent existence. In a time when image and achieving goals are of great importance, one can wonder if the social actors' motivation for participating matches the intentions of the filmmaker. DR is under a lot of pressure from the government and because of its position in the media landscape, they have always been expected to deliver quality content and new productions rapidly, whether its drama, entertainment, news, documentaries or reportages. One can wonder if the speedup in production consequently
means neglecting ethics. Also, as I will argue, it is always relevant to examine moral and ethics in documentaries as they work “somewhere between art, entertainment and journalism” (Vladica & Davis, 2008, p. 2) and involves social actors and their being in society. Furthermore, I have not been able to find previous research on the documentaries broadcasted on DR3.

Thus, my research questions are as follow:

- How did DR3 and the production team apply general ideas of ethics regarding *Generation Hollywood*?
- With what motivations and expectations did the participants enter the project and were they redeemed?
- How does the embedded ethical issues affect the final product?

The approach to answering these questions has been to conduct interviews with three participants, the producer, and the editor in chief. Afterward, I have conducted a content analysis of parts of the documentary serial. In the subsequent section, I will outline the context in which *Generation Hollywood* was created. Then, I will focus on the theory. By reviewing existing research, I have created a framework for my analysis under four overall themes; *Truth* (Butchart, 2006; Spence & Navarro, 2011), *Authenticity* (Landesman, 2008; Hill, 2007), *Representation* (Beattie, 2004; Smaill, 2010) and *Ethics* (Nichols, 2017; Rothwell, 2008). Subsequently, I will describe the data and methods I have used for my research as well as my ethical concerns. From there, I will move on to the analysis which will be connected with my chosen theory. Finally, I will draw some conclusions and provide answers to my research questions.
2. Context

Some general background and information about DR as an institution is relevant to understand in which settings *Generation Hollywood* was created.

**Danmarks Radio**
As the name also implies, Danmarks Radio (DR) started as a radio channel and was the first of its kind in Denmark when they had their first transmission in 1925 (Dohrmann, 2016). In 1951 the first TV program premiered and DR had the monopoly until 1988 where the competing channel TV2 started transmitting (Bang, 2015). Since their beginning, they have continued adding new channels, both to radio and TV and they have a wide selection of programs that embrace the whole audience in Denmark. DR is the largest provider of public service in the Danish media landscape and is organized as an independent public institution which is fully licensed. According to the Ministry of Culture’s (Kulturministeriet, 2018) website, they must apply to following:

> DR must ensure a wide range of programs and services for the entire population via television, radio, internet and other relevant platforms. The offer must include news dissemination, enlightenment, teaching in the form of education and learning, arts and entertainment (op. cit.) [my translation].

Every fourth year a new media settlement is made, including the public service agreement, and DR has been pressured to make budget cuts in the past. Now a new media settlement, which will take effect from January 2019, requires DR to cut 20% from their current budget, which means 773 million DKR, and remove two of their in total six TV channels, among other things (Holst & Pagh-Schlegel, 2018; Regeringen, 2018). Which effects the consequences of the settlement will actually have are not clear, but DR has been under pressure for quite a while now. I presume it is the most respected and reliable media source among the Danes and according to Danmarks Statistik (2018) (Statistics of Denmark), it is, with all its channels, also the most used, through the years.
Ethics

DR is transparent with their ethical mindset, and on their website one can find not only corrections for newly added content but also 95 pages of ethical guidelines (DRs Etik, 2018). In the past, they have not had many significant scandals, but some programs have been criticized. For example, right-winged politicians criticized Danmarkshistorien, a program about Denmark’s history, for being unilateral when narrating the resistance movement under World War 2 (Ritzau, 2017). Another is a documentary called Den Hemmelige Krig (The Secret War) which follows the Special Forces from Denmark in Afghanistan in 2002. It was criticized by the government among others, because of its hybrid mode, applying an interplay between reality and fiction (Albæk et al., 2007). A third example, which can be categorized as highly critical concerning ethics, is the experimental documentary serial from DR3 called POV where the camera is attached to the body of the leading characters who are kept anonymous. In one of the trailers, they failed to hide the identity of the leading character, a nymphomaniac, creating an internal investigation of DR’s procedures (Ryde, 2016).

DR and Documentaries

Television documentary has always been a considerable part of DR’s content. One can speak of a public service-tradition where independent production companies got work commissioned from both the private and public sector (Bondebjerg, 2008). Around the year 2000, a significant shift occurred in the Danish TV documentary tradition, and the genre started experimenting with aesthetics from the world of fiction (op. cit.). Documentaries were not merely factual programs anymore, but subcategories emerged and emphasized their capability to be both entertaining and tell the good story. One of the subcategories is “hverdagsdokumentaren” (op. cit., p. 509), documentaries about everyday life, which dominates the broadcasting at DR. They deal with individuals who are undergoing a process of change in one way or another and can in some cases use a degree of staging.

Now DR has three channels that all, among other things, broadcasts documentaries but with slightly different approaches. DRK is focusing on history and culture, DR2 on society, politics and debates and lastly there is DR3 which targets the youth in Denmark.
DR3

DR3 is five years old, and according to DR’s website (Dohrmann, 2016), DR3 is a channel that seeks to challenge and entertain the younger audiences:

DR3 is an innovative and experimental television channel that counters the flow of programs, specifically aimed at the younger part of the population. On DR3 there is room for new talents and program formats. Here you can see high quality of both fiction and facts, be provoked and inspired for debate and innovation through satire, science, reality and documentary (op. cit.) [my translation].

The channel is constructed by a channel administration which is organized under what is called DR Media, consisting of the chief of channel, two editors and a project manager. They order and buy content from different production departments, one being DR UNG which delivers approximately half of the Danish content (Erik Hansen, Editor in Chief at DR UNG, phone conversation, 2018). DR3 ordered Generation Hollywood from DR UNG as I will refer to as DR in my analysis. Their documentaries usually deal with the everyday life of young people, as described with “hverdagsdokumentaren” above and their target group is age 15-40. The overall goal is to paint a picture of how it is to be young in today's Denmark. They work with a clear premise in every program and wants to speak to a broad audience (op. cit.). Usually, they deal with groups of individuals who want to achieve something, either personally or professionally in their lives and their struggles with doing so. Hansen explains how they want to focus on the individuals and want the audience to relate to them rather than the goals. For example, they made a documentary serial called I Forreste Række (In Front Row) where they followed professional ballet dancers from The Royal Ballet in Copenhagen. From the very beginning it was important for DR3 not to make the serial about ballet, but about individuals who strive for excellence - as this is also a general tendency they see in the generation they want to target.

My perception of the channel is that their identity is built up around the documentary serials which all follow the same format and style. They are always up for great discussion, and the persons they portray usually divide the viewers.
3. Theory and existing research

Research landscape
Documentary is a relatively young craft but has been a subject of research since its very beginning. Scholarship about documentaries involves both how to analyze content and how films are received and used and, especially, the complexities regarding their claim to truthfulness about the world (Aufderheide, 2007). It also involves ethics, and what to do with people when filming them. Even though it is a complex field with many different genres, modes, and styles among other things, there are some ideas, but not rules, which applies to the overall discourse of documentary.

In my search for theories, I have found material concerning both independent filmmakers and television documentaries produced by larger TV institutions. Immediately, it would make the most sense to draw on knowledge about TV documentary, and I acknowledge the scholarship regarding the subject. But in this research, I have found it to be more useful to mainly benefit from the understanding of scholars concerning independent films. They seem to reach an understanding on a deeper level and do not merely concentrate on the overall procedures and historical timeline, but stresses the relationship between the maker, camera, and subject which is mainly my focus. At the same time, it is essential to emphasize the significance of the context I have described in the previous section and I do have this in mind when conducting my analysis. I am entering a field that seemingly is researched thoroughly from all aspects of its complexity. Therefore, the following reviews and presentation of the theoretical framework are not merely to distinguish my research from others in the field, but also to identify themes that will benefit my research and narrow down the broad field of ethical issues.

Truth
In his identification of three main ethical problems, in On Ethics and Documentary: A Real and Actual Truth Garnet C. Butchart (2006) argues that they all relate to our ideas about truth. He explains how the problem of objectivity concerns the idea that the camera does not lie, that there must be some truth to the scene that unfolds. This hinges with the issue of the “audience’s right to know” as this means the camera actually can
lie and that the truth may be subject to “concealment, distortion, or outright fakery in the illusion created by the image maker” (p. 429). And lastly, it also concerns the problem of participant consent because it involves the idea that there is “some kind of truth behind the negotiations that led up to (the) documentary production” (p. 429). He relies on Badiou’s philosophical system and explains it by saying: “the truth is what holds together a specific set of elements in a given context and configures them in a particular way. Badiou calls this configuration a situation and explains it as “a specific arrangement of elements in a specific place and time. In a given situation, the truth is what applies to each and every element included within it”. (p. 433).

Spence & Navarro (2011) also acknowledge that the very notion of truth can be seen as a philosophical concept. But instead of following the idea they turn to legal scholar Richard K. Sherwin who distinguishes three kinds of truth: factual truth, a higher truth, and symbolic truth and transfer his thoughts to documentary film (p. 22) - factual truth being the observable truth, the higher truth being more abstract and concerning principles that supersede facts, and lastly the symbolic truth concerning our common knowledge and social values. The latter links to Butchart’s (2006) idea about audience’s right to know, as it stresses that documentarians must in some way remain socially responsible and the text must be representative of what it claims. Even though truth can be dealt with from different perspectives, they do have in common that they all want to say something about the world and “they want to be trusted by their audience” (Spence & Navarro, 2011, p. 13). This truth can occur more or less valid. They give an example of a contribution to the film’s claims of truth where a certain event would have taken place independent of the presence of the camera. Here the camera becomes a witness to the occurrence: “a sort of internal or surrogate audience” (p. 13). This is what Corner (2001, cited in Beattie, 2004) calls observational realism, a style that suggests the events we are viewing are beyond the intervention of the filmmaker.

Authenticity
Ohad Landesman (2008) discusses in his article, *In and out of this world: digital video and the aesthetics of realism in the new hybrid documentary*, in which ways the digital
cinematography contributes to the challenging interplay between reality and fiction. Even though my case study does not concern hybrid documentary films, his discussion about authenticity is still interesting for my research. He sees authenticity as part of the discussion on new aesthetic grounds formulated by cultivating a style of constructed camcorder realism (op.cit.). According to Landesman, a style can authenticate the content of a film - and in a deceitful way. He argues how the documentary facet in hybrid films becomes less of a clear genre indicator and more of an aesthetic strategy by which a filmmaker can choose to indicate familiar notions of authenticity (op.cit., p. 41). The aesthetic illusion of authenticity, I will argue, is not only seen in the hybrid documentary films, but in a variety of films that claims factuality. Annette Hill (2007) argues how factual television is a container for nonfiction content and that, for most people, it is concerned with “knowledge about the real world” (p. 3). Whereas Landesman sees authenticity as an aesthetic tool used by the filmmaker to create realism, Hill argues that the content is perceived authentic and true to life because it is factual. She also contends that factual television is performative and reflexive - and it is from this frame that audiences judge and question the claim of authenticity and truth as well as the honesty of people participating in them (op.cit.). With this statement, authenticity is not merely a tool of the filmmaker but also involves the filmed participants. How audiences perceive authenticity is determined by which kind of factual TV they are watching. For instance, most audiences regard reality TV as entertainment and do not perceive the performance as true or authentic (op.cit.).

In my review of the subject, I got familiar with two key terms that will serve my analysis. The first is profilmic reality which concerns the recorded world in front of the camera’s lens. Spence & Navarro (2011) argue that because the camera can capture things as they happen, it is frequently considered to provide an authentic record of what was in front of the camera. On the other hand, one can argue that there is also a lot going on offscreen, which the camera does not capture. The other term is DV Realism which is referring to a documentary style with handheld DV cameras, and it is one of the “recent aesthetic emphasis put on the authenticity of actors’ performances by independent film-makers” (Landesman, 2008, p. 34). Even though Spence & Navarro do not call it by the same name, they too mention the handheld style and speak about it
as an “authenticating tool” (Spence & Navarro, 2011, p. 18) that creates a mode where the sounds and images speak for themselves. It is somehow also a truth claim as it indicates that the events we are watching actually happened and that they happened just the way we see and hear them.

**Representation**

According to Keith Beattie (2004), representation concerns style, conventions and modes and can be defined as “an interpretation of physical reality, (and) not a mere reflection of pre-existent reality” (p. 13). With this statement, I will argue, he points to an understanding of representation as being not factual. He explains how the interpretation and manipulation of reality are present at all stages in the process. How the presence of a camera and other technical equipment is likely affecting the world being filmed, how the raw footage is manipulated in the editing process, and, finally, how the edited film is also subject to interpretation when producing texts for the promotion of the film (op.cit.). From this, one can argue, that representation is the transformation of reality from one stage to another, these stages being the *putative reality*, how the world is understood without the presence of the camera; the *profilmic reality*, as described in the section above; and the *screened reality* (Corner, 1996, p. 21, cited in Beattie, 2004, p. 14).

Whereas Beattie’s description of the representation process can serve my analysis in understanding the conventions and circumstances in documentary making, I am also interested in the inner life of the represented individuals. Belinda Smaill (2010) investigates how individuals, in some instances the filmmakers and others, those who are filmed, are positioned by representation as subjects that are entrenched in the emotions, whether it is pleasure, hope, pain, empathy or disgust (p. 3). She argues how documentaries can harness and uniquely focus emotions in the social world and the individuals they represent. What is particularly interesting in her writing, is how she relates to emotions being “(the) key to representation of filmic subjects and the construction of intersubjectivity in film” (p. 18). She argues how representations frame the filmed individuals as social agents, and as they are socially conditioned selves, they must be viewed as subjects in the text. This means we cannot consider them as objects
as they have motives that reach beyond our understandings of them. Subjects in documentary films may have desires that are not immediately visible to the viewer, for example, self-actualization, success or recognition. An examination around whether the representation processes, as described by Beattie, and the subjects’ desires and motives affect each other (and with what result) is a compelling analytical question to take with me.

To contextualize the above, I turn to Bill Nichols (2017) to understand the overall mode of representation I am dealing with as his formulation is particularly useful as an analytical framework. In his latest book *Introduction to Documentary* (2017), he presents six modes of representation: *Poetic, Expository, Reflexive, Observational, Participatory* and *Performative mode*. Two of them is interesting for me; the observational and the participatory modes. The observational mode is honoring the spirit of observing events, both during shooting and in postproduction, by not adding voice-over, supplementary sound effects, no behavior repeated for the camera and it also rules out interviews (op. cit.). The camera becomes a fly on the wall. The participatory mode, on the contrary, welcomes interaction between the filmmaker and his or her subject which often means interviews and conversations (op. cit.). It is important to mention that one mode does not exclude another and even though Nichols explains the modes in a historical timeline of documentary representation, all six are used when needed. Beattie (2004) describes how perceptions of reality have changed over decades and therefore also have changed in style and mode. I will argue that how we perceive reality or realism in documentary film is not only determined by decades or eras, but is also interconnected to our understanding of the filmmaker, or in this case institution. Nichols (2017) confirm my argument by saying that the audience usually possess presumptions and expectations to a film, and the filmmaker or institution needs to find a way to persuade and activate the audience (op.cit.).

**Ethics**

The discussion around truth, authenticity, and representation, interrelates all three under ethic as a broader phenomenon. Regarding truth, an ethical issue arises when the filmmaker and his or her subject does not have the same presumption of truth. In
Butchart’s (2006) attempt to identify truth, he emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between ethics and moral. Though I acknowledge his stance, my understanding of ethical behavior is that it concerns the application of key moral norms as Collins (2010) explains it. When speaking about authenticity, I also identify ethical issues in using authenticity as a tool in an aesthetic strategy. And lastly, ethical issues are embedded in representation as it concerns interpretation of socially conditioned subjects. Ethical issues can be identified in various relationships between individuals in documentary production and, in my case, I am interested in the relationship between the filmmakers and their subjects.

Bill Nichols (2017) asks “What do we do with people when we make documentary?” (p. 31). He argues that we need to speak about ethical issues as the photographic image contains a power that we should not underestimate. The power of the image stresses the power relation between the filmmaker and his or her subject. He emphasizes how an image cannot tell us everything we want to know about what happened and that “images can be altered both during and after the fact by both conventional and digital techniques” (p. 29). He speaks about The Ethics of Representing Others and the problematic view on the role of the participants because these are not professional actors, but social actors, which means the employment is underlying special circumstances. The social actors rarely get compensated, and their values reside in the way “which their everyday behavior and personality serve the needs of the filmmaker” (p. 31). Usually they sign a release, which gives the filmmaker right to use the material in whatever way he or she chooses, leaving the social actors with no rights if they should disapprove of the result. The release serves as a legal form, but despite this, some participants may end up feeling used. The filmmaker has to be concerned about his or her responsibility for the effects of his or her actions on the lives of those filmed (p. 33). Is it, for example, their responsibility to tell those filmed that they risk making a fool of themselves? (p. 36). The social actor, on the other hand, has to be aware that he or she is not to act in a film but to be in a film and be concerned about how they will be presented and if they are ready for the consequences.

Jerry Rothwell (2008) explains in Filmmaker and Their Subjects, what he sees as the key to success in the relationship mentioned above between the filmmaker and,
what Nichols refers to as, social actors. He explains how success in that relationship “demands a responsibility for the consequences of the filmmaking that go beyond the film itself” (p. 155). Because the contemporary media is not constrained, filmed material has a much wider audience and can travel deeply into the private realm. He also argues that it often changes the social actor’s world which does not only include the near future (op. cit.). But at the same time, he also stresses the conflicting fact that the conventional legal and practical parameters of television documentary do acquit the filmmaker of all consequences (op. cit.). This emphasizes the existing power relation between the filmmaker and his or her subjects. Ilisa Barbash & Lucien Taylor (1997) describe how some filmmakers have responded to this ethical issue concerning power, by stressing the collaboration with their subjects. However, they emphasize the problem of collaboration as it can end up with the filmmaker compromising with the conception and aesthetic of the film (op. cit.). They are not alone in their concern about aesthetics contrasting with ethics. Rothwell (2008) explains how the filmmaker is not just a collector of images. “As a documentary maker you try to get underneath your subject’s performance, which may include putting the material in a context different from that originally intended by the subject” (p. 156). Immediately, I see this as highly problematic. It is worth mentioning that Rothwell himself is a documentary filmmaker, which can reason his perspective on this matter.

Summary
Summarizing theory, I have chosen four overall themes to function as my analytical framework. The four themes are interrelated, and all contribute to the understanding of the relation between DR and the participants and the serial as a whole. The discussion about truth and the different perspectives you see, is interesting as it can help to understand if the social actors and DR have had the same idea about truth. And, if not, if the different understandings of the concept can have caused a discrepancy in intentions and expectations. In my reference work on authenticity, I am interested in the term used, not only as an aesthetic tool or style but also how the framing of the serial can affect the perception of authenticity. Regarding representation, I want to see how the two different modes, presented by Nichols, connect in the serial. I also want to combine Beattie’s technical approach to the theme together with Smaill’s emphasis on the subjects'
emotions, to gain a holistic picture of the representation. And lastly, when it comes to the overall question about ethics, Bill Nichols’ distinction between social actors and professional actors can be especially helpful in answering my research question, as I am dealing with social actors who are professional, or aspiring, actors in the real world. The different meaning of the two kinds of actors is compelling to my analysis as a presumption could be that it has affected the relationship between the filmmaker and the subjects. The conflict within the filmmakers choice of aesthetic and ethics can also serve to understand underlying acts and feelings, together with the notion of power relations.
4. Methodology and Data

As my thesis concerns a study of a specific documentary serial, I have chosen a qualitative approach to my method. In the following section, I will describe my use of semi-structured interviews and content analysis of the documentary serial.

By using these two methods, I aim to understand “the subjective reality (of the social actors) and understand their motivations and actions in a meaningful way” (Collins, 2010, p. 37). According to Gillian Rose (2001), the visual methodology is about interpretation and according to Mackenzie & Knipe (2006) “the interpretivist researcher tends to rely upon the participants’ views of the situation being studied and recognizes the impact on the research of their own background and experiences” (p. 2). Therefore I see interpretivism as an ideal choice for a paradigmatic framework.

Interviews
I have chosen to conduct qualitative interviews to understand the motivations and expectations of the social actors and also DR UNG (DR) who has produced the serial. I aimed for semi-structured interviews. The semi-structured approach allowed me to be in control throughout the interview, but with a scope for the respondents to express themselves in detail if needed (Collins, 2010). Concerning the social actors, I aimed for a narrative approach “with each actor’s voice being the centric of their own social context” (Collins, 2010, p. 142). This method, as every method, has its limitations that I, as a researcher, must take into consideration. The semi-structured approach led to questions that did not get answered in every interview, thus the data can become incomparable to some extent. Also, as I will explain further in the next section, the interviewees obtained different roles and are by nature not compatible, and the narrative approach with the social actors again led to further distinction. Therefore, the five interviews I conducted turned out very differently.

Sample
Concerning the social actors, I interviewed three of the in total six actors from the documentary serial. It is quite a small sample, but as I viewed the serial, I concluded it
would not benefit my research to include more actors. The representation and narratives start to repeat itself beyond the chosen, and I picked these three as their experiences occur different from each other, thus my assumption is that I will gain diversity. They are between 19-26 years old, have all watched previous documentaries with the same format from the same TV-station, and it is the first time they appear on TV as social actors and not professional actors. Furthermore, I conducted interviews with Erik Hansen who is the editor in chief at DR UNG and Rikke Frøbert, the producer of Generation Hollywood. Whereas the focus was on the individual stories in the previous interviews, these two were concerned with how the overall institution and production team relates to ethics regarding the young social actors. Hansen did not have direct contact with the production but helped me to understand the identity of the channel and the purpose of the documentary. Frøbert, on the other hand, was in charge of the serial and therefore plays an important role. Because they have different positions in the institution, these interviews also differed in questions and answers. There is a third component related to the documentary serial that I, unfortunately, did not get a chance to interview: Panorama Agency, where the actors are signed, had a person functioning as a link between the actors and DR. She took part in planning and coordinating, and angling the stories they wanted to tell with the actors. Because she signed a confidentiality agreement with the agency concerning the shooting of the documentary, she did not wanted to participate. This is, of course, unfortunate as I would have gained useful knowledge.

Conduct
Due to the fact that all the interviewees live in Denmark, and I was situated in France at the time of the interviews, I conducted them via Skype. It is not optimal but is a solution which comes closest to the personal interview that gives the greatest opportunity for observation and visual aids (Collins, 2010). The interviews with the social actors were done with a video call, while the interviews with Hansen, the editor in chief, and Frøbert, the producer, were voice calls. Even though the voice call is less personal than a video call, I still feel I got useful answers. The flow of the interview was of higher quality with the video call as the body language and facial impressions limited unnecessary interruptions of each other. I recorded all of the interviews with a separate
voice recorder on my computer. I had briefly written an introduction to my research in
the email where I requested the interviews, so the interviewees were prepared on the
subject and my motivation. The semi-structured interview questions were not always
asked in the same order, as the freedom I wanted the interviewees to have while
speaking, sometimes led to other ways and sometimes to follow-up questions. It was
even true when interviewing the social actors as their narratives where different
from each other.

After conducting all the interviews, I needed to identify patterns and similarities
to use the data in my analysis. My primary focus here was the interviews with the
actors, and the interviews with Frøbert and Hansen were used afterwards to draw
conclusions on intentions and expectations. I wanted to do a thematic analysis and was
inspired by Jodi Aronson’s (1994) outline of the process and six phases presented by
Virginia Braun & Victoria Clarke (2008). First, I re-listened to the interviews, writing
down my initial ideas about what is interesting about the data. Then, I started producing
initial codes from the data to organize it into meaningful groups (op. cit.). Thirdly, I
began to sort the different codes into potential sub-themes, placing them under the main
overarching themes from my theoretical framework. After deciding on this, I reviewed
and refined the interviews and lastly I named the themes to conduct the final analysis. It
is important to mention that the interviews with the actors were conducted in English
and the interviews with the representatives from DR were in Danish. I allowed myself
to translate the Danish interviews in my analysis.

Content Analysis
After analyzing the interviews, I conducted a content analysis of certain scenes in the
documentary serial. This is a beneficial method for my research as a content analysis “is
a way of understanding the symbolic qualities of texts” (Krippendorf 1980, cited in
Rose, 2001, p. 55). Flick (2009) also justifies this method as “the interpretation serves
to validate the truth claims that the film makes about reality” (p. 247). Whereas Rose
has a quantitative approach she also emphasizes that a qualitative interpretation can be
included (Rose, 2001), which is my intention with the method. The aim with the
analysis is to identify the four themes, explained in the theoretical framework, within
the three interviewed social actors narratives.
There are several limitations, or challenges, of the method to be aware of. One problem is the fact that it is flexible and there is no “right” way of conducting it (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008), thus it is up to me to identify and choose what is most appropriate for my particular problem. This applies in my case as the narrative material I am analyzing is not linear - thus it is not possible for me to conduct an analysis of one episode from the beginning to end. A significant limitation of the method is the fact that the film maker constructs versions of reality as to how he or she sees it and I as a researcher may interpret the material in a different way than intended by its creator. For this reason, film analyses are rarely used as a genuine strategy, but rather as an addition to other methods (Flick, 2009).

Sample
I conducted the content analysis after analyzing the interviews first (in order to understand the actors overall experiences) to be able to draw examples from the film afterwards. Therefore I interpret from the beginning as my preconception of the film is not only affected by my personal experiences but also by my understanding of the individuals, thus it would be naive to attempt an objective observation as Rose suggests as a starting point (Rose, 2001). My sample in this matter is determined by the interviewed participants’ narratives (referred to as N, M, and J) in the documentary serial Generation Hollywood, which is available at the website of the channel (Generation Hollywood, 2017). The actors do not appear in every episode and the individual stories vary in “screen time”. Therefore, instead of analyzing a particular episode, I have chosen to examine the narratives of the three interviewed actors which involve partly analyzing episodes 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. My argument here is that by focusing on the individual stories rather than a whole episode, I develop a greater understanding of the involved actors - that will benefit my interpretive research better.

Conduct
To conduct my analysis, I have been searching for an approach that would both grasp the narration of the actors and the themes described in my theoretical framework. Furthermore, even though the theoretical themes should function as a framework, it was also important not to violate the nature of the content at hand (Fields, 1988). To
systematize my analyze, I was inspired by Echo E. Fields (1988) and his techniques as presented in *Qualitative Content Analysis of Television News: Systematic Techniques*. He conducts an analysis of television news and I found the method to be useful in this case too. I have made some modifications though to accommodate this particular media content. He breaks the process down in eight stages; 1. unitizing content, 2. transcription, 3. developing and using categories, 4. verbal analysis, 5. vocal and expressive analysis, 6. scene composition analysis, 7 describing interplay of components and 8. Toward explanation (Fields, 1988, p. 184). The actors appear in different episodes of the serial, thus I started with identifying their appearances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Overview of appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From there, focusing on each actor, I ended up with three individual and wholesome stories regardless of the episodes. After identifying the narratives, I could start Fields’ analytical phases. I define a unit to be the portion of content where a sub narration with one of the actors begins and ends. So, the *unitizing* in my case consisted of identifying these sub narrations. Then I *transcribed* both the visual and verbal content of the units and made a brief description of scene composition and changes. As my intentions with the content analysis is to understand the overall mode and identify representation issues, *developing and using categories*, became *identifying and choosing specific units*. I then merged stage 4 and 5 in Fields’ approach and conducted a *verbal and expressive analysis* in the chosen units. *Vocal analysis*, and what it implies, is not relevant in this case but suitable for analyzing television news as it examines the objectivity and how journalists try to minimize inflection and expression (op. cit.). If there was anything
notable regarding the vocal, I have noted it in my verbal and expressive analysis. The scene composition analysis involved the technical matters in the unit, where different elements were identified, such as camera angle, the distance of the camera and music. The description of the interplay of message elements meant to view all the data from the former stages as a whole. Lastly, Toward explanation is the final analysis, where I also use my knowledge from the interviews.
5. Ethical Implications

Before conducting and analyzing the interviews and the content, I have considered the ethical issues that can occur with these methods. Due to my relation to the social actors involved, it has been particularly important for me that they felt respected and treated properly. Orb et. al. (2001) argue that embedded in qualitative research are the “concepts of relationships and power between researchers and participants” (p. 93). I have been conscious of this factor. There was a natural trust between us due to our relation as former colleagues. Of course it is unethical to take an advantage of this trust, thus I was conscious not to put words in to their mouths, nor ask leading questions to encourage the desired answer as this could place the actors in an uncomfortable position. I also discussed anonymity with them. I made it clear to the participants they would be anonymous if they wished, but I also knew this would affect my analysis radically as it would complicate the process of drawing examples from their narratives. As my sample consists of 50% of the serial’s actors, they are easily identifiable. In my favor, none of them demanded full anonymity and we agreed on me drawing examples, but not to use their full name in the thesis, thus they are called N, M, and J.

The interviews with Hansen and Frøbert had a different mood than the ones with the social actors. One of the primary ethical considerations with interviews is not to use the data gathered to harm the interviewee (Qu & Dumay, 2011). When conducting the interviews, I got a strong feeling that they were afraid of the consequences of my research - so it was important I clarified I was not researching their intentions and ethical stances to cause harm to neither them nor the institution. Whereas the interview with Erik stayed somewhat superficial, and it might be influenced by his position in the institution and the fact that he had not had any personal contact with the actors in the serial, my discussion with Rikke became truthful and at times even confidential after this clarification. In order for her to feel safe, I suggested that she explicitly stated whenever she found herself saying something she did not want to be disclosed, and I also offered her a read-through of certain subjects.

Even though the content I analyzed is accessible to the public (premiered in February 2017, rebroadcasted January 2018 and now available at DR3’s web channel until June 2019 (Generation Hollywood, 2017)), it would not be ethical of me to...
disclose my analyses of the narratives, without given consent. I got this consent when interviewing the participants, and they are aware of my intentions of analyzing the content. During the serial, the involved participants interact with others, thus I had to take their appearance into account. Furthermore, just because I have the consent does not mean I can do with it as I please. Research ethics is a complex area and do not have any hard and fast rules beyond copyright laws (Rose, 2016). I therefore also have to rely on my moral framework when shaping my research.

I believe that I have conducted both methods respectfully to ensure validity. The internal validity is established by using both interviews and content analysis as methods to secure truth value between what is said and what is shown. Regarding the interviews, all interviewees agreed on me returning to them with follow up questions and validation if needed, which I did. As this is a qualitative research, the validity relies on me as a researcher and the participants’ thoughts and experiences within the framework of theories I find credible.
6. Analysis and Findings

When I conducted the interviews with the actors, I had my theoretical themes in mind: Truth, Authenticity, Representation and Ethics. Thus the sub-themes which emerged, relate to that: Expectations and Motivation, Collaboration with DR, The Actor’s Role and Representation. The sub-themes function, among others, as titles for sections in the analysis. My findings turned out to contain more diversity than I expected. I did not necessarily find any patterns (which of course, is also caused by the very small sample), but three different experiences of the same project. It became clear that the actors did not have the same cameraman/woman and had minimal contact with each other during and after the project. Therefore, I ended up with three individual narratives which demand me to also view their situations individually in the analysis and not merely compare them. From Hansen and Frøbert, I expected general thoughts and procedures regarding ethics, both overall in the institution and concerning Generation Hollywood. The interviews also show that they, especially Frøbert, has the same feeling about the serial as I do: It is not a typical DR3 case. Their interviews contribute to my analysis as a different point of view than the actors' experiences and help in clarifying some of the actors' emotions.

The content analysis resulted in a visualization of the three narratives, and as I had seen the serial beforehand, I already had an idea of which units I wanted to use in my analysis. After conducting the interviews, this partly changed. I intended to let the content analysis speak for itself, but instead, the content analysis consisted of analyzing examples the actors saw as problematic. This benefited my overall research and showed that even though ethics does not immediately seem to connect to the final product, the ethical issues somehow created tensions that affected the outcome.

I have divided my analysis in before, during and after the production. The interviews are used through the whole analysis, whereas the content analysis serves to exemplify in the last part.
Preproduction
The overall purpose with the interviews was to begin answering the first two research questions: how DR had applied their ethical guidelines as described on their website and to understand the participants’ motivations and expectations of being a part of the serial. As ethics are the overall theme of my research, the issues embedded will be presented and discussed through all the phases of the production. The following section will focus on which considerations DR had in the start-up phase and present findings which will serve as knowledge for further analysis. Subsequently, I will concentrate on the actors’ reasoning for being a part of the project.

The Ethical Guidelines
On DR’s website, you can find their ethical guidelines which is a 95 pages long document, concerning both internal and external ethics. They are based on DR’s values of “credibility, independence, versatility, diversity, quality, creativity, openness and responsibility” (DRs Etik, 2018, p. 8). Frøbert explains: “I have not read all the 95 pages of the ethics guidelines, it is more something we have in the back of our mind and that we act upon intuitively”. In the beginning, the production team carefully chose the actors they estimated to be a good fit for the programme. It concerned whether they are psychologically fragile and their agenda for being in the program. It also involved choosing the actors with the best-fitting story where they aimed for diversity and finding actors who are at different places in their career. With all their programmes, DR try to find the most recognizable and human stories, and Frøbert explains how they might not live up to their procedure in this particular case:

We chose a cast from what made most sense plot-wise instead of looking at who had interesting human qualities (...) Hindsight, we should have been less focused on where they were in their career because that is not what was interesting, the interesting is the human issues they all struggle with (...) Maybe they were not recognizable enough. Or we weren’t capable of getting it through.

The focus on the outer story, rather than the inner, turned out to have an impact on the further process and according to Frøbert it also let to the production team paying even more attention to ethical issues: “Regarding ethics, it is something we have worked
particularly thoroughly within this case as we presumed they might come across as uncongenial.” When I asked Hansen how they ensure that participants’ expectations match the final result, he explained: “First of all, at this point, people have seen a lot of the content from the channel, so we know that the participants roughly know what they are saying yes to and how we tell their story”. I will elaborate in the next section, how the participants had some expectations because they watched earlier programs. One can argue there is an ethical issue when a production team takes a different focus in the start-up phase than the usual - especially when those programs function as an example of what they can expect.

Afterward, they made a contract in collaboration with Panorama Agency (PA). Even though I was not able to interview people from PA, it became clear to me that their role had an impact on the production. It is, of course, the participants who sign the contract at the very end, but PA were gatekeepers as they would be under other circumstances where their clients are hired to do a job. In this instance, without compensation though. Subsequently, as Frøbert explains, DR tried to “prepare them by conversing with them about which story we want to tell with the individual. This can of course change because then comes reality, but we play with open cards”.

Motivation, Expectation, Intention
Two of the actors mentioned they saw other documentaries with the same format and style, thus they had high hopes and believed this serial would have the same appearance. J explains:

So because it was DR3, which is like really good TV and I'm a huge fan of their shows, one of the reasons I said yes was because I saw something they called De smukke drenge (The Beautiful Boys), about the model industry. I thought that was a very real picture of these boys. I thought they were very brave and very cool and it was a very relevant and a truthful way to show the aspects of modelling, and it was important for young boys and girls to show that it is not all that fancy, and that's what I wanted. I wanted to show that it is really hard and it takes a lot of work and ambition.

N agrees and adds: “I saw it as a great opportunity, I like the format so I had a clear expectation of what it could be.” M explains it by saying: “...for me, it was a very clear motivation about making an honest documentary about how the life is for someone
trying to become an actor." Besides the expectation of being represented as former participants, one of the actors also had a personal agenda beyond showing a true image of her struggle. J explains: “I also thought it would be good for publicity and I thought that I would maybe get more work from it.” This finding fostered my presumption of them being professional actors intervening with their role as social actors as Nichols (2017) describes it.

During my interviews with Frøbert and Hansen, it became clear to me that I not only had to consider DR’s intentions but also their expectations. Hansen explained to me how they require the participants to be “absolutely honest and they need to trust they can be that with us (…) When they are absolutely honest, it is crucial we respect how big a sacrifice that is and treat them correctly”. With this statement, I got the assumption that DR and the participants had the same expectations overall, and Frøbert explained further on their intentions: “We wanted to make a portrait of a generation who does not want to settle with a regular life. Where everyday life is not enough”. This intention, however, could be argued to conflict with the participants' idea about presenting an accurate picture of their situation. The notion about truth as a phenomenon that can be perceived in different ways (Spence & Navarro, 2011) is notable here, as DR and the actors might have had different ideas of truth already in the early phase of the project. DR’s intentions imply that something exciting is happening in the actors’ life, something beyond a normal life. The truth, when speaking with the actors, is different. N mentions how he was concerned about not being interesting enough and also explains:

They, of course, tried to paint a glamorous picture of it but let's just be honest, it is what it is. Yes, of course, someone is lucky and goes all 'Pilou’ or ‘Mads Mikkelsen’ [Danish actors succeeding internationally] on it, but it is far from most of us.

It became clear that the boredom and the waiting for castings, callbacks, and rejections was a significant part of the actors’ truth and important for them to show. Spence & Navarro (2011) argue that “for both documentary filmmakers and spectators, truthfulness seems to involve an effort to establish an unequivocal correspondence between representation and its referent” (p. 22). I will argue this also applies to the
participants and might not be the fact in this situation regarding the filmmakers. A reason for this could be found in the contextual environment the serial is created within. As mentioned in chapter 2, DR3 orders and buys content from production departments and Frøbert explains how they have already bought a certain premise before finding participants and the individual narratives. In extension she explains: “...then, after the shooting and you sit with the material in the editing room, it is often here you find out if it works or not and there was definitely some things missing here.” One can argue the institutional structure’s involvement consequently can have caused two different perceptions of truth. I am convinced this is not intended from DR3. But it is possible that they in their best belief have tried to force their truth because of the already sold concept.

During Production
The following section will concentrate on the circumstances during the shooting. First, I will elaborate on how being both a social and professional actor can be a problem. Then, I will focus on the overall collaboration between DR and the participants. Lastly, I will examine the third component in the production, Panorama Agency.

The Role of the Actor
As already implied, the distinction between social actor and professional actor are seemingly blurred in this case as the participants are both. During the interviews, the participants repeatedly referred to this issue. The serial is shifting between being filmed by cameramen/women and the actors filming themselves with a digital camera. Usually, the cameramen/women are shooting whenever there is a dialogue, or the actors are participating in some event, while the self-filming functions as a video diary. The video diary has become a common tool in television documentary (Rothwell, 2008) and features as an “intimate insight into what is happening to them” (op.cit., p. 153). M explains how he used acting technique when filming himself:

When we are acting, when we are doing a scene, and I am talking to you, I think it is important to be personal, but not private. So, I can express I am having this or that feeling, but not why I am having it. And in the program, I really tried to use that and only
be personal, but I could feel from the beginning that they really wanted me to become private, and that is where I hold back (…) I don’t believe putting those (private) stuff out in public is a good idea under any circumstances.

This conflicts with both Frøbert and Hansen’s expectations of complete honesty and creates a distance in the correspondence between representation and its referent as Spence & Navarro (2011) explains it. Besides, the intimate insights of the video diary were entirely in the hands of the actors who constantly sent the self-shot footage to Frøbert during the two months of filming. They were not allowed to delete anything but could talk with the producer if there were scenes from the footage they did not want to be in the final product. That did not necessarily mean that it was not used as they had no editorial rights. Frøbert explains:

> It is very often they (participants) are vain and delete footage that is actually great (…) But, yeah.. I have a feeling that exactly these people have deleted a lot. It was a problem, with many of them, that they were very ‘actor-like’ and I think they saw it as some kind of promo for themselves, so I think they had a hard time with being honest and fragile.

All three actors admit they have deleted and when I spoke with N, a follow-up question emerged, asking if it could have anything to do with them being actors: “When you do a programme about a segment of actors, who actually care how they get perceived, then of course. You can’t help yourself with editing a little here and there”.

I established in the former section how both parties entered the project, wanting to show a true representation of the subjects but how they might have had a different perception of what truth is. The notion about truth highly interrelates with the idea about authenticity. The style of self-filming authenticates the content as Landesman (2008) describes it. It is an aesthetic strategy and promotes the honesty of the actors (Hill, 2007). But the findings above suggests that the authenticity is merely an external tool and that the inner life of the actors does not respond to the authentication. By filtering themselves, as M explains, and editing themselves by deleting footage, one can argue it is difficult for DR to present a true and authentic representation of the actors. Taking Smaill’s theory into consideration, it is possible that the actors’ motivation, which reaches beyond our understanding of them (for example, J’s hope for good publicity)
impacts the level of self-editing. The self-editing creates a crooked relation between the authenticity as an aesthetic tool and the authenticity of the actors' inner life. One can argue that it has been a valid issue from the very beginning of the project. As explained in the section about ethical guidelines, the actors got cast because of their outer story which Frøbert retrospectively formulated as a problem.

Collaboration
When I asked the actors about the collaboration with DR during the shooting, they all related their answers to the cameramen and women who followed them and not DR as a whole. It became clear that their relationship to the cameramen/women was important and a relationship they all cherished. Especially J speaks warmly about her embedded camerawoman: “We all had one person we were very close and connected to (…) She became like family to me, and I still talk to her a lot. She prepared me mentally. I thought she was one of the people who were very honest with me”. N calls himself “lucky,” and M explains it as a symbiosis, also because some of the people he interacts with in the program had worked with his cameraman on other projects. They obviously put a lot of trust into these people, but as already elaborated in the former section, they were also conscious about how they were presented, thus they were careful when speaking to the camera. The cameramen/women also contributed to the participatory mode (Nichols, 2017) as they asked the questions and were responsible for realizing the film. Sometimes the actors felt the cameramen/women asked leading questions and tried to change a situation to something else, but it was not a problem for them to say no and get back on track. When I asked about the collaboration with DR in general, the actors had different opinions on the matter. J felt: “DR and the casting director were more seeing it as a job and entertainment (…) the communication could have been better with the rest of the team.” M has the same feeling and explains how he felt they had the same agenda in the beginning, but as the production progressed, it changed to be more about entertaining than focusing on what he calls the true story, which made him not to trust them. One big issue for M occurred in Paris when he was working on a film. The cameraman was not allowed to be on set, but he tried to sneak in anyway which I
assume M saw as a serious break of trust. This action is also a clear violation of DR’s ethical guidelines which states:

> Unless permitted, it may be punishable and in violation of good press practice to be in places where there is usually no free access to the public. It is not crucial whether it is a public or private building. The essential factor is whether there is free access to the public [my translation] (DRs Etik, 2018, p. 27).

A film set is usually not open to the public and according to M he clearly told the cameraman not to enter the set. On the other hand N seemed to be better prepared on the business perspective as he has worked behind the camera on different reports and reality TV. He felt he got a lot of positive feedback from DR during the process.

Nichols (2017) and Rothwell (2008) both emphasize the filmmaker's responsibility, but they speak about it as a one-to-one relationship. In this production, I will argue, the structure contributed to confusion. When I think of independent documentaries, the filmmaker is either controlling the camera or appear as an interviewer/investigator, thus he is present on the set. Frøbert, who was the producer, was not on set and one can argue that the cameramen/women functioned as extended arms who were set to realize the wanted story from the producer. A possible consequence of that can be elaborated with help from Corner’s (1996, cited in Beattie, 2004) explanation about representation being a transformation of reality from one stage to another. The putative reality is how the actors understand the world, the profilmic reality is how the embedded cameramen/women understand the world, and lastly, the screened reality is in the hands of the producer and editor. The transformation happens regardless of the internal relations and responsibility, but in this case, the stages are determined by three different operators, making the distance between the subject and sender larger than within a one-to-one relationship. It can be discussed how significant an impact it had, but the gap might explain the problems Frøbert felt about not being capable of finding the relatable human story. The question of truth is also valid here, as the actors can have the impression that they have the same understanding of the world as the cameramen/women. A type of ‘we were there together, we must have seen the
same’. An answer to why the screened reality might not live up to their understanding can be found in the producer and editor’s different perception of the filmed.

**Gatekeeping**

Another problematic side of the collaboration is the relation to the second authority who is influencing the production. *Panorama Agency* (PA), who I, unfortunately, did not get an interview with, was a natural part of the production as the actors were from their youth section called *New Generation*. They pitched the actors to DR and developed the contract together with them, which contained different restrictions and rules that applied both to DR and the participants. PA was also responsible for creating contact to the sets and castings the actors attended. In similar cases, DR has not worked together with a second authority, and Frøbert explains how collaborating with an agency in a production like this, did not always benefit the process:

> It became clear it was an obstacle that they had to deliver to us (…) Everything had to go through them, and there were a lot of castings and sets we didn’t have access to. And, of course, their primary interest was the actors and not our cause, so if they felt a director didn’t want us on set, they didn’t do much to change that (…) It is also a problem because we want to give our participants some resistance. We would have liked to be with M on set (in Paris), to see him out of his comfort zone, that would have benefited us a lot.

For M, PA’s presence was meaningful: “We (him and PA) went through some of the stuff when I felt it wasn’t going really good. I think we got a lot of support”. For N it was the opposite: “I didn’t hear from PA in the shooting or broadcasting period (…) I got more feedback from both Frøbert and my camerawoman.” A natural reason for this is of course that the participants are subjects with individual needs. It seemed like M reached out to PA because he needed to talk it through with a third party and N did not have those needs. The issue raises a question about responsibility and power, and the relationship between DR and PA seemingly had an impact on the final product. A hypothesis could be that when a production has two authorities involved, with two different agendas and interests, it creates tensions as it is possible for the participants to choose confidentiality at one place and not the other - where DR was interested in
following the actors where ever they go, while PA was interested in protecting their clients and staying on proper terms with directors, producers and casters. Taking Barbash & Taylor’s (1997) notion about power into consideration and thinking about how some film makers stress the collaboration with their subjects to soothe the ethical issues, gatekeeping can be seen as a positive component for the actors. Besides DR giving the actors the freedom to film themselves (and therefore in some extent being in control of the material) PA’s gatekeeping worked as a restriction to DR’s power which in the same exchange meant that DR was compromising their concept.

Postproduction and Final Product
This section focus on the broadcasted documentary serial and what happened afterwards. First, I will present findings from my content analysis to see how truth and authenticity relate to the style and format. Second, I examine the representation of the actors and why it might not live up to their expectations. Third, I analyze examples from the content which have been subject to editing, and lastly I examine the procedures and aftershocks.

Generation Hollywood
The serial consists of in total six episodes with approximately 27 minutes duration each. We follow the everyday life and struggle for a breakthrough of six Danish actors who are at different places in their career. The serial shifts between an observational and participatory mode (Nichols, 2017) and uses DV realism (Landesman, 2008) as an aesthetic tool when the actors are filming themselves.

The observational mode is used whenever an event occurs where the actors are interacting with other people who are not their nearest family and friends. Here the embedded cameraman/woman is a ”fly on the wall” and merely observes the actions. With other words, it can also be called observational realism (Corner, 2001, cited in Beattie, 2004) which indicates that the event would take place regardless of the camera. The mode contributes to authenticity as it means that no behavior is repeated for the
sake of the camera (Nichols, 2017) and music or any other supplementary artifacts that might disrupt or affect the profilmic event are not present.

An ethical consideration is notable here. The observational mode invites the viewer to observe affairs the actors are not in control of themselves. Maybe J’s speech (see still image 1) at the woman’s event did not go as intended, but as she has no editorial rights, it will be too late.

The participatory mode means the filmmakers, in this case the cameraman/woman, interact with their subjects which leads to interviews or conversations. What happens in front of the camera is caused by the interaction (Nichols, 2017). When Nichols refers to it, the filmmaker does not intervene and afterward pretend to merely observe. But in Generation Hollywood, the interaction is not intended to be visible to the viewers. The interviews are constructed so the questions, or the theme the programmers wish the actors to speak about, is either edited away or said while the camera is off. In the content analysis, I have identified three instances where the actor speaks directly to the cameraman/woman, but there is no response. A reason for this can be found in what Hansen calls a mantra from DR: “We do not take a stance in the program itself.” The mode makes it possible for the filmmaker to generate missing

Still image 1, J speaking about her career at a women’s event
content which the actors themselves either have not thought about or cannot create themselves, for example, reflections and background stories.

Besides the interview style, the producer and cameramen/women also sent text messages when they wanted the actors to speak about a specific subject or answer a question while filming themselves. An ethical issue with the participatory mode is how it implies that the cameramen/women ask personal questions - and as it was already mentioned, the actors sometimes felt pressured and thought that the questions were leading.

DV Realism is mostly perceptible when the actors are filming themselves with digital cameras. In the same way as the observational mode, the DV Realism contributes to authenticity which is intensified by the video-diary style. Furthermore, the actors also comment on the camera’s presence, for example when it does not do what the actor intent. In the first episode we see N walking to his agency, and when he arrives and walks through the door, he is not in control of the camera, and he says: “Hov, ej jeg får da zoomet helt vildt” (oops, I am zooming like crazy right now). Another incidence is him and his girlfriend sitting on the couch speaking about N and his dreams. Afterward,
N gets off the couch to turn off the camera. As he is about to press the bottom he says: “Ej skat, den har slet ikke filmet” (Oh, honey it didn’t record). His girlfriend replies: “Jo den har” (Yes it did), they both laugh and N turns off the camera. The comments contribute to an understanding of the event being authentic and not edited. Music is used through the serial to support the atmosphere, the same with voiceover, but the voiceover is of the actors themselves, taken from the self-filmed footage. Text is used only to identify the subjects and once when explaining what New Generation is.

The modes and DV realism work together in persuading the viewers of an accurate and authentic depiction. The style and format are the same as in previous similar programs from DR3, thus one can argue this is not the reason for the case to stand out. Why the truth and authenticity are questioned in this case has to be found somewhere else, maybe in the issues of collaboration and gatekeeping.

Representation
My findings showed that the final representation did not entirely live up to the actors’ expectations, though they immediately had different opinions about it. Firstly, N did not feel he was misrepresented in the overall picture: “Overall, I think it ended up pretty good. I remember I was crazy nervous, but when I see the programmes I don’t feel there is anything they chose to show, that I am really sorry about”. It is interesting that it is N who feels this way, as Frobert also describes him as having the most recognizable story to tell: “He definitely had a little more of that human touch. He was the best case as he dared to be weak and honest and as the DR3 case usually are”. One can argue that N’s approach differs from the others - as it was also exemplified earlier both when discussing collaboration and gatekeeping, and how he might have had a better understanding of documentary making. At the same time, he also points out one scene where he was surprised how they had edited it together, which I will elaborate on in the next section. J also thinks it is an honest representation and takes the opportunity to reflect more about her own actions:

I feel that it was pretty honest. I will say that sometimes, because I am very ambitious, I am pushing everything and sometimes it made me seem annoying (laughs) (...) And of course there have been some cuts, but not in a really negative way. But sometimes the
filming structure and how they would film what I was doing... So I tried to calm that
down, never wearing makeup so if they put some technical things on me I was still able to
like, mask off myself (...) But I thought ‘its DR3, so it’s real’ and I forgot the
entertainment aspect in it.

I interpret her, maybe a bit vague, answer as also being overall satisfied with the
representation but she was surprised with the title: “I was told it was gonna be called
*The Young Actors*. When they said it was gonna be called *Generation Hollywood*, I was
like ‘this is not good’. But I don’t think I could do anything and I think that I was kind
of scared”. *The Young Actors* would definitely have been a more identifiable title taking
former DR3 cases into consideration. An answer to why the title changed might be
found in the postproduction process. Frøbert explains how it usually is in the editing
room that you figure out if the story works or not, and if DR3 have not gotten what they
expected, they might have found it necessary to change the title, to make it
representable for the content. This conflicts with the actors’ expectations and can be
considered as an ethical issue. M is clearly the most unsatisfied one with the overall
representation:

> It became the straight opposite of what we wanted (...) It was so weirdly angled and
weirdly put together so it sounds like we really want to become famous and Hollywood
stars (...) I really feel they edited and only took the pieces that made sense to them. They
made it into a story about six young people who wants to become famous in Hollywood
(...) It became something totally different than what we said yes to.

It seems like M feels cheated and had expectations that DR3 did not live up to. Both J
and M express that they expected a specific representation because of the previous DR3
cases and as Nichols (2017) describes, the audience possess presumptions to a film
caused by the channel’s reputation. I will argue it is not only the audience but also the
participants who possess these presumptions which lead to J and M’s frustrations. With
Smaill’s (2010) notion about subjects being entrenched in emotions and having desires
that are not immediately visible to the viewer, it can be argued that they are not
immediately visible to the production team either. It can be believed that the participants
and the production team have not had a thorough talk about what to expect of the
representation. Maybe the actors have not said out loud that they expect a representation on the same line as earlier cases, and Frøbert, and rest of the team, have not said they cannot promise how the representation will be, but they do have the same clear ideas of how it could be. To match DR’s intentions, Frøbert explains that they tried to tell them “the more honest, vulnerable and open you are, the better will people like you”. She emphasizes that they intend to portray people the audience can root for, not laugh at, and how they always try to make them more likeable than they appear. But also how difficult that is when the embedded cameramen/women cannot make the participants reflect, which she points out as a problem in this case. Furthermore she explains how they want the audience to understand the participants’ motives, which sometimes means making editorial choices that promotes this understanding.

Some Editorial Choices
As already implied, there are some editorial issues related to the representation of the actors. The first case is in the intro. We see N sitting at home speaking to the camera in a close-up. It is not obvious if he is filming himself or if the camerawoman is present, but N indicates in the interview that a camerawoman was there.
While the intro music plays, he says: “It is my dream to become an actor in Hollywood”. In my content analysis, I identified two cuts: “It is my dream to become an actor [cut] In eehhm [cut] Hollywood”. I asked N about this scene:

I can’t remember correctly what I was saying, but I remember I thought it was taken out of context. It is a part of a sentence where I am saying something like ‘it is my dream to become an actor’ and then I elaborate with saying ‘to make a living of it’. And then, because they kept on pressuring, I said: ‘And yes, someday it would, of course, be crazy huge to come to Hollywood’. It was edited so it sounded like it is my ultimate goal and the whole reason for me to be in the business.

When saying the first part of the sentence, “It is my dream to become an actor”, he is looking determined into the camera. “In eehhm” is said while he looks down to his right and “Hollywood” is said with a higher eye-line, looking away from the camera as one can see in image 6. One can argue that his different actions not only visualize the two cuts, but are also up for interpretation regarding truth and authenticity. Looking directly into the camera can be interpreted as him telling the truth, whereas looking away can be interpreted as the opposite. The issue of truth claims in the unit concerns the text not being representative of what it claims (Butchart, 2006). Surely it is representative of what it claims, but it is not representative of what is actually said by N. The scene plays out in the participatory mode in the form of a staged interview that is subject to visible editorial choices. As the interpreter, I identified the cuts before speaking to N, which means others can have noticed the same. But others can have understood it as authentic because the unit claims to be factual (Hill, 2007) and because there is a common
presumption of DR3 making true television. Why DR made the editorial choices for this
clip, which is shown repeatedly and used as trailer for the programme, is perhaps the
same as why the title changed in the progress. To make it representable for the rest of
the content.

The second case is a scene, that J points out having regrets about being in the
program. The situation plays out in episode 2. She has a casting for a role as Alice Babs
and we see her prepare which also meant going to the hairdresser. Initially we see her
sitting at home preparing the text. From there we follow J and her mother to the car
where J is dressed in a 50’s style dress. They then go to the hairdresser and afterwards
they drive to the casting. Usually when actors go to a casting, they show up in their own
style of clothes and try to make their appearance as neutral as possible. J explains the
reason for her preparation: “I was getting all dressed up and stuff, because we needed
content I think. (Thinking back) I would not have filmed that because it was way too
much”. Because of her comment about them needing content, I asked if it was DR who
wanted the preparations:

Because it was a period piece I needed some hair, and I got my mums friend, because she
is a hairdresser, so she just did it for free. But yes, it was definitely a thing, you know ‘try
on this clothes, put it on’ all this stuff and yes, that was created. I would not have done
that. That episode looks to me that I am crazy.
J indicates that she would have made her hair regardless of DR’s presence, but the profilmic reality is an issue here. It indicates that J paid for a hairdresser to look her best for the audition and it is never told or indicated in any way that it is her mother’s friend. According to Spence & Navarro (2011) this is considered, by the viewers, as an authentic record of what happened, but it does not provide knowledge about the underlying circumstances, such as J getting the hair done for free or DR staging the preparation because they needed content. This conflicts with common ethics as there is, again, an equivocal correspondence between the representation and its referent (Spence & Navarro, 2011).

The third case is a scene in episode 5, where the editing, according to M’s feelings, went too far. The unit consists of M packing his things, getting ready to leave Paris and his first professional job as an actor. He is filming himself, making it clear he is not happy about going home as he has no job as an actor to attend when returning. We follow him in the cab and lastly in the plane. The last picture we see is him looking out of the window when he lands in Denmark and sad music is playing.

Still image 8, the last frame in the unit
The profilmic reality is clearly that M is sad and the mood is intensified with help from the music. When M himself speaks about the representation he says:

> When I was flying home from Paris, they put on some sad music and I had tears in my eyes, so they made it look like I was really sad about going home. Actually, just before I filmed that thing, I explain to the camera why I have tears in my eyes and it is because I am so scared of flying.

For M this was highly critical and he felt misrepresented. On the other hand it can be seen as a proof for Rothwell’s (2008) perspective about the filmmaker putting material in a different context from that originally intended by the subject, in order to try to get underneath the subjects’ performance. From this perspective the ethical issue becomes of lesser value. M was actually sad about leaving. DR chose to visualize this sadness by using material out of context. M signed a release which leaves him with no power to change the alignments DR made of his emotions. One can argue that M had agreed to DR owning his representation when he signed the release, but again the discrepancy between expectations and final result proves to have consequences. It is an ethical issue when DR mold a representation which was intended to represent a physical reaction, rather than an emotional one. I mentioned earlier how the participants to some extent have control, or power, of the material as they could decide what they filmed themselves, thus they can, to some extent, control their representation. One can argue the above proves it wrong. It is an example of the complexity of ethics because there are no rules when first the release is signed. The filmmakers can do with the material as they please and the social actor has no editorial rights. No law protects the participants in this matter. Where copyright law protects the publication itself, no law protects the represented body of the social actor and they have to rely on the powerholders morality.

**Postprocedures and Aftershocks**

As established by both Nichols (2017) and Rothwell (2008), the film makers’ responsibility reach beyond the film making itself as it can affect the participants after the broadcasting. Frøbert makes it clear that they have procedures for that:

> They get a guide that helps them when the program is out there. For example it prepares them if journalists calls, how they can always refer to us if they don’t want to give any
comments and also how to act on social media. We also make it clear that sometimes they will find clips taken out of context on social media. Besides, the embedded cameramen/women are always very good at calling the participants to hear how they are doing and keeping in contact, especially if there is someone who has had some kind of problems.

It goes hand in hand with the procedures Rothwell (2008) defines as the key for a successful relationship. The actors also partly agree on being prepared for what could come afterward and it is obvious that they had different needs concerning this. N did not have contact with DR after the program broadcasted. He explains that they were welcomed to contact DR if needed. M, who is generally unsatisfied with the representation, did not have contact either, but one can argue it might have been beneficial for him to speak with them about the fact that he feels that he said yes to one thing that turned out to be something else. He explains: “I didn’t have contact with them after it was sent, so I haven’t expressed my feelings and since it had already been on TV, I felt there was no point in going through the trouble”. It also becomes clear that there have been no meetings after the broadcasting. I believed that a natural part of making documentaries like this was to evaluate the whole process. Both to make sure that everything has progressed in the right manner but also to make DR and their procedures (regarding production and ethics) more efficient. One thing they did, however, was to invite all actors for a viewing of the first two episodes which Frøbert expresses as important for emphasizing the collective feeling of having created the project together.

M did not have many reactions from people who watched the show, whereas N had positive reactions from both strangers and friends and family. J is the one who got the most feedback of the three actors. She was contacted from other TV channels who wanted to make programs about only her. She refers to the offer as “documentary serials” but I have the impression that it was more like reality TV shows or reportages which made her upset as she explains that she is serious about her acting and wants to do fiction. She also explains how people confronted her when she was out with friends and that people wrote messages to her on social media. Most of the communication was positive, but she also refers to some of it as hate messages. She explains that she did not feel DR prepared them for hate. Why she did not feel prepared, I presume has to do with the fact that the guide they were given from DR was in writing. One can argue that since
every case in this programme is individual, an individual talk with the actors after the broadcasting would have been more beneficial. One big issue that became publicly known was Joachim Fjelstrup, Danish actor who made up several impersonations of J and displayed her in the name of comedy. As J explains:

That was really not very cool. That was exactly what I was afraid of (…) to see someone make fun of it in a way that goes out to so many people in Denmark and they listen to him and they get that perception of me instead of me talking to them, and actually watch the program and see in what context I was delivering that message, Yeah that was really tough, but I have humor and that is how he works, that is how he gets success so if I can contribute to that (laughs). In that case I had to be the bigger person.

When I asked her if DR reached out to her after the incident she answered no, but that PA did. Frøbert says: “I believe Julie (J’s camerawoman) texted her as soon she saw Joachim had made it. I believe she texted or called J to hear if she had seen it and what she thought about it”. Even though J do not recall her camerawoman reaching out, I have a slight feeling that she did but that J does not see her camerawoman as DR, but a person she has spent much time with and sees more as a friend. This recalls the confusion and difference between a TV documentary and independent documentary production elaborated in the section about collaboration. I will argue that this can result in negative feelings towards DR as it seems like they did not made an effort, when the truth is that they actually did.

I am left with a wonder of the lack of procedure after a situation like this and the preparation the participants receive before the broadcasting and streaming access on their website. Rothwell (2008) explains how contemporary media is not constrained, thus the filmed material can have a deep impact on the private realm of the participants which is true in this case. One thing is not to evaluate the process, but DR has seemingly neglected to take the contemporary media’s development into account. They have not incorporated the difference between broadcasted television and online streaming when updating their ethical guidelines, thus they appear outdated. As already mentioned, Frøbert states they do make it clear the participants can find themselves in a situation where clips are taken out of context on social media. What is missing is, for example, counseling about online bullying and how to handle it. This should not only be
offered when or if it happens but also, in my opinion, include all participants before the publication. What happens in the participants' private inbox and their lived reality stays invisible to DR unless the participants draw attention to it. The question is if it is DR’s responsibility to be ahead of the situation or if the responsibility lies within the participants’ considerations of being filmed as Nichols (2017) argues they have to do.

Reflections
Both Frøbert and the participants thought and wondered about the production afterward.
Frøbert explains that:

But it is weird with this program because it turned out to be a very atypical DR3 case and we have really tried to look into ourselves and find out what it was. Because, for me, it has been a little on the edge. They got more displayed than usually and that is not at all something we wish for.

All actors imply the same and they seem to have an internal agreement about the reason being the serial concentrating more about “Next stop: Hollywood” than the individual struggles. I asked the actors if they regret being in the program and both N and J said “Yes”. N explains:

I shouldn’t have been a part of it. I don’t feel it was the right choice because subsequently I got a feeling that I wasn’t an actor anymore. I was that guy from TV who wants to be an actor and I think that has affected how things have been going afterwards.

J has the same opinion:

I regret the whole thing now, but that’s just life. It’s one of my biggest regrets in two years. (…) The thing is, when you put yourself out there, like it’s not embarrassing the program, I’m fine with how I am and my approach, but I could feel the Danish industry didn’t like it (…) It’s been a huge backstep for me, because I was actually doing well and I had a bunch of stuff going on, and that was also why I thought it could help me get more. But it didn’t.

M is the only participant who does not answer with a straight yes:
Well, it depends how I look at it because it didn’t give me anything that have been efficient for my career; there I felt a little put out (…) The thing I want to take out of it is that I got my first meeting with E (his fiancé who was his co-worker in Paris) on tape. That is very precious and means a lot to me that I have that on film. So, then I don’t regret it. I just wish it would have been less of a reality show and just truth.

It is interesting how the one who is most negative towards the process and final product is also the one who is not entirely regretting being a part of it. An answer might be found by turning once again to Smaill’s (2010) notion on the participants having motives and desires that reach beyond our understandings of them. M feels that he had a personal gain from the program whereas N and J feel that they got the opposite. Even though J is the only one who expressed her hopes for good publicity, it is obvious that both N and M also thought about their careers and one can wonder if they all had an underlaying hope for more work caused by the program. Nichols (2017) implies that the actors might end up felling used as they do not get compensated and one can argue that the actors subconsciously had hoped for some kind of compensation in form of success or recognition.
7. Conclusion

Overall, this research has approached the complex nature of ethics in a selected case study. Even though it is a small case study, it is the first example of an academic research, focused solely on a DR3 documentary, and, as such, it can be seen as a general contribution to the scholarly research field of ethics in documentary filmmaking.

The study shows that ethical issues appeared before, during and after the production of *Generation Hollywood*. First, the participants had already existing presumptions of what the final product would be like, caused by watching earlier cases with same style and format from DR3. Usually, these presumptions are redeemed as the procedures in the startup phase are the same in every program. Because of discrepancy between the already bought premise and what was actually possible, the production team chose the participants based on their outer story rather than the inner as they did with former cases. Second, it appears that the ethical issues were not merely caused by DR’s procedures but that issues emerged due to the problematic collaboration with the gatekeeper and participants. It became a problem for some of the participants to distinguish between being a social and professional actor which lead to them editing and filtering themselves, affecting the intended authenticity they themselves wished for. This also questions their motives for participating as they all express regret and mentioned that the program had impacted their careers negatively. Another problem, during the production phase, was PA’s function as a gatekeeper which meant that two institutions were possessing power, with PA restricting DR. These restrictions resulted in DR taking some chances to not compromise their concept. For instance to sneak in on set to be able to tell the story, which resulted in mistrust. Furthermore, the producer's lack of presence on the set created a strong bond between the embedded cameramen/women and participants but not to DR itself. The internal structure, resulting in a distance between the subject and sender can have caused misunderstandings and a change in the putative reality and the screened reality (Corner, 1996, cited in Beattie, 2004). Third, the content analysis showed that DR made some editorial choices which conflicted with the participants' perception of truth. Especially one of the participants felt misrepresented which have created negative feelings towards DR. None of the
participants have spoken with DR after the broadcasting, and there has been no evaluation of the process.

To answer my final research question, I believe that the ethical issues appear in the authenticity and representation of the final product. My impression is that the two parties have worked on different levels without fully meeting each other during the process. The shift in focus in the start-up phase might have had an impact on the final representation and lead to different understandings of truth and a disappointment for some of the participants. When the intentions and expectations are not comparable from the beginning, it influences the rest of the process and ethical issues occur, regardless of already tested procedures. Thus, the findings imply that in order to capture authenticity, all involved needs to tune their expectations and intentions so they are compatible.

None of the parties were totally satisfied with the final result, which confirms my belief that this particular case stands out compared to other DR3 cases. As established in chapter 2, DR has been pressured by the government, concerning content and budget cuts and their budget is to be cut even more in the future. However, I found no proof of the budget cuts affecting their ethical procedures.

The research contributes to the field of production studies. It aimed to understand the mechanisms and underlying emotions that are in play before, during and, after a production. Today’s entertainment demands changes rapidly, and while modern technologies also evolve, one can argue it can affect how we treat people while representing them. As mentioned, “hverdagsdokumentaren” is a great part of the broadcasted documentaries on DR3. From a historical view, this format has developed together with technology and demands. It can be argued that it no longer differentiate, to a great extent, from how we perceive reality TV. I will argue documentary film wants to educate viewers, whereas reality TV focuses on conflicts and entertainment. This research shows how Generation Hollywood works somewhere in between. It blurs the line that separates the formats, and can be seen as a result of where “hverdagsdokumentaren” is today.
Implementation and Need for Further Research

Luckily, the participants as well as the representatives from DR were very cooperative and open to sharing their personal stories and experiences of the project. The fact that I already had personal relationships with the participants might have resulted in them being more open than if I was a stranger to them. Both parties also consented to me reaching out after conducting the interviews if I had follow-up questions, which I made use of and benefited my research. My findings made me realize how Panorama Agency, as a third component in the production, have affected the final product, thus the study would have benefitted from an interview with them. Furthermore, the content was easy to access at DR’s website.

Many of the issues that emerged relate to the participants being both social and professional actors, which makes it hard to anticipate if this research is applicable to other cases. The theoretical framework and the chosen methodology are, of course, applicable to others, but the findings will probably not have the same results. I will argue that, when researching ethics, it is crucial to treat and discuss every case in an individual manner as every experience is individual. As my findings also show, even within a specific case study it is necessary to address every personal experience as a matter for itself.

To research DR and their ethical stances in this form of documentary film making further, would necessarily mean to look and compare with similar cases. As it became clear that Generation Hollywood stands out from previous DR3 cases, this research is not representative and cannot make any general assumptions. Thus, I will argue, that a shift in focus, from one case study to a broader view of DR and their procedures, would be not only an exciting research, but also a necessary one. There is no scholarship related to the subject and because of DR’s role in the Danish media landscape it is crucial to understand their ethical practices. A further inclusion of theories about TV documentary filmmaking could help to understand the institutional practices better than in the given research.

The thesis slightly touched the need of distinguishing between broadcasting and online streaming. Today’s television documentaries are most likely not only to be broadcasted but also made available online. It makes it easier for agents to share and
edit the material and we can not speak about an end date or a broadcasting period. Because the material somehow becomes a lasting artifact of our culture, one can wonder where this leaves the social actors. It is not merely exciting research, but also necessary to examine the consequences when neglecting the shift from broadcasting to online availability, especially within the discourse of documentary. Furthermore, a study like this could contribute to positive changes in ethical procedures.

Another limitation of this study is the lack of audience research. It could help to understand how the final text was perceived and add a more nuanced answer than the one I alone as the interpreter can give. It would be interesting to examine from an audience perspective why this serial stand out from other DR3 cases and broaden it up by asking: With what satisfaction does audiences view a documentary like this? It is safe to say that the participants’ private lives are utilized to create entertainment. As viewers, we follow both the ups and downs. Most of the time the participants appear vulnerable, and one can wonder why vulnerability, inadequacy, and sadness are sellable. By taking a psychoanalytical approach, it could be compelling to research the audience's desires and pleasures of watching documentaries with this format.
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Appendices

Appendix 1

*Interview Questions for the Participants*

1. What were your thoughts when you joined the project?
2. What was your motivation?
3. Did you have any doubt or skepticism?
4. What did you expect?
5. How was the collaboration with the production team?
6. Did you feel you had something to say regarding the material?
7. Have you felt pressured into doing something that was not natural to you?
8. How is your overall feeling of having participated in this documentary serial?
9. Do you feel misrepresented in some way?
10. Did you think differently about documentary production?
11. Did your expectations add up to the result?
12. Do you regret being a part of it?
13. Anything you would have done differently?
14. What did you gain from the project?
Appendix 2

*Interview Questions for Rikke Frøbert, The Producer*

1. What is your position in DR?

2. How were you a part of the production *Generation Hollywood*?

3. Which thoughts do you have when you choose the participants?

4. Do you have a talk with them about what they represent with their story?

5. When in the process do you consider the ethical procedures?

6. What do you do to comply DR’s ethical guidelines?

7. How big of an influence do the participants have on the footage?

8. How do you ensure the participants do not feel displayed and is that even possible?

9. Which procedures do you have following the broadcasting?

10. Anything else that have affected the production, concerning ethics?
Appendix 3

Interview Questions for Erik Struve Hansen

1. What is your position at DR?

2. How will you describe DR3 as a channel?

3. How does it work when you want to make a documentary?

4. What are the purpose and your intentions with the DR3 documentaries?

5. It is typically about young people who want to achieve something - how do you assure the final result lives up to their expectations?

6. What if editorial choices make them feel misrepresented?

7. You produce many documentaries in a short time, in your opinion, does it sometimes go too fast, concerning ethics?

8. How do you ensure the participants is comfortable and do not end up feeling used?