"And I felt quite posh!" Art-house cinema and the absent audience – the exclusions of choice

Dr Ailsa Hollinshead
Edinburgh Napier University, UK

Abstract

This paper is based on a small, qualitative research project in Scotland that explored why some film viewers chose not to watch 'art-house' films or attend 'art-house' cinemas (alternatively known as cultural cinema). The aim of this pilot project was to talk to film viewers in areas of deprivation about their film viewing choices and practices with a view to gaining some insights into the ways in which those choices and practices could be seen as related to Bourdieu's concepts of cultural and symbolic capital. There were two reasons for choosing an area of deprivation. Firstly, there were practical implications for local art-house cinemas, which had no clear understanding of this 'absent audience', and at a wider level it will have practical implications for national policy makers. Secondly, there was my own interest in extending previous research I had conducted into the impact of cultural practices and their relationship to social exclusion. Initial findings from the study suggest that there is a link amongst cultural and symbolic capital, and economic and educational deprivation. Whilst there are some obvious findings related to economic constraints, there are less obvious indications that symbolic capital and the related concept of symbolic violence impact upon the choices that interviewees made. Unpacking some of these issues leads to the conclusions that, with more considered marketing, there is a distinct possibility of creating an audience that is no longer as absent whilst recognising that inequalities in access to cultural capital cannot be resolved easily, reinforcing Bourdieu's ideas about the complex relationship amongst different forms of capital.

Keywords: art-house cinema, audiences, Bourdieu, cultural capital, cultural policy, social exclusion

Introduction

The quote in the title of this paper comes from a middle-aged, female interviewee whose main film consumption was Hollywood cinema, which took place either in multiplexes or at home:

> Joan: Do you know what, it was Manhattan I went to see in the Cameo.
>
> INT: Okay, yeah.
>
> Joan: And I thought, like I'm not posh or anything like that, but I thought that was quite educational! **[Laughter]** And I felt quite posh! **[Group 3 interviews]**

The venue and choice of film signified for her people who were well-educated (which signified posh), and for her to feel posh was an unusual experience. It was not for 'people like me' (Archer et al 2007: 220). The aim of this paper is to explore the choices that impact upon people's decisions to engage in different kinds of cultural events, most specifically, watching films either in the cinema or at home, and why certain kinds of cinema and film are not chosen. Bauman has argued that, in liquid modernity, '…everything in a consumer society is a matter of choice, except the compulsion to choose…' (2000: 73). Bourdieu too wrote a great deal about the impact of cultural choices on life chances and the way that those choices or 'tastes' were anything but neutral in an ideological sense. They were related to the habitus, which is described as a set of historical relations 'deposited' within individual bodies in the form of mental and corporeal schemata of perception, appreciation and action (1992: 17). In his *Practical Reason*, he expands on this slightly abstract explanation:

> Habitus are generative principles of distinct and distinctive practices - what the worker eats and especially the way he eats it, the sport he practises and the way he practises it … Habitus are also classificatory schemes, principles of classification, principles of vision and division, different tastes … but the distinctions are not identical ... the same behaviour can appear distinguished to one person, pretentious to someone else and cheap or showy to yet another. (1998: 8)

How do those classificatory schemes influence choices about film viewing and cinema attendance and what is their significance in relation to developing wider audiences' bases?[1] Elizabeth Evans raises similar issues in her article in this issue, when discussing the film audiences for art-house/independent cinema in the East Midlands, although, unlike this paper, her audiences are not from more socially deprived areas (2011, on-line).

I want to digress into a slightly self-reflexive mode at this point in order to explain the genesis of this project and to explain some of the issues I have yet to resolve. I have been

interested for some time in the way media representations (particularly television) of certain groups impact upon social attitudes (without arguing for a direct media effects approach), and how those representations can contribute to social exclusion (Hollinshead, 2002). Subsequently, I extended this interest into the relationship between cultural capital and social inequality. Having been given access to data about attendance figures at a local art-house cinema (Filmhouse, Edinburgh), it was very clear that there were certain areas in the city where there were barely any attendees. Upon closer examination it was clear that a number of these areas were counted as areas of multiple deprivation according to the Scottish Government Index of Multiple Deprivation. I knew that the cost of attending the art-house cinemas was no greater (and in some cases, cheaper) than the multiplexes. I was also aware that the two art-house cinemas had reputations for being somewhat 'posh' – one more so than the other. Was it just the case that the films on offer in those cinemas really didn't appeal or was it the cinemas themselves that didn't appeal? I became interested in these questions at two levels. First, there was the practical question of how cinemas might increase their attendance figures from an area that currently has very low attendance and secondly, there was the more sociological question about the relationship between habitus and various forms of capital. It also became increasingly obvious that the definition of cultural capital in relation to policy had longer-term significance for my findings. This paper therefore offers some answers but it also raises some questions for which I don't have answers; but I believe the issues are important and their discussion may well eventually lead to some clearer answers.

Savage et al (2005) explored the relationship between habitus and capital, and space and place in relation to working class culture. They argue that 'Where people feel comfortable in places, they tend to populate such places, either through permanent residence or through revisiting, but where they do not, they tend to avoid them' (p101). Bourdieu also makes a similar point about the same relationship:

> At the risk of feeling themselves *out of place*, individuals who move into a new space must fulfil the conditions that that space tacitly requires of its occupants. This may be the possession of a certain cultural capital, the lack of which can prevent the real appropriation of supposedly public goods or even the intention of appropriating them. (1999: 128)

There is a link between this and understandings of what 'cultural capital' actually means. In a discussion of policy issues in relation to cultural capital and inequality, Bennett and Silva (2006) begin with a consideration of the competing understandings of Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital and the challenges and modifications to it that have been proposed. Regardless of which definition ultimately proves most viable, they go on to argue that the way in which it is currently understood in relation to policy in the UK is somewhat removed from Bourdieu's concern that cultural capital is related to social hierarchies and the

legitimisation of certain social practices. According to Ahearne (2004 cited in Bennett and Silva 2006: 90), increasing the diversity and level of take-up of different social practices was merely a form of working class racism that served to keep people in their place and did not enable them to engage with more 'legitimate' cultural capital. Bennett and Silva go on to make the point that the way in which the concept of cultural capital now functions in British cultural policy debates is to convert questions concerning inequalities in access to cultural resources into ones concerning the social and moral integration of a range of deprived or marginalised constituencies into 'the mainstream' (p94). Fangen (2010) makes a similar point about the move to a moral and normative view of social exclusion which, despite having the best of intentions, may serve to keep people in their place, and suggests that more nuanced understandings of the term actually provide a more complex but more satisfying analysis.

One of the key issues in relation to cultural capital is that it is primarily about relations of power and how it can be converted into other forms of capital, depending upon the different fields an individual may operate within and, therefore, the relative value of any kind of capital in any given field (there is a separate argument that can be made here which relates to Bourdieu's concept of *illusio* i.e. the 'game' played in each field only succeeds when people accept the doxic nature of actually playing the game, Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 97ff; this can be seen to tie into the more celebratory aspect of the debates around cultural omnivores which, it seems to me, ignores the still classed realities of social and cultural life and the potential limitations that are imposed on individuals with limited cultural capital – something I am very aware of as a lecturer in a widening-access university). To ignore that dimension is to dilute the concept. In a report for the National Cultural Planning Steering Group (the administrative arm of the National Cultural Planning Forum, Scotland) in 2004, the concept of cultural capital is used as an adjunct to social capital and social regeneration. There is much emphasis on the role of culture in developing '…many aspects of community engagement, empowerment and leadership' (Ghilardi, 2004: 5). She goes on to make the point that:

> There is a strong and growing evidence base of the links between cultural participation, including sports, and *social capital* (bonds and networks of trust and reciprocity) in communities. In particular, connections have been established between a range of forms of cultural participation and access to cultural capital in:
> • civic participation and volunteering rates;
> • improved literacy, writing, numeracy skills
> • increased skills in the key competencies of problem solving, planning and organising, communication, and working with others; and
> • sustainable and innovative economic development (Ghilardi, 2004: 6)

There is much emphasis on the role of culture in developing social inclusion within communities or 'natural regions', which would appear to have resonances with Bourdieu's understanding of the power that accrues with increased capital in any field. However, the radical challenges that Bourdieu argues for end up being somewhat diluted when it becomes clear that cultural capital is related to cultural planning which is defined thus:

> Thus Cultural Planning is not the planning of culture (although cultural provision stocktaking may be part of it) but a process that finds the relationships between people and the way they live (culture) and uses that knowledge to inform the development of a community. In this way, culture is inextricably linked to community assessment and development (Ghilardi, 2004: 22).

It seems to me that this not only relates to the point made by Ahearne earlier, but also because of the emphasis on developing a particular community's identity (notwithstanding any diversity therein) a risk is run that whilst individuals may well benefit from these kinds of interventions, it does not necessarily equip people to feel at home in other areas – which brings us back to the point made above by Fangen (2010). This is borne out by the following section:

> The Cultural Planning approach supported here rests on the importance (and uniqueness) of the local. This extends beyond thinking about distinctive local assets, and moves to an understanding of the importance of local environments to local communities, (and local economies), as well as the idea of culture's importance to place making (Ghilardi, 2004: 21)

In 2009, an evaluation of Cultural Planning was published and the emphasis on locality is clearly evident. Whilst expanding individuals' horizons in a variety of ways is intrinsic to the model, and I do not want to be overly critical of what are genuine attempts to engage more deprived communities in activities that have the potential to be individually and communally beneficial, what is less clear is how Cultural Planning (and its dilution of the significance of cultural capital) addresses the point made by Bourdieu (1999) and Savage et al (2005) about enabling people to feel comfortable in places they don't 'naturally' feel comfortable: the point that is at the heart of Bourdieu's concerns about the impact of the classificatory schemes that are within the embodied habitus.[2]

Roberts (2004: 58) has also made the point that the inclusion agenda is intended to address the failure of excluded groups to respond to opportunities for betterment, which are supposed to be there for the taking in education, training and the labour market; this link can be seen in the extracts above regarding cultural planning. He continues, somewhat pessimistically, that this way of thinking cannot be reconciled with the actual pattern of

leisure inequalities and that, as in the past, these leisure initiatives will fail to haul the disadvantaged up the socio-economic ladder. These points, discussed above, all indicate the complexity of trying to understand the relationship amongst different forms of capital, particularly when there are contested meanings around cultural capital.[3] As Roberts argues, 'The social and cultural dimensions of stratification should never be neglected. But let no one forget that there has always been an economic base which remains as deserving as ever of its privileged status in class analysis.' (2004: 70).

How then do people living in an area of Multiple Deprivation make choices about one aspect of cultural activity and do those choices contribute to exclusion, inclusion or really make little difference at all?

Method

In order to explore the various explanations that may arise for different levels of engagement, (and drawing on the rationale provided by Crouch and McKenzie, 2006, for small, qualitative studies) semi-structured interviews were seen as the most effective method of gaining that information. As mentioned earlier, I had been given access to data on the geographical distribution of Filmhouse in Edinburgh and, because of my interest in the impact of culture on social exclusion,[4] I decided to concentrate on one of the areas with low socio-economic capital. The chosen area, according to the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (2008),[5] had a working age population of 63% but an employment-deprived population of 21%. The Scottish average for working age population was 62.7% with only 12% being employment-deprived. In terms of income, the chosen area had 32% of the population measuring as income-deprived as against a national figure of 15%. To make a more localised comparison within the city, the area where my campus was based at the time of this study had a working age population of 52.2%, with 6% classing as income-deprived and 5% as employment-deprived. A report from HMIE (2010), gives more current figures:

> The Edinburgh Deprivation Index indicates that there are considerable levels of deprivation across the learning community. The proportion of jobless people of working age at 20% is considerably higher than the Scottish average of 12% and higher than the rest of Edinburgh which is 9%. The percentage of the population who are income deprived at 41% is considerably higher than the national average of 17% and that of Edinburgh which is 14%. The percentage of young mothers is 24.9%. This is higher than the Scottish average of 13.7%.

As an aside, it is worth noting that 'learning community' equates with working age population and this linkage between working and learning was something I had discovered in a previous research project into Adult Education provision in the city of Edinburgh (Hollinshead, 2004).[6]

Having decided on which area to concentrate on, contact was made with a Community Worker who agreed to liaise with me in order to recruit interviewees at the local community centre. I was only looking for 10 interviewees because this was to be a pilot project. My initial plan was to conduct face-to-face interviews but, after a meeting, I was persuaded that group interviews were more likely to be successful and I was happy to be guided thus. A separate paper could be written on the pitfalls of trying to do research via gatekeepers. Suffice to say, it did not go as smoothly as hoped and the optimistic assertion that 5 groups of about 5 people could be recruited easily turned out to be very far from the reality. Three groups were eventually recruited comprising a total of 16 interviewees (which was at least 6 more than I had hoped to interview individually). Selection criteria were kept simple – prospective participants needed to watch film, either in the cinema or at home, though preferably both. After a discussion based around the key themes, brochures from Filmhouse and Cameo (the two independent/art-house cinemas in Edinburgh) were shown to group members in order to explore further their perceptions of what was on offer in those cinemas.

In each group, all members knew each other to a greater or lesser degree. One group comprised all women and they were also part of a separate group that met on a regular basis for various activities. Despite the presence of ethnic minorities at the community centre, all the interviewees were white Scottish/English. One interviewee had a degree and a couple had job-specific qualifications over and above some form of school leaving certificate. The highest level of education for six of the interviewees was Standard Grade (GCSE in England, usually attained between 15 and 16 years of age) and it appeared that three of those didn't actually have any qualifications at all because the part of the demographic form where that information was to be recorded was left blank. In terms of cinema attendance, frequency ranged from 'once in a blue moon', 'once every couple of months' to 'every weekend'.[7] Viewing films at home, no matter the format, was at least a weekly occurrence for all interviewees.

All interviews took place in rooms in the Community Centre and were tape recorded, with additional notes being jotted down immediately after the interviews. They were then professionally transcribed. Following transcription, names of interviewees were anonymised, though it is interesting to note that when reassured that this would take place, a number of the interviewees expressed a wish to have their own names retained.[8] Thematic analysis was used to analyse the data based around the key themes of the interview schedule. These themes were:

1. Biographies of Taste, which covered their favourite films either by film name or genre.
2. Biographies of experience, which covered what they had seen, where they had seen it and why.

3. Constraints, which covered cost, other people e.g. children or partners, transport, awareness of different films, and any other issues that were seen as constraints.
4. Perceptions of otherness/sameness, which covered the ambience of cinemas, other members of the audience, reputation of the cinema, films that fitted with their self-perception and awareness of discounts etc.
5. Frequency of attendance, which was designed to separate out home viewing from cinema viewing.
6. Ideal experience, which explored what made going to the cinema worthwhile.[9]

The themes were linked to the aims of the project, which was to understand why people choose not to consume 'cultural' cinema and/or not to attend 'cultural' cinemas and the relationship to cultural capital, and to explore those choices in relation to social inclusion/exclusion. Rather than addressing each theme separately, some have been merged to reduce potential repetition; frequency of attendance has been mentioned briefly in the footnotes.

Findings

Biographies of Taste Favourite film/genre was an important opening question because the answers would tell me if I had fallen into stereotypical assumptions about the interviewees' tastes and would therefore have to modify subsequent questions. Interviewees were asked about the best film they had seen recently and what made it so. This grounded the research in the actual consumption practices of interviewees, rather than a broader question of taste (Chan & Goldthorpe 2005: 210) [See Appendix for a list of films]. The majority of interviewees either had children or grandchildren and this seemed to have a significant impact upon the films that had been seen recently. Nevertheless, a number of the interviewees also identified 'children's films' as being amongst their favourites.

In terms of genre, there was no consensus but all of the films that were first mentioned were Hollywood blockbusters that had received a great deal of marketing. Further discussion in relation to films that had been enjoyed led to the inclusion of four foreign language films. One interviewee talked about a Spanish film, *The Orphanage*, that he had on DVD, which he'd been told was very good:

> Doug: No there's one *The Orphanage* where the wee boy goes round with a tattie [potato] sack on his head killing people, but that's the Spanish…
> Mike: No I've not seen that.
> Doug: I've got that on DVD…
> INT: I've seen it, yeah.
> Doug: But I've not watched it because it's in Spanish and I couldn't be bothered reading!
> **[Interview Group 1]**

When I checked the demographic data after the interview, it transpired that Doug had no school leaving qualifications and, based on other comments in the interview, I suspected that literacy might have been the reason. As for the other films mentioned, they were only watched because of word-of-mouth recommendation. There was a near-universal view that watching subtitled films was hard work and, for that work to be rewarded, the film had to be exceptionally good; hence the reliance on word-of-mouth recommendation. I return to this point in the section on Constraints. The only gendered finding in this section was that all of the men disliked what they described as 'chick flicks':

> Doug: I hate chick flicks, they're all the same!
> INT: I think you're probably not the target audience [laugh]!
> Doug: I do, I go and see these kind of films and they're all the same… guy meets girl, they fall in love…
> Mike: Fall in love.
> Doug: Split up… d'you know what I mean, it's…
> INT: But why do you go and see them if you don't like them?
> Doug: Because I get made to! **[Laughter]**
> **[Interview Group 1]**

Whilst foreign language films don't necessarily signify high cultural capital because they are heterogeneous, it was very clear that Hollywood blockbusters in English with well-known actors were the overall favourites, with children's/family films very high on the list thus lending some support to the idea of choices that are made within a popular culture framework.

Biographies of experience. This theme explored the broad range of filmic experience. Apart from a handful of older women, 3D films were very popular and this was related to the family outing dimension. However, it was also closely related to the amount of marketing it had received and therefore the amount of pressure that parents and grandparents were subjected to. Parents and grandparents frequently referred to their grand/children asking insistently to go and see the latest blockbuster film. Chan and Goldthorpe (2005) found that having a family that includes children below the age of 5 has a significant negative effect on the chances of someone being an omnivore. In my study, that age limit seemed to extend to the top end of primary school at least.

There was nothing particularly significant in relation to genre but an interesting point to emerge was the desire for what could be termed a traditional narrative structure, regardless of genre and a preference for films that were realistic or believable at some level: a point identified in Bourdieu's *Distinction* (1984: 27). The women-only group had no liking for

violence unless it was justified, supporting work on television viewing by Schlesinger et al [1992].[10]

For the majority of interviewees, family consideration was a key reason for viewing choices. This was closely related to the amount of marketing (or word-of-mouth) that a film had received, and this referred to home as well as cinema viewing.[11] In terms of trailers, this led to frequent disappointment but despite this, alternative forms of information were rarely sought out. Only one respondent mentioned getting information about films from either newspapers or television programmes. This woman was also a member of two local film clubs:

> Cathy: …and there was Yes Men and there was another one, I've forgotten, but both, and I would never have gone to watch them, but the Reel Club you go in the evening and it's free. And I always go and I see something very, very different, it doesn't matter what it is, and it's of this moment.
> **[Interview Group 2]**

Involvement in these two clubs appeared to have had a significant impact upon the diversity of her viewing habits and she is the only interviewee who could be described as having a greater amount of cultural capital in terms of her regular viewing habits.[12]

Word-of-mouth was extremely important when engaging with films outside their normal choices. Stu is referring to a film recommended by his older sister, which he watched on Film4:

> Yes I can think of a film that got recommended to me off my older sis, you know, it was a Brazilian movie called *The City of Boys* … We wouldn't have watched that film in the past because it was Brazilian, nothing to do with it actually being Brazilian, but it had subtitles and stuff, and so I'm kind of a lazy goer, you know, if I go to a movie I like to listen to it as opposed to having to read the lines from the bottom of the screen and stuff. So I was really gripped with that film, and so it's a film I actually watched and read as a movie and we kind of probably wouldn't normally watch it.
> **[Interview Group 2]**

However, for the majority of interviewees, family recommendations were based on what was known of their existing taste, as in this quote from Frankie:

> Usually if my daughter's watched a film and she's bought a DVD or if she's got a loan of one, she'll phone me and say 'mum, this is the kind of film you would

like' and if I can sit in my house and it's quiet I can watch it and relax. As I say, I
can't sit in a cinema now because the noise just goes for me.
[Interview Group 3]

Cinema as a social event was the overarching experience for the interviewees, with only one
interviewee saying they would go on their own and as a result they had to put up with some
teasing from the rest of the group. Solitary viewing at home was seen very differently.
However, the wider sociability of cinema viewing that is discussed by Evans (2011 on-line)
and Aveyard (2011 on-line) in this journal was notable by its absence. On the surface,
sociability only related to the people they went with but, as one of Aveyard's interviewees
points out, attending a cinema in a rural part of Australia was a very different experience
from her cinema attendance in the city of Melbourne, and of course my interviewees are
city dwellers. The discussion below about perceptions of otherness/sameness relates to this
point.

Home and two relatively local cinemas were the most common viewing venues. The most
local cinema [Cinema A[13]] was popular because it did not involve transport costs but it was
less popular due to staffing issues. The next closest multiplex [Cineworld] was most popular
because of the availability of free parking plus the size of seats and screens. This cinema also
had the advantage of having places to eat close by. Barely any of the respondents had been
inside or to watch films in either of the art-house cinemas [Filmhouse and Cameo] and were
unaware that they both had café-bars. For a number of respondents, this was because they
didn't know where they were in the city and they made assumptions about cost and
clientele (which will be addressed later). Unless people felt that it was a film that had to be
seen in the cinema they were much more likely to watch at home on DVD, through
subscription channels or via the Internet. There was a hint that illegal downloads were
indulged in but this was not pursued, deliberately.

Perception of otherness/sameness. Due to the similarity of the cinemas they attended,
there was little expression of liking or disliking the ambience of the cinemas. However, there
was a universal dislike of the layout of multiplexes (the path that led from tickets to screen
going past displays of sweets, snacks and drinks), with one group clearly articulating that
this was a deliberate ploy to get them to spend money.[14] Also, there was an intense feeling
of irritation when multiplex staff made them relinquish the foodstuffs they had purchased
elsewhere. Cannier interviewees had learned to hide these things more carefully but I would
argue that there is a relationship here to bodily hexis, which Bourdieu describes thus: '…a
basic dimension of the sense of social orientation, [it] is a practical way of experiencing and
expressing one's own sense of social value' (1984: 468). This relates back to points that I
made earlier about people feeling comfortable in places and their 'right' to inhabit them. It
also relates to my critique of the way in which cultural capital is used in relation to cultural
policy when all it may do is serve to keep people in their place rather than give them the

confidence to inhabit other places, either permanently or temporarily. That would seem to be relevant to Doug (who had not watched *The Orphanage* due to subtitles) who had had this experience. He was also unaware of the bar in the cinema and of the ticket machine option, which enabled queues to be avoided.[15] I should make it clear that this is something with which I am struggling. Why for instance, if people resent this kind of treatment, do they continue to attend these cinemas? My tentative conclusion is that there is a link to the notion of social value which is embedded in the idea of bodily hexis. If at some level you feel that you have less social value (and this could be linked to the issues I suspect around literacy) but nevertheless you like going to the cinema, it is just one of those things that 'people like us' put up with because the multiplexes *are* the only cinemas you think of attending – for all of the other reasons that are discussed in this article.

A degree of probing was required to explore perceptions of other members of the audience/cinema due to what appeared to be, on the surface, the total lack of interest in anyone other than their companions. What could be assumed is that they felt comfortable almost unconsciously and therefore had no need to take an active interest in other customers. However, it became clear that, for everyone, different cinemas had different general connotations, as Jancovich et al have noted: 'specific cinemas have different meanings for different people' (2003: 174 cited in Evans, 2011 on-line). Cinema A was seen as more family-orientated and Cineworld was seen as having more students. The presence of students had connotations of being more up-market, emphasising an assumed link between educational capital and social capital.[16] It was also seen as being family-friendly despite the complaints about foodstuff experiences. For those interviewees who had direct experience of the art-house cinemas, their perceptions of the audiences were that they were more 'posh' and more 'studenty'. Whilst a clear definition of 'posh' was never obtained, it appeared to be based around perceptions of educational capital and professional employment status.[17] (It is probably worth mentioning that I never asked for clear clarification of what 'posh' meant because it seemed to me that it was self-evident, not only from the ways in which it was used by the interviewees but because it is something that regularly crops in tutorials with 1st year Sociology students at my university and youngsters from deprived backgrounds that I have been involved with in a voluntary capacity. It is difficult to pin down precisely but always connotes elements of education, accent and perceived wealth.)

Cameo's 'poshness' was based on the types of film and the large student attendance – foreign language, art-house and more generalised releases. Filmhouse was seen as being the most posh cinema based on the types of film (a greater number of foreign language films than Cameo) but also the perception that, whilst students did attend, more of their audience were professionals. One interviewee had attended a screening of a locally-made film in this cinema and, like the small number of others who had been into it, felt the ambience made them feel special. However, it would appear that feeling special was

insufficient to translate into attending outwith that one event. Cathy makes a similar point about Filmhouse and Cameo, in relation to making a choice about going to see any particular film:

> … and I'd probably read about it here or here and think 'oh I like the Filmhouse, I like the Cameo' and it's also the feel-good factor and I've been there before, it's like John Lewis, it never fails, you know, that doesn't fail and that doesn't fail. **Interview Group 2**

One other female interviewee said she had been into Filmhouse for a cup of coffee on a couple of occasions, which was a nice alternative to pubs because, again, it had a nice ambience, but these women's perceptions and experiences had not impacted upon any of their friends within the groups, and it appeared that none of the other interviewees knew anyone else who went inside Filmhouse or Cameo. Again, it goes back to the point about not feeling at home because of the actual and perceived differences, and the way that impacts upon the possibility of appropriating varied cultural resources.[18]

Constraints. This section brings together many of the issues that were raised earlier. It is not only about physical and economic constraints but it is also about perceptions and awareness, which can be seen to be related to the interrelationship amongst different forms of capital. Numerous writers have commented on the importance of class in relation to cultural activities and social divisions, challenging the popular idea that class is no longer relevant or that it is so diverse that it ceases to have any analytical meaning. Le Roux et al (2008) argue, 'Social classes, therefore, remain highly associated with patterns of lifestyles, demonstrating clearly that class matters in structuring contemporary UK cultural practice' (p1062).

In their study, cinema attendance, going to musicals, art galleries and museums were more socially divided than other activities. Lawler (2005: 801)) argues that taste may not be determined by class, but it is used to mark class. Compton (1996) has also argued that consumption practices serve to reinforce and reproduce social hierarchies and more importantly, the maintenance of consumption practices is heavily dependant upon economic class position (p118). Drawing on the ideas of Bourdieu, Holt (2008) argues that the varying forms and quantities of capital that individuals possess highlight inter-generational processes that serve to reproduce socio-economic advantage, disadvantage and privilege (p236). According to Gayo-Cal, economic factors are not a primary reason for not participating in certain activities and out of a list of 12 reasons for not attending the cinema, affordability was joint 5th (2006: 178). Lack of interest and dislike were the top categories but, interestingly, cinema was one activity where cost had more of an impact on participation than other leisure activities. Proximity was also an issue in relation to cinema

attendance. In terms of my own findings, economic factors were the most consistent constraint for interviewees and proximity was often related to economic considerations.

The economic cost of a trip to the cinema, especially when children were involved, was seen as extortionate. The cost of tickets was not the main issue, rather, it was the additional costs related to foodstuffs. One interviewee said that he had recently spent £55 taking his 3 young sons to see a 3D film. Couples expected to spend a minimum of £20 inside the cinema, excluding any travel costs or going for a drink or meal pre- or post-viewing. For people on low incomes, this was a considerable expenditure. Family tickets were available but they were still seen as very expensive. However, constantly related to the cost of the tickets was the cost of foodstuffs and the fact that children did not understand just how expensive they were. As a result, physically attending a cinema was a considerable financial investment and only one that was undertaken when children could not be resisted, it was a special occasion, or when word-of-mouth said that this was a film that had to be seen in the cinema. For many interviewees, there was little awareness or uptake of the various concessions that were available, including things like Orange Wednesday. However, when interviewees were aware of concessions, it did appear to provide additional motivation for attending – Cathy from Group 2 and Julie from Group 3 were prime examples of this but they were the exceptions rather than the rule.

The question of proximity was quite significant and contributed to the reasons for attending the two local cinemas. City centre cinemas (art-house or otherwise) involved additional costs for transport and the limited availability of cheap parking in the city was also an inhibitor. There was also the question of time costs in accessing cinemas that were further away. Free parking at multiplexes, or being within walking distance, reduced the overall cost of a trip to the cinema, which bears out the findings of Gayo-Cal (2006).

Constraints relating to family and friends were also important, as has already been indicated particularly in relation to the demands of children and balancing budgets. Couples had somewhat more complex negotiation systems, depending on how well aligned their tastes were. One woman, who rarely went to the cinema anymore, watched a lot of DVDs at home with her husband, who regularly introduced her to films that she would not necessarily have chosen herself. The flexibility entailed in home viewing meant that it was much easier for couples to satisfy different tastes. In terms of cinema attendance, where tastes differed, the compromise was, 'One week's a good film and one week's a woman's film!' It was also clear that whichever side of the divide one fell, the compromise film was rarely seen positively and was just one of the aspects of relationships that had to be tolerated. For those with families, watching at home was the most popular means of viewing films because there were no tickets to buy, no transport to worry about and treats could be indulged in at a fraction of the price plus, the ability to stretch out on sofas with family around was seen as extremely pleasurable.

In terms of choosing which films to watch, there were considerable constraints related to limited sources of information. Only one interviewee referred to television film programmes and newspapers as a source of information about films. Word-of-mouth, children's pestering, trailers and posters in cinemas were the main reasons for choosing to watch a film, with the first two being the most consistent. This limited source of information was made even more significant when brochures for Filmhouse and Cameo were shown to the interviewees. Barely any of the interviewees had ever seen either of the brochures. The film summaries in each brochure were seen as especially helpful, particularly when few of the films were recognised. Two additional factors were commented upon, which takes us back to the potential to develop audiences. First, having a photograph on the front cover of a well-known actor who was starring in one of the films being shown in Filmhouse, was seen as enticing and would make them want to look inside and see what else was on offer.

Secondly, the pricing at the two cinemas was commented upon. The biggest surprise was discovering the cost of tickets in Filmhouse and the different concessions that were available. One father commented that he had taken his children to Cineworld where it had cost him over £30, whereas if he had taken them to Filmhouse during one of their children's screenings it would only have cost £10. The connotations of poshness around the cinema had led to an assumption that it must be expensive. Disbelief was expressed that such good prices were not clearly advertised on the front of the brochure. Cameo's brochure did not include prices anywhere and on that basis it was assumed they must be expensive. Casey (2010) provides an interesting discussion of classed attitudes to consumption where the middle classes exhibit insouciance towards the harsh realities of balancing the desire for cultural commodities versus the limited resources available to indulge those desires. Not advertising prices and concessionary rates in a clearly visible manner only serves to reinforce perceptions of these venues as places for the better-off and only to be entered on special occasions. I would argue that it is a form of symbolic violence. In 'On Television' Bourdieu explains it thus:

> Symbolic violence is violence wielded with tacit complicity between its victims and its agents, insofar as both remain unconscious of submitting to or wielding it. The function of sociology... is to reveal that which is hidden. In so doing, it can help minimize the symbolic violence within social relations and, in particular, within the relations of communication. (1996: 17)

In relation to unclear pricing, it says people 'like us' may value discounts but we don't need to advertise them, perpetuating distinctions that disadvantage the already economically disadvantaged.

The final area that acted as a constraint in relation to genre watched was subtitles, and it should be noted that many more questions could have been asked about this but time constraints prevented that happening. Only two women liked subtitled films: one, because she said it suited her learning mode[19] and the other because French films enabled her to practise her French (the only interviewee who appeared to have a second language). For the rest of the interviewees, word-of-mouth was essential as was an exceptionally good story line. Hollywood blockbusters would be tolerated with weak storylines, but if effort had to be made, over and above watching, then the certainty of a reward was required. Some of the older interviewees had problems with subtitling due to ageing eyesight and, as I suggested earlier, I strongly suspected that, for a number of the interviewees, the issue was literacy.[20] It does suggest though that there is perhaps an audience for dubbed films if foreign language films are to gain wider popularity across a more diverse audience base. In 2010, OTX research carried out an exit poll into the screening of a dubbed and sub-titled version of *The Girl With The Dragon Tattoo*. They found that the dubbed version attracted more mainstream viewers than the subtitled version and that those who saw the subtitled version were significantly more likely (65% vs. 34% for dubbed) to watch foreign films 'a lot' or 'occasionally' (p.1). They conclude: 'The fact that the dubbed version of the film did bring in a markedly different audience to the subtitled format, however, suggests this format is more effective at attracting a more mainstream audience' (p3). There are a number of caveats in their findings but nevertheless, the findings from my interviewees would suggest that exposure to dubbed films (providing they are of a good enough quality) may be advantageous in introducing people to a greater diversity of films.

Conclusion

What then are the exclusions of choice for my interviewees? In many ways they come back to what Bourdieu described as the 'choice of the necessary' (1984). In contemporary society there may be 'no choice but to choose', but choices can only be made within a framework that enables some and potentially excludes others. It was evident that there was self-exclusion from art-house cinemas (and films) due to limited awareness of their existence, ambience, cost and availability. The relationship between children and film choice also relates to Holt's (2008) argument about the inter-generational reproduction of socio-economic differentiation. If parents have limited awareness, they cannot expose their children to alternative cultural forms that may result in greater cultural and social capital with the concomitant benefits.

Despite Gayo-Cal's (2006) findings that economics was not a primary cause of non-participation, most other authors assert the importance of economics in relation to participation and the classed nature of leisure participation in contemporary UK society. Non-attendance due to proximity concerns might appear to indicate laziness about wanting to travel any distance but this frequently acts as a signifier for economic constraints. For the interviewees in my research, economic constraints were the most significant in terms of

where they consumed film and how frequently they consumed it. Choosing where to go and choosing what to see assume a greater importance than if money is less of an issue. Not many of us enjoy going to places where we feel uncomfortable and have little certainty of enjoying ourselves and, if going there requires a fair degree of expenditure, most of us would prefer to be certain of a positive return for our investment. Arguably this is why word-of-mouth and perceptions assume such importance for my interviewees.

As with other studies, there was a relationship amongst my interviewees between educational capital and cultural capital. Knowing how to access information that extends one's knowledge not only leads to potential economic savings but, in relation to film viewing, can also lead to broadening one's knowledge of the world and of different cultures. The few interviewees who had watched films that could be described as art-house (this includes all foreign language films regardless of genre) had nearly always enjoyed them, but they were always seen as something special and out of the ordinary. The same applies to attending Filmhouse and Cameo. If a venue has a reputation for being posh and exclusive, that reputation is enhanced when there is little visible advertising of their good discounts or the absence of long paths past endless displays of foodstuffs, for example. Bourdieu (1992) discusses symbolic power and violence in relation to language and the power to 'name'. I would argue that not clearly advertising discounts and benefits goes beyond the language of economics. It reinforces a hierarchical notion of those who are 'entitled/able' to attend art-house cinemas and comes back to the idea that if you have to ask how much something costs, you assume that it will be expensive (because of all of the connotations of poshness) so you probably can't afford it – and this place is therefore not for the likes of you[21].

I come now to my unresolved issues. If cinemas are keen to expand audience bases, why don't they distribute brochures to community centres in more deprived areas to enable a greater awareness of what is available? Likewise, the simple device of showing good discounts on the front cover (and particularly ones aimed at children and families) would serve as an economic attraction and go some way to dispelling the myth that both cinemas are only for social elites with money. Why are subtitles so problematic? Whilst aversion to subtitles is not confined to those with low educational capital, limited literacy will inevitably make those films less attractive. More understanding of this relationship would be beneficial, but equally the possibility of providing dubbed films exists and perhaps greater experimentation on the part of exhibitors might open up a new audience rather than relying on Hollywood remakes with all of the cultural alterations that entails. Why, when there was so much dissatisfaction with existing sources of information, were alternative sources not sought out? At its simplest, this seems to relate to lack of knowledge and uncertainty about the trustworthiness of different sources whereas word-of-mouth in particular seems to ensure a return for one's money. Was it because it was not important enough because film viewing/attendance was engaged in for entertainment and not for any wider educational benefits? Likewise, there was the lack of awareness of economically cheaper alternatives.

However, it seemed that that lack of knowledge kept returning to issues of cultural capital and habitus.

For instance, when researching avid cinema-goers, Stimulating World Research (2007: 23) found that their interviewees saw film as being a doorway to other cultural spheres. If cultural capital is seen as encouraging the development of local cultures, with a link to community regeneration in a socio-economic way, but not necessarily being a doorway *to* other cultural spheres (some of which are still seen as more legitimate than others), then potential audiences from more deprived areas are unlikely to be reached, and thus unlikely to have the opportunity to make informed choices about what may or may not be advantageous to them. Savage et al (2005) spoke about people feeling comfortable in places. Engaging with disadvantaged communities by offering regular viewings with a short talk about the film (as opposed to the educational short courses on various cinematic themes that currently exist in Filmhouse, for example, and which imply that it is for those who can engage at a moderately higher intellectual level) could well serve to make Filmhouse feel more comfortable. It is a strategy deployed by Cameo and one of the reasons that Cathy felt comfortable going there.[22]

I am left wondering whether developing local cultural activities within a cultural planning approach, and their problematic usage of cultural capital, is actually liberating or whether in fact it refers back to my discussion of Bourdieu's concept of *illusio* – it merely teaches people to know their place and not to look beyond their own borders too much. Equally, I question just how much the celebratory aspects of cultural omnivorousness seriously take into account the continuing significance and consequences of classed cultural activities, particularly for those who live in areas of multiple deprivation. Ultimately, I believe it is an ideological question, and my own ideological position leads me to the view that expanding cultural capital is always a good thing, regardless of whether it leads to economic benefits. It creates a bodily and psychic sense of ease in the world where specialness is something other than feeling you are being 'allowed' to enter a space that is not really for the likes of you.

Acknowledgements

Biographical note:

Dr Ailsa Hollinshead is a lecturer in Sociology at Edinburgh Napier University. She is also Director of the Edinburgh International Film Audiences Conference. Contact: a.hollinshead@napier.ac.uk

References

Archer, L. Hollingworth, S. & Halsall, A. (2007) `University's not for Me — I'm a Nike Person': Urban, Working-Class Young People's Negotiations of `Style', Identity and Educational Engagement *Sociology* 41 (2) 219–237.

Aveyard, K. (2011) The place of cinema and film in contemporary rural Australia, *Participations. Journal of Audience and Reception Studies,* Vol 8 (2), http://www.participations.org/.

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bennett, T. & Silva, E.B. (2006) Introduction. Cultural capital and inequality: policy issues and contexts, *Cultural Trends*, 15 (2/3) 87–106.

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste.* Harvard University Press: USA.

Bourdieu, P. (1992) *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical Reason.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *On Television and Journalism.* London: Pluto Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. et al (1999) *The Weight of the World. Social Suffering in Contemporary Society.* Cambridge: Polity.

Bourdieu, P., Poupeau F. & Discepolo, T. (2008) *Political Interventions: social science and political action.* London: Verso.

Casey, E. (2010) Struggle and protestor passivity and control? The formation of class identity in two contemporary cultural practices, *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13 (2) 225–241.

Chan, T.W. & Goldthorpe, J. (2005) The social stratification of theatre, dance and cinema attendance, *Cultural Trends*, 14 (3) 193–212.

Compton, R. (1996) Consumption and class analysis in S. Edgell, K. Hetherington and A.Warde (eds.) *Consumption Matters*. Blackwell: Oxford.

Crouch, M. and McKenzie, H. (2006) The logic of small samples in qualitative research, *Social Science Information,* 45 (4) 483–499.

Evans, E. J. (2011) Superman vs Shrödinger's Cat: Taste, Etiquette and Independent Cinema Audiences as Indirect Communities, *Participations. Journal of Audience and Reception Studies,* Vol 8 (2) http://www.participations.org/.

FairPlay (2009) *Testing the benefits of cultural planning* http://noema.org.uk/downloads/Studyfinalversion.pdf [accessed 18/1/2011].

Fangen, K. (2010) Social exclusion and inclusion of young immigrants: presentation of an analytical framework, *Young*, 18 (2) 133–156.

Gayo-Cal, M. (2006) Leisure and participation in Britain, *Cultural Trends*, 15 (2/3) 175–192.

Ghilardi, L. (2004) *Culture at the centre*. National Cultural Planning Steering Group/Noema Research and Planning, London.

Hill, J. (2004) UK Film Policy, cultural capital and social exclusion, *Cultural Trends*, 13 (2) No. 50, 29–39.

HMIE (2010) *Learning Community Inspection* 27th April 2010 http://www.hmie.gov.uk/Default.aspx [accessed 18/1/2011].

Hollinshead, A. (2002) *The Production and Reception of Discourses of Religion in Fictional Broadcasting.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Glasgow.

Hollinshead, A. (2004) *Adult education policy, practice and provision: researching learner/user involvement in Edinburgh.* Adult Learners' Forum in Edinburgh/Edinburgh Learning.

Holt, L. (2007) Embodied social capital and geographic perspectives: performing the habitus, *Progress in Human Geography*. 32 (2), 227–246.

Lawler, S. (2005) Introduction: Class, culture and Identity, *Sociology*, 39 (5), 797 – 806

Le Roux, B., Rouanet, H., Savage, M. & Warde, A. (2008) Class and cultural division in the UK, *Sociology*, 42 (6), 1049–1071.

Paterson, R. & Kern, R. (1996) Changing highbrow taste: from snob to omnivore, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61, (5) 900–907.

Radway, J. (1986) *Reading the Romance: Women, patriarchy and popular literature.* London: Verso.

Roberts, K. (2004) Leisure inequalities, class division and social exclusion in present-day Britain, *Cultural Trends*, 13 (2) No. 50, 55–71.

Savage, M., Bagnall, G. & Longhurst, B. (2005) Local habitus and working class culture in F. Devine, M. Savage, J. Scott & R. Compton (eds.) *Rethinking Class, Culture, Identities and Lifestyle.* Palgrave Macmillan: Hampshire.

Schlesinger, P., Dobash, R., Dobash, R. & Weaver, K. (1992) *Women Viewing Violence.* London: BFI Publishing.

Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation, http://simd.scotland.gov.uk/map [accessed January 2010/February 2011].

Silva, E. B. (2006) Homologies of social space and elective affinities: researching cultural capital, *Sociology*, 40 (6) 1171–1189.

Stimulating World Research (2007) *A Qualitative Study of Avid Cinema-Goers.* UK Film Council.

Subtitling versus Dubbing: An OTX Case-study Report to the UK Film Council (2010) UK Film Council.

Warde, A., Wright, D. & Gayo-Cal, M. (2007) Understanding cultural omnivorousness: Or, the myth of the cultural omnivore, *Sociology,* 1 (2) 143–164.

Appendix

Group 1 (Men and Women)

Like	*Don't Like*
Avatar/3D	
Alice in Wonderland /Disney	
The Christmas Carol/3D	
Toy Story 3 (anticipated)	
Nanny McPhee (anticipated)	
UP/Disney	[Subtitled]
The Bounty Hunter	Football hooliganism e.g. The Firm
Once Were Warriors	[Chick Flicks]
Law Abiding Citizen	
Shutter Island	

Titanic
[True stories/true violence]
[Psychological]
[Horror]
[Chick Flicks]
The Orphanage – but not been watched due to subtitles

Group 2 (Men and Women)

Like	*Don't Like*
Avatar/3D	Up Pompeii/Frankie Howard
March of the Penguins	
Alvin and the Chipmunks	
Misery	[Subtitled]
Yes Men	[Women/love stories]
The Age of Stupid	
Bowling for Columbine	
Fahrenheit	
Festival	
The Champ	
Braveheart	
Geisha	
La Vie en Rose	
Apocalypto	
The City of Boys	
[Good story]	
[Ewan McGregor]	
[Sporting films]	

Group 3 (All women)

Like	*Don't Like*
Greyfriar's Bobby	Monsters
Nanny McPhee	James Bond
Babe, Pig in the City	Gory
Mrs Doubtfire	3D
Big Momma's House	[Subtitled]
Home Alone	
Nutty Professor	
Dirty Dancing	
Pretty Woman	
Sound of Music	
Saturday Night Fever	
The Full Monty	
Dear John	
Braveheart	
Rob Roy	
One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest	
Brokeback Mountain	
Pulp Fiction – for John Travolta	
Manhattan	
[True Stories]	
[Proper story]	

[Emotional stories]
[Musicals]

Notes

1 A number of writers have taken up the argument developed by Peterson and Kern (1996) that the hierarchy of tastes proposed by Bourdieu is less relevant in contemporary society and that the distinction is between omnivores (who have a broader range of tastes across all genres) and univores (who are restricted to popular cultural forms) (Chan & Goldthorpe, 2005; Silva, 2006; Bennett & Silva, 2006). This is not to suggest that they all take the same approach and neither is it to suggest that there have not been criticisms of Petersen and Kern's ideas, nevertheless it is not unreasonable to argue that the structures of the classed cultural practices that were identified by Bourdieu in the 1960s, in France, have altered somewhat in the intervening years.

2 For those who have argued that Bourdieu is either inevitabilist or deterministic in his analyses, the following sentence sums up for me what has always been at the heart of Bourdieu's work and whilst he discusses the educational institution in particular here, I would argue that it is highly relevant to the misappropriation of the term 'cultural capital' in relation to cultural policy; it is possible, nay desirable, to be interventionist whilst always being aware of the consequences of those interventions if the 'illusio' of the wider social context is NOT taken into account: *It is by knowing the laws of reproduction that we can have a chance, however small, of minimizing the reproductive effect of the educational institution. Bourdieu, Poupeau & Discepolo 2008:53)*

3 I define cultural capital in the same way as Bourdieu whilst acknowledging that in contemporary society the components of legitimate cultural capital will be somewhat different from his early definitions.

4 My own definition of social exclusion in this context is somewhat broad and is probably closely related to the idea of cultural omnivores versus cultural univores (Petersen and Kern, 1996) but it is also closely related to Bourdieu's understanding of the role of cultural capital in facilitating or inhibiting movement across a number of fields.

5 The most recent year on the Index.

6 There were similar problems around what constituted life long learning to those around definitions of cultural capital, and it contributed to some extremely disjointed policy.

7 The only person who went every weekend was a teenager. One person went twice a month but that was because of a film club. For many of the older women their frequency of attendance was much closer to the 'once in a blue moon' end of the spectrum in that once or twice a year was closer to the norm. One man went every week in the winter, however this was a child-care solution for an estranged father and he made it clear that as soon as the weather improved it would cease due to the expense.

8 The ethics requirements of my university meant that I had to ignore this request. On discussing this with the Community Centre staff, the opinion was offered that to use their own names made them feel valued and would give them a degree of status. However, I hadn't noted who had said yes or no due to the ethics requirement. Nevertheless, it is an interesting dilemma and one about which I am still unresolved.

9 Compared to a 2007 study of avid cinema-goers, none of my respondents fell into any of the definitions of an avid cinema-goer despite having some similarities in relation to the cinematic experience.

[10] I am well aware that this does not do justice to the complexity of the findings of Schlesinger et al, nevertheless, for the sake of brevity it was clear that there were similarities in terms of what was 'justified' violence as opposed to what was seen as gratuitous violence.

[11] In the women only group, a number of the women watched films on television in the afternoon when they only had themselves to consider. Regardless of what the film was, the fact that it was on Channel 5 in the afternoon signified that it was the kind of film they would likely enjoy. The channel was trusted to provide what they were looking for, which is somewhat reminiscent of Radway's work on women reading romance novels (1986).

[12] I am mindful of the point made by Warde et al (2007), that volume alone is insufficient to describe cultural omnivorousness and that without the compositional element, the relationship between the intrinsic eliteness and standard of 'good taste' (which relates back to Bourdieu's ideas of legitimate taste) is eviscerated. I am equally mindful that I have only explored one aspect of cultural participation.

[13] In order to preserve the anonymity of respondents and their location, this is the only cinema that will be referred anonymously.

[14] In the first interview, I asked the group to draw a picture of their ideal cinema to see if it would produce something interesting rather than just relying on the spoken word. It was a complete disaster! The group hated it and rather than seeing it as fun, felt that it was like being back in primary school. I abandoned it for subsequent interviews.

[15] This was someone whom I suspected had what is described as functional literacy – it is sufficient for everyday life but not for more autonomous activity, and of course is part of educational capital, which is related to 'bodily hexis'. I also suspected that other interviewees fell into a similar position based on comments made throughout the interviews.

[16] It is difficult in a written format to convey this idea but the tone of responses and the repeated small references to poshness made it clear that for my interviewees the presence of a student population meant a slightly more up-market, or posh, venue. This seemed to be connected to the assumption that students would be fairly well behaved in cinemas unlike youths who were not students; those who are referred to colloquially as either 'neds' or 'chavs'.

[17] In the all-women group, one member referred to members of the local film clubs as being posh and 'arty-farty'. This is extremely reminiscent of some of Bourdieu's findings about poverty and people being castigated for not knowing their place or trying to better themselves (1984).

[18] Mike, from Group 1, had not been to Filmhouse but told a story about going into a wine bar with some of his friends. The main clientele for this wine bar is young professionals but they were unaware of this when they entered. They immediately felt out of place due to their clothes and their accents and felt strongly that they were being looked down on. Service was seen as patronising and overly slow for their group and as soon as they finished their drink, they left. He said that now he would always pay more attention to the clientele of anywhere he was thinking of going and if they seemed 'posh' he would not enter.

[19] This was Cathy [Interview group 2] who spent a great deal of time emphasising the educational element of film alongside the enjoyment factor. She was the only interviewee who emphatically emphasised this dimension of film viewing.

[20] This wasn't an area I explored in any depth and can only put it down to a feeling that emerged over the course of engaging with the interviewees.

[21] In my mid-40s, I was taken to Paris for the first time. I provided my own spending money but I was on a very limited budget. Whilst walking down the Champs Elysées I saw a beautiful white blouse that screamed 'buy me!" but because there was no price in the window (and it was a very chic looking shop), despite urging from my partner, I refused to go inside to either try it on or even ask the price. I had convinced myself that it clearly wasn't for the likes of me. I am quite clear that that experience related to my own bodily hexis at the time and my feelings of being socially out of my depth and therefore lacking in the appropriate social value. However, in order to re-emphasise the non-deterministic reading I take of Bourdieu, exposure to different fields and an accumulation of social capital in particular, have ensured that I no longer feel intimidated.

[22] Confining it to film club members would seem to be insufficient and would need to be expanded to a broader potential audience. See endnote 17.