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Executive summary

What is reported

1. This document reports on cultural practices associated with film and television and their relations with social divisions among the contemporary British population. It focuses on the relationships between cultural tastes and knowledge as expressed in film and television preferences, and ethnicity, social class, gender and education. It engages with these issues by exploring how cultural capital, a resource for the transmission of privilege across generations and for marking class distinctions, is implicated in the media field.

Methodology

2. The study is based on a multi-method approach combining focus group research, a national statistically representative survey of the UK, a qualitative study of a sample of the households which participated in the quantitative survey, and an investigation of a small sample of business and professional elites. Fieldwork started in March 2003 and finished in July 2005.

3. Comparisons are made between the main sample and an ethic boost sample drawn from Britain’s three largest minority ethnic groups: the Indian, Pakistani and Afro-Caribbean communities.

Summary of key findings

(a) The media and ethnicity

4. Members of minority ethnic groups have a strong involvement in film culture. They go more regularly to the cinema than the rest of the population and are more likely to own collections of film and video, as well as to watch film clips on the internet and accessing news and sports.
5. Digital, satellite and cable television are accessed in greater proportions by minority ethnic groups, although the internet is accessed less relative to the rest of the population.

6. While the Indian respondents watch the least weekday television, Afro-Caribbeans and Pakistanis are close to the norms of 6 to 7 hours of the main sample. But they watch television more often with other family members as a consequence of their having larger households than the main sample, except for Afro-Caribbeans who watch television mostly by themselves.

7. Indian respondents mostly watch BBC1, with little involvement in ITV and channel 4. Afro-Caribbeans find Channel 5 more appealing than other groups, while Pakistanis have a viewing profile similar to that of the main sample but prefer Channel 5 in greater proportions.

8. While minority ethnic groups are less fond of soaps as a genre, responses to particular soap operas show a strong contrast between *Eastenders* and *Coronation Street*, with minority ethnic groups showing higher levels of preferences for the former than the main sample and very low levels of interest in the latter. This suggests a preference for metropolitan cosmopolitanism and a distanced relation to northern working class culture.

9. Minority ethnic groups also show little liking for programmes that embody the values of ‘Middle England’, preferring American and Australian imports. This is echoed in the lack of interest in the classic signature of ‘quality’ British cinema like costume dramas and literary adaptations.

10. A double orientation to specifically British aspects of film and television culture is evident among second generation migrants. On the one hand, there is an adaptive practice of engagement resulting in higher levels of involvement than first-
generation migrants; on the other hand, a critical relation and distance is also registered in relation to certain practices as a way of maintaining a different identity.

12. Second generation migrants have a more active relation to film and television culture than they do in relation to many other aspects of publicly funded culture in Britain.

(b) The media and class, age, and gender

13. The sharpest differences here refer to age. Younger respondents go to the cinema more often and are also the most likely to use the internet to watch film clips. Those in higher occupational groups go to the cinema more often than respondents in routine occupation. Gender makes little difference to participation in film.

14. There are also no marked gender differences in participation in television but age is again a key discriminating factor: older viewers watch more television. This is an inversion of participation in film culture by age. The situation is similar regarding occupational class: while those in higher occupational groups go to the cinema more often, it is those in lower-level occupations who watch television the most. The more educated also watch less television.

13. Gender is the most relevant discriminator of film tastes, strongly polarising film choices and preferences, and is closely followed by age in this regard. Younger audiences with high levels of education are a particularly distinctive audience segment.

15. Many film tastes are shared by all classes, particularly for mainstream commercial cinema. However, the members of higher occupational groups prefer dramas and literary adaptations or science fiction and crime, routine workers prefer westerns and those who never worked prefer comedy. The strong preference of the
intermediate class for romance reflects a predominance of women in this occupational group.

16. In terms of television channel choices, BBC1 and ITV1 are, across the board, the two most preferred channels, but BBC1 (and BBC2 and Channel 4) have stronger preferences among the higher educated whereas ITV1 and Channel 5 are more popular with audiences with lower levels of education. Age differences are implicated in preferences for television channels.

17. Gender strongly influences choice of satellite and digital channels with, for example, women watching more lifestyle and hobby programmes while men prefer documentary and sports channels. Younger viewers prefer music channels. Gender also polarises television choices in the terrestrial environment. This is illustrated, in the most extreme cases, by women’s high level of preference for soap operas and men’s equally marked preference for sports programmes with very little gender cross-over in either case.

Policy implications

18. The differential forms of participation in film and television culture associated with ethnicity, social class and level of education show that both are implicated in the processes through which social inequalities are produced and reproduced in contemporary Britain.

19. The explanation that is offered to account for this by drawing on cultural capital theory question some of the formulations of social exclusion policies. Inequalities are evident in the relational nature of media preferences and practices across complexly articulated age, gender and class positions in ways that question the logic of a division between a ‘mainstream’ and the socially excluded.
20. A cultural capital approach similarly points to a different way of understanding and engaging with the different media tastes and practices of minority ethnic groups than the morally integrative concerns of social cohesion theory.
Introduction

This report arises from a broader research inquiry into the relationships between cultural practices and the forms of social division and difference that characterise the relations between different sections of the population in contemporary Britain. Its primary focus is on the relationship between forms of participation in, knowledge about, and preferences for different kinds of film and television, and the ethnic, class, gendered, and educational characteristics of our respondents. However, we shall also take account of our more general findings where these help to illuminate the relationships between, for example, tastes in the visual arts and the pattern of likes and dislikes for television genres, or the relations between people’s literary and musical tastes and their film preferences. This will serve as a useful means of identifying the specific place of media practices within the organisation of the field of cultural consumption as a whole.

The evidence on which we draw in the report is both qualitative and quantitative. The quantitative data is provided by a survey of a nationwide representative sample of adults resident in Britain at the time the survey was administered (November 2003 to March 2004). This survey comprised a main sample of 1564 supplemented by an ethnic boost sample of 227 drawn, in roughly equal proportions, from Britain’s three main minority ethnic groups: the Indian, Pakistani and Afro-Caribbean communities. The questions we asked in this survey were designed to explore the relations between the respondents’ cultural tastes, the cultural activities they participated in, and their knowledge of selected cultural items on the one hand and, on the other, varied aspects of their social backgrounds: their genders, occupations, class positions and
identifications, ethnicities, incomes, educational backgrounds, etc. These questions reflected the prior knowledge we had acquired of the cultural interests and activities of different sections of the population through a nationwide programme of focus group discussions conducted with groups recruited from a diversity of social backgrounds. The evidence we acquired from the survey was similarly complemented by a follow-up programme of household interviews held with a selection of the respondents and, where relevant, their partners. Finally, in view of the notorious difficulty of recruiting elites via general sampling methods, we used a range of personal and institutional connections to interview eleven people who had attained positions of particular prominence in business, politics, or other professions. This was important to us in view of the significance of elite cultural interests and tastes from the point of view of our theoretical concerns.

These derive from the pioneering work of Pierre Bourdieu whose survey of French cultural tastes conducted in the 1960s, and discussed in *Distinction* (Bourdieu, 1984), has generated a significant literature examining the relationships between cultural practices and the dynamics of social distinction in contemporary societies. Initially undertaken in the context of the democratic cultural policies that predominated in France in the post-war period (see Ahearne, 2004, and Loosely, 2004), Bourdieu’s work has also had a significant impact on the terms of debate and practice informing access and equity policies in the arts and cultural fields, both in France and internationally. Bourdieu’s central contention in *Distinction* is that tastes – for art, literature, fashion, film, sport, food and drink – can be divided into three major classes each of which corresponds roughly to particular levels of education and occupational classes (Bourdieu, 1984: 16). The first of these comprises ‘legitimate taste’ consisting
of those works whose value is validated by the institutions of legitimate culture: museums, art galleries, concerts, theatre, national film theatres, etc. This is most common among the higher professional classes and educational groups; and this is especially so for those with avant-garde taste, which Bourdieu defines as legitimate culture in the process of being made: tomorrow’s legitimate culture, if you like. The second class of taste Bourdieu identifies is that of ‘middle-brow taste’, most common among the middle and lower-middle classes and those with intermediate levels of education. ‘Popular taste’, finally, is attributed mainly to the working classes and corresponds inversely to level of education. Bourdieu suggests that these different kinds of taste are implicated in different appreciations of culture, with a stress on aesthetic form prevailing in the taste for legitimate culture of the upper-middle-classes and a stress on function dominating the popular tastes of those in the working classes.

In the survey on which his evidence for these claims was based, Bourdieu gave considerable attention to film preferences and other aspects of film culture. But he gave television relatively little attention, asking only one question in what is now clearly, and was probably then, an anachronistic form: ‘If you watch TV, which programmes do you mainly watch?’ What is more surprising, perhaps, is that he does not report any of his statistical findings in relation to this question. Television is discussed only once in Distinction where, interestingly, it is treated as a cipher for something else as Bourdieu interprets working-class resistance both to formalist experiments in television and to attempts to bring high culture into the home as a proxy for working-class responses to formalist innovations in modern art (Bourdieu, 1984: 33). This neglect of television has been largely repeated in the subsequent literature in which debates with Bourdieu and refinements of his approach have
focused mainly on music, art, reading, sport or cuisine, but rarely on film and hardly ever on television.⁸

There are some good reasons for this. Georgina Born (2003: 776), for example, has noted that broadcasting, with its mixed economy of hybrid institutions and ambiguous genres with fluid and overlapping boundaries, does not fit well with Bourdieu’s categories which operate better when genres and audiences are more clearly differentiated. Bernard Lahire (2004: 627-36) makes a related point in drawing attention to the key role that the increasing cultural centrality of television has played in shifting the balance of cultural consumption from a variety of public and collective contexts into the more individualised and privatised setting of the home where both the need to, and the scope for, displaying social standing through the programme choices people make are significantly reduced. But these are not entirely absent. An anecdote from a Radio 4 programme on the thinking behind the introduction of *Pot Black* to BBC2 in the early years of the channel, and as its first sports brand, will help make the point. The producers responsible for the programme’s concept were aware that, in order to appeal to a BBC2 audience, then, as now, recruited mainly from the higher income and higher education groups, snooker would need to be made more respectable and individualised to detach it from its image as a largely working-class sport conducted in dingy beer halls. This aspect of BBC2’s social positioning was captured precisely by the tale of a household whose members only ever watched ITV – except when someone rang the door bell, when it was the family practice to switch to BBC2 and to invite the visitor in to the lounge to be duly impressed by the seriousness and high tone of its viewing habits.
There is ample evidence in media studies too that the need to establish some evaluative distinctions within television is one that has been pressed with some persistence over the last twenty years or so. In the debates about the role of value in cultural and media studies, the need for media studies to equip students with the critical capacities to make valid judgements concerning the relative aesthetic merits of different kinds of television text has been consistently stressed. A tendency to map out television as a site for a set of evaluative practices – similar to those characterising what is still the more legitimate area of film studies – has been similarly evident in debates about ‘quality television’. These are familiar processes through which the forms of expertise that have been developed in association with the development of media studies are now aspiring to establish a canon of ‘high quality’ television texts which might match the already canonised films of art cinema. This new critical function is especially clear in many of the new forms of television study guides that are appearing around television’s new canonical genres – especially new drama imports from the US – in which the boundary lines between academic analysis and upmarket consumption manual are becoming increasingly blurred. Yet if there is little concern with television in the literature that has followed the wake of Bourdieu’s work, the literature that has focused on questions of quality and television has done so with scant regard to any quantitative evidence regarding the organisation of viewers’ preferences or the distribution of these in terms of class, gender, occupation, education, or ethnicity.

It was with a view to correcting these varied shortcomings in the literature, then, that we incorporated a detailed set of questions on television exploring generic likes and dislikes, channel preferences, and viewing contexts, as well as questions probing likes
and dislikes for particular programmes, alongside a set of questions exploring film preferences and knowledge in terms similar to those used by Bourdieu in *Distinction*. While, of course, they have their limitations and pose problems of interpretation that we shall identify at appropriate points in the report, these two sets of questions – which we reproduce here as Appendix 1 - constitute the most detailed exploration of media tastes that we are aware of and, when interpreted in conjunction with our questions exploring other aspects of cultural taste and social background, permit a more detailed mapping of media taste and their place in the broader distribution of cultural tastes than has been attempted before.

There was, however, another more specific absence we had in mind when designing our survey: that of ethnicity. This does not figure as an issue in Bourdieu’s *Distinction*. Nor, with some notable exceptions (Dimaggio and Ostrower, 1992; Trienekens, 2002), does it figure too prominently in the theoretical literature that has subsequently been developed in its wake. While questions of ethnicity have been more consistently present in the policy literatures concerning cultural diversity issues and questions of cultural access and social inclusion – including the BFI’s own study of black and Asian film (BFI, 2000) – there is little available information on the television viewing practices of minority ethnic groups in Britain, or on the relations between these and film preferences. We therefore, in designing all of our research instruments, made sure that these took adequate account of Britain’s ethnic diversity while, at the same time, recognising the practical limits on the extent to which we could do so in a survey of this kind. There are two main issues here. First, for reasons of economy, it was necessary to restrict the scope of our ethnic boost sample to the three most populous minority ethnic groups in the UK in order to produce
sample sizes within each of these that would provide a statistically meaningful basis for comparisons with the main sample. Second, given the constraints of a questionnaire in which questions had to be posed in the same way to, and be answerable by, the members of all ethnic groups – majority as well as minority – we were obliged to focus on media and cultural activities which, in being supported by either the state or by national media and cultural markets, enjoy a reasonable measure of common currency and accessibility across ethnic boundaries. This means that our work throws little light on the media practices that are specifically, and sometimes exclusively, associated with particular minority groups – what Sandra Trienekens (2002) refers to as community-based cultures which operates to mitigate the effects of broader social divisions of class within minority communities. This is not because we doubt the importance of such cultures: to the contrary. However, such practices can only be adequately examined by means of more finely-grained methods of analysis than is possible in a national population survey. Where we do hope to push debates on, though, is in the light our findings throw on the questions that Ghassan Hage opens up, as an extension of Bourdieu’s work, by pointing to the need to consider the different positions that majority and minority ethnic groups occupy in relation to those forms of cultural capital that are nationally validated and the claims to national belonging these confer on those who possess them – and deny to those who do not (Hage, 1998).

These, then, roughly sketched, are the issues this report is concerned with. To pursue them, we start, in the first chapter, by reviewing the data produced by our survey concerning the forms of participation in, knowledge about, and preferences for different kinds of film and television shown by different groups within our samples.
We look here in more detail at Ghassan Hage’s concept of national cultural capital and consider the light this throws on the differences between the media practices of majority and minority ethnic groups. We also, in this chapter, review the findings of our multiple correspondence analyses of the film and television preferences of the main sample. This technique – which we explain more fully later – visualises the relationships between different tastes and social positions in ways that allows the complex sets of interdependencies between them to be taken in ‘at a glance’.

In chapter 2 we turn to the qualitative evidence derived from our focus groups, household interviews and elite interviews, reviewing this for the light it throws on the ‘social logics’ underlying the film and television practices of the UK population. We also consider here how the ‘media talk’ of our respondents helps to clarify, and sometimes to qualify, the statistical sketch of media practices drawn in chapter 1. In chapter 3 we review our main findings, and discuss their policy implications. We also place our findings relating to media practices in a broader setting by considering their connections to literary, artistic, musical, culinary and sporting practices.

For readers who would like to know more about the theoretical traditions we draw on in the report, the postscript reviews the two key concepts informing our analysis: the concepts of cultural capital and of the cultural field and the connections between the latter and field theory more generally.
Chapter 1: Viewing by numbers

Our questionnaire was designed to explore three main aspects of cultural capital by probing, first, the extent of our respondents’ participation in different aspects of film and television, second, their tastes as expressed by their preferences for particular film and television genres and, in the case of television, specific programmes, and, third, their knowledge of film culture as evidenced by the degree of their familiarity with the work of six named film directors. Our primary purpose in putting the same questions that we asked the main sample to our ethnic boost sample was to explore the position of the three main minority groups in the UK in relation to these different aspects of cultural capital, particularly with a view to assessing the extent to which they might be excluded from those aspects of cultural capital which are strongly connected to a sense of national belongingness. It will therefore be useful, in beginning to look at these different aspects of cultural capital in detail, to compare the general frequencies for the main sample with those for each of the three largest minority ethnic groups included in our survey distinguishing, where appropriate, between the members of these groups in the sample who were born overseas and those who were born in the UK. We have, for this purpose, included the Afro-Caribbean, Indian and Pakistani respondents included in the main sample with those recruited by the ethnic boost survey. The resulting ethnic file, when weighted, comprises 95 Indian, 96 Pakistani, and 45 Afro-Caribbean respondents.

To place these aspects of our findings in context, some preliminary remarks on the social characteristics of the Afro-Caribbean, Indian and Pakistani respondents and their relations to those of the main sample are in order. In the ethnic boost file men
outnumber women by 55% to 45% (reversing the main sample ratio of 54% women to 46% men). The Indian sample, however, is especially biased toward men who account for 63% of this group. Household sizes are generally larger in the ethnic boost file, with 18% of Afro-Caribbean, 38% of Indian and 59% of Pakistani households having five or more members compared to 9% in the main sample. Household incomes across the two samples are generally comparable except that Pakistani households are the poorest overall (25% below £15000 compared to 15% in the main sample) while Indian households are the richest with 25% having an annual income of more than £60000 compared to 11% for the main sample and only 4% of Afro-Caribbean households. The high income level for Indian households is echoed in the significant concentration of Indians who are either large employers or occupy senior management and professional positions – 17% compared to 8% for the main sample, and 0% of the Afro-Caribbean group. Pakistani respondents are the most likely to be in routine occupations. The most distinctive difference in terms of level of education is the very high rate of university education among the Indian respondents – 48% compared to a main sample figure of 23% which the Afro-Caribbean and Pakistani groups more-or-less match.

Forty-three percent of the ethnic boost sample were born in the UK. Those who were not came mainly from Pakistan (19%), India (17%) and Jamaica (6%). Those born in the UK are mostly young – 89% are aged between 18 and 39 compared with 42% of those born overseas. English is the first language of 58% of the sample, with 13% speaking Panjabi, 12% Urdu and 9% Gujurati as their first languages. Bengali, Hindi, Kashmirit, Malayalam, Pushto and Tamil are the other first languages named.
Bearing these differences within and between the Afro-Caribbean, Indian and Pakistani groups in mind, we turn now to outline the main differences between each of these and the main sample so far as indicators of media participation, tastes and knowledge are concerned.

**Ethnicity and media practices**

(i) **Participation**

The members of all three minority ethnic groups go more regularly to the cinema than do the population generally. Indians and Pakistanis are especially fond of cinema-going with 46% and 41% respectively going once a month or more frequently compared to 18% of the main sample. It is notable, too, that members of the ethnic boost file are more likely to have large collections of film on video. Five percent reported collections of 200 or more films compared to 1% of the main sample. Watching film clips on the internet is also more popular with all minority ethnic groups than is true of the British population generally. Eighteen percent of the Indian and Pakistani respondents, and 13% of the Afro-Caribbean respondents, reported this use of the internet compared to 7% of the main sample. Members of the Indian and Pakistani communities are also more likely to use the internet as a means of accessing news and sport. Thirty nine percent of Indian and 35% of Pakistani respondents use the internet for this purpose compared to 22% of the main sample, with Afro-Caribbean usage falling a little below this.

We did not ask about ownership of television sets, presuming this to be close to universal. This proved to be so with only 1% of the main sample and 1% of the
Pakistanis surveyed reporting never watching television. Video or DVD player ownership was more or less ubiquitous too at around 95% of both samples with little variation between any of the minority ethnic groups. With regard to digital, satellite or cable television, however, each of the three minority ethnic groups accesses this to a greater degree than the population as a whole – around 73% for Indians and Pakistanis and 63% for Afro-Caribbean respondents compared to 55% of the main sample. Internet access is less, however, especially for Pakistanis, 33% of whom reported internet access in contrast to 54% of the main sample and 56% and 45% of the Indian and Afro-Caribbean respondents respectively.

If the data presented so far suggests a strong involvement in film culture on the part, particularly, of the Indian and Pakistani respondents, the same is not true of television where the pattern is more mixed (Chart 1: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Table.). Indian respondents watch the least weekday television while Afro-Caribbean and Pakistani respondents are closer to the main sample norms of 38% (0-2 hours), 47% (3-5 hours), and 14% (6+ hours) except for the above average high levels of viewing (6 hours or more) of the Afro-Caribbean group.
With regard to the context for viewing (Chart 2: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Table), the Pakistani, Indian and, to a lesser degree, Afro-Caribbean groups are – as a result of their larger households – much more likely to watch television in extended family contexts than are the rest of the population. They are accordingly also considerably less likely to watch only with partners or alone, except for Afro-Caribbeans who are the most likely to watch television by themselves.
(ii) Taste

The most evident differences with regard to channel choice concern, first, the high rate of preference for BBC1 on behalf of the Indian respondents who also watch ITV less frequently than all the other groups (Chart 3: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Table). The Afro-Caribbean members of the sample are pretty disinterested in Channel 4 but highly involved in Channel 5, with Indian and Pakistani respondents also more interested in this channel than the main sample. The members of the ethnic file are more likely to watch both BBC channels if they were born overseas: 50% preferring BBC1 compared to 43% of those born in the UK, and 6% BBC2 compared to 1% of those born in Britain. These relationships are reversed in the case of both ITV (most liked by 32% of those born here compared to 13% of those born overseas) and Channel 4 where those born in Britain are four times more likely to choose this as their preferred channel compared to first-generation migrants. This is, however, as
much a function of age as of ethnicity given the youthful composition of the members of this sample born in Britain.

**Chart 3 TV channel (terrestrial) watch most often**

The members of all three minority ethnic groups, and especially Afro-Caribbean respondents, are considerably more likely to have access to digital, cable or satellite television than members of the main sample (Chart 4: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Table.). The Indian and Pakistani groups show strong preferences for ethnic or overseas channels, but low involvement in popular channels. This interest in overseas channels is especially marked among members of the ethnic file born overseas – 19% compared with 6% of those born in Britain - just as these have relatively little interest in popular channels (1%) compared to their, on the whole, younger British-born counterparts. The use of non-terrestrial movie channels is high on the part of both Afro-Caribbean and Indian respondents – another sign of high involvement in film culture on the part of members of the minority ethnic groups that is also echoed in the strong preference for films as one of the most liked types of television for both Indian and Pakistani respondents (Chart 5). Music channels are
popular with Afro-Caribbean and Indian respondents, but none of the three minority ethnic groups matches the quite strong interest in documentary channels that is evident in the main sample. The total lack of interest in all of the BBC digital channels and Artsworld is also notable.

**Table 4: Satellite/digital/cable channel watch most often**

![Bar chart showing channel preferences](chart.png)

It is notable, too, that, in terms of preferred genres, documentaries are relatively low in the priorities of all three minority ethnic groups which, conversely, show a strong preference for news and current affairs programmes – particularly on the part of the Afro-Caribbean and Pakistani communities (Chart 5: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Table.). Those born overseas are also much more likely to prefer these kinds of television than are the UK born: 30% in contrast to 13%. Indians and Pakistanis are not much interested in soap operas and all three groups are less interested in dramas than the main sample. Indians and Pakistanis are particularly fond of comedy on television, and Afro-Caribbean people like television quizzes,
game shows and television sport, which is also popular with Indians. No member of the ethnic file indicates reality television as their most preferred television genre (and it figures highly in the dislikes of all three groups), and the same is true of programmes centred on the home (cookery, home improvements, gardening) on the part of the Afro-Caribbean and Pakistani respondents. These programmes also figure quite highly in the dislikes of all three groups, especially for Afro-Caribbean respondents who, along with soap operas, rated this as the type of television they liked least after reality television.

**Chart 5: Type TV programme like most**

The pattern of preferences emerging from first choices for particular television programmes is, in some senses, more revealing, especially with regard to the differences between those born in the UK and those born overseas. Rather than reporting the responses to all the programmes we asked about, however, Charts 6a to
6c (see Appendix 2 for accompanying Tables) focus on five groups of programmes each of which brings together programmes that were closely related to one another in the preferences of the main sample. The programmes brought together under the ‘soaps/reality tv’ heading are thus ones which correlation analysis showed to be significantly interconnected across the first, second and third preferences of the main sample – and so on for the other groups of programmes. There are a number of noteworthy differences between the preferences of the three minority ethnic groups and those of the main sample here:

(i) While Chart 5 tells us that all three minority groups are less fond of soap operas than are the members of the main sample, it becomes clear, when we look at programme choice (Chart 6), that attitudes vary significantly in relation to different examples of this genre. *Eastenders* is very popular, more so than with the main sample, and the same is true of the Australian soap *Home and Away*. There is, however, a marked disinterest in *Coronation Street*, especially on the part of Indians and Pakistanis.

(ii) While, in the cases of popular dramas, *The Bill* is very popular with all three groups, and especially the Indian and Pakistani groups, other popular dramas like *Midsomer Murders* and *A Touch of Frost* are strikingly unpopular, and – although this is not shown in the Chart - more so on the part of those born in Britain.

(iii) Positive evaluations of the genres of ‘serious television’ are high, especially in relation to *Panorama*. However, there is little interest in new drama, and none in the examples of this which are American imports.

(iii) By contrast, in the case of the new comedy genres, American comedy imports like *Sex and the City* and *Friends* are popular with one or more of the groups – with most of this support coming from their younger members born in the UK (16% of
whom chose *Sex and the City* and 12% *Friends* compared to 3% of those born overseas in both cases).

These findings show, in some cases, a distant relation to programmes that conspicuously embody the values of ‘middle England’ (*Midsomer Murders, A Touch of Frost*) as well as those of northern working-class culture (*Coronation Street*) while, in others, suggesting a strong but selective interest in American and Australian imports. As such, they clearly raise important questions about how first- and second-generation migrants negotiate their relationships to both the national and global media culture – questions to which we return later.

**Chart 6 (a): Television programmes like best : Soaps/reality TV**

![Bar Chart](chart6a.png)

**Chart 6(b) Television programmes like best: Popular drama**

![Bar Chart](chart6b.png)
Chart 6(c) Television programmes like best: ‘Serious television’

Chart 6(d) Television programmes like best: New drama

Chart 6(e) Television programmes like best: New Comedy
Coming, finally, to films, the lack of interest in documentaries that we have seen in relation to television is echoed for all groups except for the Afro-Caribbean, and the marked lack of interest in costume drama and literary adaptations – one of the stable outputs of the British film industry – is striking (Table 1). This is also toward the higher end of the least-liked film genres for the three groups, especially Indian respondents. Indian and Pakistani respondents are, unsurprisingly, strongly interested in ‘Bollywood’ – especially those born overseas (24% compared to 10% of British born) – while Pakistani respondents show a strong liking for science fiction films, although this is almost entirely accounted for in terms of British-born Pakistanis.

There is zero interest in art or alternative cinema across the three minority groups and Afro-Caribbean respondents have an especially strong aversion to war films: 19% indicate this as the film they like least – more than twice the rate of the main sample and that for the other minority ethnic groups.
Table 1: Type film like most (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Film</th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action/Adventure/Thriller</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/art cinema</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume drama/Literary adaptations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film noir</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science fiction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) Knowledge

Our findings here derive from two questions in which we explored the relationships between knowledge and taste by asking those who took part in the survey whether they had heard of (and so knew of) six named film directors and four television ‘events’. We also asked whether those who had heard of the directors or television programmes in question would make a point of watching them, thus expressing a positive liking for them. In Chart 7 and Table 2 we report on the different responses of the overseas-born and UK-born members of the ethnic file in relation to these questions. The pattern of responses in Table 8 is quite straightforward: familiarity with the named directors is greater in all cases on the part of those born in Britain, and a liking for their work is also greater except, marginally, in the case of Ingmar
Bergman and, more pronouncedly, in that of Mani Rathnam, an Indian-born Tamil.\textsuperscript{14} It is also notable that the UK-born are more likely to have heard of and, on the whole, more likely to like the non-American directors – Pedro Almodovar, Jane Campion and Mani Rathnam - than are the members of the main sample, suggesting a more cosmopolitan set of tastes.
Chart 7 (a): Not heard of/would like to watch Film Directors: Stephen Spielberg

![Chart 7 (a): Not heard of/would like to watch Film Directors: Stephen Spielberg](chart7a.png)

Chart 7 (b): Not heard of/would like to watch Film Directors: Alfred Hitchcock

![Chart 7 (b): Not heard of/would like to watch Film Directors: Alfred Hitchcock](chart7b.png)

Chart 7 (c): Not heard of/would like to watch Film Directors: Pedro Almodovar

![Chart 7 (c): Not heard of/would like to watch Film Directors: Pedro Almodovar](chart7c.png)
The responses reported in Table 2 are a little more puzzling. Discounting the World Cup which, unlike the other television events, is clearly one with a global reach, here the greater likelihood that those born in the UK will know about these events than do those born overseas is not accompanied by a greater liking for them – a tendency that
is especially evident in relation to the Queen’s Christmas message. Clearly given the relatively youthfulness of those born in Britain, age is a factor here. But this may also in some cases reflect a rejection of, or distancing from, certain key aspects of the national culture: none of the British born Indian and Afro-Caribbean respondents, for example, are part of the 3% of the UK born who watch the Queen’s Christmas message. This interpretation is all the more plausible when considered in relation to the similar tendency that is evident in the other aspects of film and television choice already discussed: the lack of interest in television programmes with strongly white, middle-England associations (*Midsomer Murders, A Touch of Frost*, in contrast to *The Bill*, for example, the differences in responses to *Coronation Street* and the more multicultural *Eastenders*, and the strongly negative reaction on the part of minority groups to the classic signature of ‘quality’ British cinema – costume dramas and literary adaptations.

**Table 2: TV events (column %)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Born in the UK</th>
<th>Born overseas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand National</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not heard of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to watch</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soccer World Cup</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not heard of</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to watch</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Queen’s Xmas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not heard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to watch</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Election</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not heard of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to watch</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the face of it, these findings suggest two somewhat contradictory orientations in relation to the ‘national cultural capital’ that is associated with these aspects of British film and television culture. Proposed by Ghassan Hage to distinguish between the formal aspects of citizenship which have to do with the institutional-political
relationships of migrants to the body politic and the more informal practical-cultural relationships to the national culture that operate at the level of everyday practice, national cultural capital comprises an acquired familiarity with a nationally-coded set of ways of doing and thinking that confers what Hage calls a sense of national governmental belonging – an entitlement to occupy the space of the nation and to speak for it – on the part of those who possess it. For those, whether first or second generation migrants, who are positioned in subordinate positions in the national field, ‘the aim of accumulating national capital’, Hage argues, ‘is precisely to convert it into national belonging; to have your accumulated national capital recognised as legitimately national by the dominant grouping within the field’ (Hage, 1998: 53).

Yet such adaptive or aspirational practices may also be paralleled by different ones registering a distance and critical relation to the forms of cultural activity in which national cultural capital is lodged and made manifest.

The extent to which this might be true of the relationship of ethnic minorities to the most conspicuously national aspects of film and television culture covered in our survey is one we return to in the final section of this chapter. It is necessary first, though, to look more closely at the main sample and at the ways in which practices within this vary in accordance with a range of considerations – of class, age and gender, for example – which differentiate it internally. For this will give us the richly textured sense of how the media practices of Britain’s majority ethnic groups are organised that we need if we are to better understand where, how, and why the media practices of Afro-Caribbeans, Indians and Pakistanis are most distinctive.

**The social space of film**
Perhaps the sharpest differences in patterns of participation in film are registered in relation to age. Those aged 18 to 34 go to the cinema once a month or more compared to 16% of the 35 to 54 year olds and 6% of the over 55’s, half of whom never go compared to 7% of the youngest group. The younger members of the sample are also the most likely to use the internet to watch film clips – 14% compared to 6% of the 35 to 54 year olds and 2% of the over 55s. The influence of occupational class is most evident in relation to those who never go to the cinema, rising more or less consistently from 7% of large employers and higher level managers and professionals to 41% of those in routine occupations. Gender has relatively little impact on cinema attendance, although men – at 9% - are twice as likely as women to use the internet to view film clips. Tastes, however, are dramatically polarised in terms of gender with men’s first preferences for film genres expressed as a ratio in relation to women’s choices ranging from 1:31 in the case of romance films to 10:1 in the case of war movies (Table 3).
Table 3: Film and gender, main sample (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainly women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Women/men ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td><strong>31:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume drama/literary adap</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td><strong>5:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td><strong>3:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td><strong>2:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>1.6:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td><strong>1.2:1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainly men</th>
<th>Men/women ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td><strong>1.2:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td><strong>1.3:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/thriller</td>
<td><strong>1.7:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/art cinema</td>
<td><strong>2.5:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science fiction</td>
<td><strong>3:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerns</td>
<td><strong>5:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td><strong>6:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film noir</td>
<td><strong>7:1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td><strong>10:1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The influence of occupational class on taste, by contrast, is less strong. In Table 4, first preference film genres are assigned to classes on the basis of the class that registers the highest rate of preference for them, and arranged in descending order of their strength of association with that class.¹⁵ Costume dramas and literary adaptations are thus more strongly associated with large employers and higher level managers and professionals than they are with any other class, and more strongly than the other genres – science fiction and crime, for example – of which the same is true.¹⁶ While clear and quite marked differences of class association are evident in some cases – science fiction, documentaries and westerns are examples - the range of difference from the sample mean is, on the whole, quite modest.
Table 4: Film type and occupational class, main sample (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strongest class association</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Large employers/higher managers/professionals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume drama/literary adaptations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science fiction</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film noir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower professionals/managers; higher technical/supervisory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/Art cinema</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small employers/own account workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower supervisory &amp; technical workers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-routine occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Routine occupations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerns</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never worked</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are, however, more interesting local differences when the pattern of responses within these broad class bands is examined more closely. Science fiction, for example, is much more strongly supported by higher level managers and new professional employees than it is by professionals belonging to the traditional employees and self-employed groups. Costume drama is most strongly supported by new and traditional professional employees within this class whereas those liking art cinema come exclusively from the traditional professionals, both as employees and as
self-employed. The strong interest in romance films in the intermediate class comes
mainly from the clerical and administrative and the sales and service sectors within
this class – the sectors where women workers are mostly congregated - whereas none
of the routine workers who like westerns are located in the sales and services sector.
The preference for action, thrillers and adventure movies on the part of small
employers and own-account workers is most pronounced on the part of the non-
professional (37%) and agricultural (57%) sections of this class.

The articulation of relations of occupational class and gender that is evident in many
of these differences within classes becomes clearer in Table 5 which summarises
those genres for which there are significant differences in the gender distribution of
preferences for the genres most strongly associated with particular classes. The
inverted pattern of the ratios between men and women for costume dramas and
science fiction within the large employers and higher level managers and
professionals is of particular note in suggesting the operation of gendered forms of
cultural capital. The significance of this becomes clearer when considered in relation
to the gendered pattern of trainings among the university educated members of this
class. Thirty-five percent of those who studied science, maths or engineering at
university – and 77% of these are men - belong to this class compared to 22% of those
who studied humanities and social science subjects at university, 62% of whom are
women. Only 1% of those studying science subjects had a strong liking for costume
dramas and literary adaptations compared to 13% of those with humanities or social
science qualifications, with 11% liking science fiction compared to 8% of those with
humanities or social science qualifications.
Table 5: Gender/primary occupational class association, main sample (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class (Men/Women ratios)</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large employers/higher managers/professionals (69%M:31%W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume dramas</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science fiction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower profs/manage; higher tech/supervisory (43%M:57%W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/art cinema</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate (18%M:82%W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small employers/own account (68%M:32%W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/thriller</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower supervis/technical (76%M:24%W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-routine (28.5%M:71.5%W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine (52%M/48%W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerns</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, then, there is little evidence that film tastes are strongly divided along class lines. Certainly, we do not see a bipolar division between a clearly demarcated set of ‘upper class’ tastes and a group of popular films with appeal only to the working classes. That said, although, as we show elsewhere (Bennett and Silva, 2006), the effects of class are more weakly marked in relation to the media than they are in relation to the literary and visual art fields, this does not mean that they are without consequence. Genres that are conventionally ranked as low genres in hierarchies of film tastes – war, horror, westerns, musicals, comedies and cartoons – are associated most strongly with routine, semi-routine and lower supervisory positions while those in professional and management positions do show above
average levels of interest in genres that are traditionally viewed as belonging to the higher end of the film market: costume dramas, literary adaptations, film noir, and art cinema. It is also clear that, when looked at more closely, film tastes register significant differences between different sections of the same class and, as we have seen, they play an important role in the relations between gender and class with men and women members of the same classes often having significantly different film tastes that relate to the different kinds of cultural capital they have acquired in the course of their educational careers. And certainly there is little sense that those who do like the most legitimate genres do so at the price of non-participation in popular cinema. Indeed, while the tastes of the managerial and professional classes might be most distinct from those of the working classes in their appreciation of legitimate genres, the overall balance of their preferences is often tilted more toward popular cinema. To consider the case of professionals – both lower and higher – while 8% of these most preferred alternative or art cinema and 3% said they would make a point of watching a Pedro Almodovar film, 33% most preferred action, thriller and adventure films, and 32% said they would make a point of watching a Stephen Spielberg film.

Turning now to the influence of level of education (Table 6), this, too, is relatively modest. There are strong associations between liking musicals and westerns and having no formal educational qualifications, and between liking horror films and possessing higher secondary qualifications. The impact of university education is, however, quite small except for its connection to liking alternative or art cinema. This, again, stands in marked contradistinction to musical, artistic and literary tastes where university education is usually the most powerful discriminating factor.
Table 6: Film type and level of education, main sample (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongest level of education association</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No qualifications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerns</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GCSE/O Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Level, Higher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Further Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science fiction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/art</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film noir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age plays a much stronger differentiating role in relation to film choice than either class or education (Table 7). Its role in this regard is, indeed, second only to that of gender and, when genre preferences are arranged in a descending hierarchy from those that are most liked by 18 to 34 year olds compared to those aged 55 years and over, age polarises the field nearly as strongly.
Table 7: Film type like most by age, main sample (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18-34</th>
<th>35-54</th>
<th>55 +</th>
<th>Young/old %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youngest high preferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science fiction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative/art cinema</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film noir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollywood</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Adventure/Thriller</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oldest high preferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartoon</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume drama/Literary adaptations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerns</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear, then, that film choice varies in accordance with a range of social characteristics, but more so with gender and age than with level of education and occupational class. Figure 1 (see p. 62), the result of a multivariate correspondence analysis of the relations between film choice, makes it possible to visualise the interactions between the genre choices that we have so far considered one-by-one and, at the same time, to plot their relationship to a range of social positions. The vertical axis of this representation of the social space of film choice is governed largely by
age, with the three younger age groups included in the top left quadrant, but then swinging over to the right of the space as increasing age is associated, in the bottom right quadrant, with lower levels of education. The left-right axis is structured largely in terms of level of education and class position, albeit that the operation of these is inflected by the vertical axis of age. The working class positions (routine, semi-routine and lower supervisory workers) are located in the top right quadrant, and the higher occupational classes (both of the managerial and professional classes) in the bottom left quadrant. Those in intermediate occupations, small employers and own account workers are in the bottom right quadrant. Those with no educational qualifications are also congregated in this quadrant, while those with lower secondary and higher secondary qualifications are located in the top right and top left quadrants respectively. Those with vocational qualifications are also to be found in the top left quadrant, and those with university qualifications in the bottom left quadrant. There is also a gendered aspect to the horizontal axis, although not a sharp one, with women congregated more to the right of the space than men. We should note, finally, the operation of ethnicity within the main sample. The White English (71% of the sample) are located pretty well at the centre of the space, while the White Celtic (19%) are to their right, reflecting a tendency toward lower levels of education and lower occupational class positions on the part of the Irish, Scottish and Welsh members of sample. The White Other group (3%) is recruited mainly from North Americans, Europeans, and Australians currently working or studying in the UK. Many of these are credentialed workers with high levels of education and the highest occupational class positions of all the ethnic groups. The Other Origins group (7%) include the Afro-Caribbean, Indian and Pakistani members of the main sample as well
as other Asian and Black British and is most distinguished by the relative youthfulness of its members

**Figure 1: The social space of film choice**

Note: please magnify to 150% for on-screen viewing

It will be helpful, in discussing organisation of this space, to group those genres which occupy related positions within it, either because they are in the same quadrant or the same section of a quadrant. It will then be possible, by aggregating our respondents’ first preference for the genres within each of these sets and relating these
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to occupational class, level of education, age, gender and ethnicity (Table 8), to see how genre preferences within the social space of film are connected to different levels of cultural capital and the positions that different groups take up in relation to one another via their film preferences. However, a word of caution is necessary here since genres in the same quadrant may sometimes be closer to genres in other quadrants and, in some cases, genres occupy the borderlines between quadrants. We shall therefore comment on such cases where appropriate.

Bearing these qualifications in mind, six sets of genres can be identified.

(i) **Mainstream cinema (43.5%; 681 cases)**

This comprises action, thriller and adventure films and comedy, all located close to the centre of the space in the top left quadrant. These genres recruit their support fairly evenly from men and women. They also appeal to those from all levels of education, and, it is important to note, are the most popular choices for all levels of education just as they are the most popular choices for all social classes. Mainstream cinema, finally, is equally popular with the younger and middle age groups, but considerably less so with the over 55’s. They show little variation with regard to gender.

(ii) **Mainly women’s cinema (12.3%; 192 cases)**

This consists of cartoons, romance films, crime and Bollywood. These are located in the top right quadrant of the field. Women are roughly five times more likely to like such genres than men. This is reflected in the class composition of those with first preferences located in this set with the largest support coming from those who have never been in paid employment – many of whom are full-time housewives – and those
in intermediate class positions. There is also a reasonable spread of recruitment from across all levels of education although, compared with the mainstream genres, the ratio of those with no educational qualifications to those with both vocational and university qualifications is tilted in favour of the former. Those preferring the genres in this set are more likely to be middle-aged than in the younger or older age groups. In terms of ethnicity, the non-white members of the sample stand out as having the highest rate of preference for these genres. This partly reflects the inclusion of Bollywood in this genre set which, apart from its associations with gender, is also, as we have seen, strongly preferred by Indian and Pakistani respondents (but more so, however, by a ratio of about 2 to 1, by women within these groups).

(iii) Older popular cinema (12.5%; 197 cases)

The relevant genres here are war films, musicals and westerns located in the bottom right quadrant. Those whose first preferences fall within this set are most sharply distinguishable in terms of their low levels of education: the ratio of those with no qualifications to those with university degrees relative to the whole sample is a little over 4 to 1. The class structure of preferences for this set is characterised by a similarly steep incline of 7 to 1 between the 21% of routine workers and the 3% of large employers, higher managers and professionals whose preferences fall within it. The ratio of old to young in this set relative to their representation in the sample as a whole is over 6 to 1, and men are about a third more likely than women to prefer genres in this set. It is notable that neither the White Other or Other Origin groups shows a significant interest in these genres.

(iv) ‘Respectable’ cinema (14.8%; 231 cases)
The genres here are documentaries, costume dramas and literary adaptations. These form a closely interacting set toward the right hand border of the bottom left quadrant. Women are about a third more likely than men to like these genres. Those aged over 55 are about twice as likely to like them as those aged between 35 and 54 who, in turn, are more than twice as likely to like them than are 18 to 25 year olds. Small employers and own account workers show the strongest level of preference in occupational class terms. Preferences within this set, however, are also distinct from those of the older popular cinema group, tilting the balance of preferences toward the higher end of the occupational class structure with 17% of employers, higher level managers and professionals most liking these genres compared to 10% of routine workers. This set recruits higher levels of support from the lower secondary, higher secondary and vocational levels of education than does the older popular cinema set, and reverses the university/no qualifications ratio to roughly 6 to 4 in favour of the former. Choice for genres in this set thus operates, in part, as means of distinguishing those who like them from those with, on the whole, lower levels of education and occupying lower class positions, whose preferences are for older popular cinema. It is worth adding that, while not exclusive to Britain, literary adaptations, costume dramas and documentaries are strong aspects of British film culture and that, therefore, this set comes closer to being a national cinema than any of the others. There is little variation in level of interest in these genre among ethnic groups in the main sample.

(v) Younger popular cinema

(12.6%; 197 cases)
This comprises horror films, science fiction and fantasy, genres occupying the central regions of the top left quadrant. Here, too, we can see how genre choice is an act of
positioning within social space – in this case, one of double differentiation as preferences for horror, science fiction and fantasy films serve to mark off younger viewers from both mainstream cinema and from arts cinema. This is, however, more true of science fiction and fantasy than of horror which differs from these in the much younger age composition of its devotees (22% are under 25 compared to 4% of those interested in fantasy and 8% of those liking science fiction. Its associations with lower class positions are also considerably stronger. Men are twice as likely as women to prefer genres in this set except, again, for horror which men and women like equally. Those aged between 18 and 34 are about twice as likely as the middle age group to like genres in this set, and these, in turn, are about twice as likely as the over 55s. Here, however, the university educated are twice as likely as those with no educational qualifications to prefer genres in this set, and those with higher secondary qualifications almost three times as likely to do so. It is clear, moreover, in view of its age structure, that many of those who fall within this set are still in higher education on either a full or a part-time basis (interest in horror is highest among those with higher secondary qualifications) and that they will therefore eventually go on to acquire degrees. Here, then, is ample evidence in confirmation of the view that genres like fantasy are often interpreted parodically in the context of age-specific practices of distinction which mark off a space of film consumption that is differentiated from both mainstream cinema and the genres of art cinema (Sconce, 1995). Ethnicity is not of particular consequence in relation to this group of genres.

(vi) Arts cinema (2.4%; 37 cases)

This small set comprises art cinema and film noir, genres clustered closely together toward the left edge of the bottom left quadrant. Comprised mainly of men, and with a
bias toward the younger and middle age groups, those preferring these types of film are mostly university educated and with a marked concentration of support from those in the two highest occupational classes. It is notable, too, that knowing and liking the two art cinema directors we asked about – Pedro Almodovar and Jane Campion – is closely connected to liking these genres, as is knowing and liking Mani Ratnam as a marker of cosmopolitan cultural capital. There is, then, a strong set of European connotations (art cinema, film noir, two European directors) associated with the preferences of this group. Knowing and liking Alfred Hitchcock and Steven Spielberg, by contrast, are located at pretty well the dead-centre of the field while Ingmar Bergman is located closest to respectable cinema. Once again, ethnicity is muted in its effects so far as the main sample is concerned.

Table 8:

Table 8(a) Genres in social space (row %): Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainstream cinema</th>
<th>Mainly Women’s cinema</th>
<th>Older Popular cinema</th>
<th>Respect’le cinema</th>
<th>Younger popular cinema</th>
<th>Art cinema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8(b) Genres in social space (row %): Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainstream cinema</th>
<th>Mainly Women’s cinema</th>
<th>Older Popular cinema</th>
<th>Respect’le cinema</th>
<th>Younger popular cinema</th>
<th>Art cinema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No quals</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE/O Level</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Level, Higher</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8(c) Genres in social space (row %): Occupational class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainstream cinema</th>
<th>Mainly Women’s cinema</th>
<th>Older Popular cinema</th>
<th>Respect’le cinema</th>
<th>Younger popular cinema</th>
<th>Art cinema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSEC1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
NSEC1: Large employers, higher level managers and professionals
NSEC2: Lower level professionals and managers
NSEC3: Intermediate occupations
NSEC4: Small employers and own-account workers
NSEC5: Lower supervisory higher level technical workers
NSEC6: Workers in semi-routine occupations
NSEC7: Workers in routine occupations
NSEC8: Never worked

Table 8 (d) Genres in social space (row %): Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainstream cinema</th>
<th>Mainly Women’s cinema</th>
<th>Older Popular cinema</th>
<th>Respect’le cinema</th>
<th>Younger popular cinema</th>
<th>Art cinema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 (e) Genres in social space (row %): Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mainstream cinema</th>
<th>Mainly Women’s cinema</th>
<th>Older Popular cinema</th>
<th>Respect’le cinema</th>
<th>Younger popular cinema</th>
<th>Art cinema</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White English</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Celtic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Origin</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The general conclusions to be drawn from this are, first, that traditional elite practices of distinction in the cinema do exist, but are relatively minor in their impact, serving as a means for symbolically marking out small percentages of those in the higher social classes and educated strata from both other classes and educational strata and, just as importantly, from the larger percentages of their class and educational peers who do not place the genres of European arts cinema high in their preferences. The social space of film is somewhat more consequential in the lines that are drawn within it by the much larger groups who prefer ‘respectable’ cinema and, in so doing, clearly distinguish themselves from similarly aged people with both lower levels of education and class positions. Finally, film is perhaps most dynamically operated as a space of distinction by younger cinema-goers with relatively high levels of education, and destined for higher ones as they complete their educational careers, and who are equally likely to be upwardly mobile through the occupational class structure.

We move on now, in the next section, to consider the extent to which similar divisions are – or are not – evident in the social space of television.

**The social space of television**

In terms of level of participation, gender registers no distinctive effects. Those aged over 55 watch the most television. Twenty-one percent of this age group report watching 6 or more hours on weekday evenings compared to 13% of the 35 to 54 year olds and 9% of the 18 to 24 year olds, and 55% between 3 and 5 hours compared to 40% and 49% respectively. They are the least likely to watch less than two hours per evening at 24% compared to 47% of the middle age group and 42% of the youngest. Age, then, is clearly working differently in relation to television than in relation to
film, as participation increases markedly with ascent through the age ranks in contrast to the much younger profile of frequent cinema-goers. The same is true of occupational class. As we saw in the previous section, those occupying higher class positions are more likely to be regular cinema goers than are those in lower class positions. In the case of television, however, those in the two higher class positions are considerably less likely to have high viewing hours than all other classes except small employers and own account workers, with those in routine occupations and those who have never worked watching the most (Chart 8: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Table). The largest response for large employers and for all levels of managers and professionals is for watching 2 hours or less per weekday. Education operates similarly. Those with university education are about three times as likely (58%) to watch sparingly as those with no educational qualifications (21%), for example.

**Chart 8 : Weekday hours viewing by occupational class**

It is difficult to disentangle from these figures the extent to which they reflect real differences in practice as opposed to low reporting on the part of the members of higher class positions and educational groups as a means of registering a distance from the negative associations that attach to heavy television viewing: the ‘couch
potato’ as a figure usually with lower class connotations representing, in (usually) his preparedness to watch whatever is on ‘the box’, an incapacity to discriminate that signifies indolence in both body and mind (see Bennett, 2005).

Channel preferences give a clearer indication of the ways in which viewing practices connect with social position. BBC1 and ITV1 are the two most preferred channels for all levels of education, all social classes, all age groups, and for both men and women (Chart 9a to 9e: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Tables). BBC1, like BBC 2 and Channel 4, are more likely to be preferred as one ascends the ladder of educational accomplishment, whereas the opposite is true for ITV1 and Channel 5. The class profiles of these channel preferences show the same tendency. Age, however, is relatively muted in its impact so far as channel choice is concerned. It does not have a major influence on preferences for ITV1 which fluctuate by only 12% through the age ranges. Preferences for BBC1 increase by roughly 20% between the two extremes of the age range, and those for BBC2 increase threefold between the 18-24 year olds and the 55-64 year olds, and tail off a little after that. The exception to these tendencies is Channel 4 where preferences are highest in the 18-44 age ranges and fall off sharply after that. With regard to ethnicity, the most notable findings are the low rate of participation of the Other Origin group in BBC2, and their high level of engagement with Channel 5, while the White Other group has the strongest liking for Channel 4.
Chart 9(a): Channel preferences by education

Chart 9(b): Channel preferences by occupational class

Chart 9(c): Channel preferences by age
Chart 9(d): Channel preferences by gender

The structure of preferences in relation to digital, satellite or cable channels is by no means so clearly organised. Gender has limited effects, and mostly in relation to channels defined in terms of particular genres. Women are about twice as likely to watch lifestyle and hobby channels as men who, in turn, outnumber women in liking documentary channels and, by a ratio of 8 to 1, sports channels. Age operates in similar ways with the younger respondents far more likely to prefer music channels over both the other age groups while those over 55 have a strong liking for documentary channels. There are no discernible significant correlations between
channel choice in the non-terrestrial environment and either level of education or social class.

Gender, though, polarises choices in television just as sharply as it does in relation to film. Sport and soap operas comprise the polar extremes here, the latter liked by women in a ratio of 13:1 to men and the former reversing this pretty well exactly. Other genres strongly preferred by women are quizzes, variety, and drama, all at a ratio of 4:1 in relation to men, cookery, domestic improvement, and gardening programmes at a ratio of about 3:1 and arts programmes and police shows at a ratio of 2:1. Men and women like watching films on television and reality TV pretty much equally. After sport, men’s preferences are for documentary programmes at a ratio of 2:1, news and current affairs programmes at a ratio of 3:2 and comedy programmes at a ratio of 4:3.

Age is consequential in terms of its impact on genre choice, but less polarising. Sports, soaps, and cookery, home improvement and gardening programmes are liked pretty evenly across the age ranges, and the same is true of drama except for the quite strong interest (10%) shown in this by the 35-54 year olds. The genres most strongly associated with age are, in order of the oldest/youngest age group ratios, quizzes and games shows at 12:1, news and current affairs at 3:1, arts, variety and documentaries all at 2:1, and police and detective shows at 7:5. Eighteen to 34 year olds most prefer comedy programmes and reality television at ratio of roughly 4:1. Films are also strongly preferred at 3.5:1.
In terms of classes, the genres most liked by routine workers relative to other occupational classes are police and detective shows (10%) and soap operas (21%) – genres little liked by intermediate workers (4%) and large employers and higher-level managers and professionals (3%). Semi-routine workers have the strongest, but still very low, class preferences for reality television (2%) and films on television (10%), and large employers and higher-level managers and professionals the lowest. Lower supervisory workers score highest in relation to documentaries (17%) and comedy (15%), tastes which are most sharply distinguished from those of semi-routine (7%) and routine (8%) workers respectively. Small employers and own-account workers have the highest relative preferences for quizzes (4%) which recruits its lowest support from the large employers and higher-level managers and professionals (1%). Workers in intermediate occupations, who are mostly women, have the strongest relative preferences for drama (12%), cookery, home improvement and gardening programmes (6%), and variety television (2%). Lower professionals and managers are the most likely to prefer arts programmes (1.5%), with small employers and own-account workers, semi-routine and routine workers all expressing zero interest in this genre. Large employers and higher level managers and professionals, finally, register the highest levels of interest in news and current affairs programmes, and sports programmes – the first recruiting least interest from routine workers (8%) and the second from intermediate workers (8%) which, again, reflects the gendered composition of this class (82% of whom are women), especially relative to the large employers and higher level managers and professionals (69% of whom are men).

The genres preferred by those without formal educational qualifications are soap operas at 20%, police and detective shows at 8%, quiz and games shows (5%), and
variety television (2%). Those with university qualifications are the least likely to like three of these genres – soaps, police and detective shows, and quizzes – while those with vocational qualifications were the least likely to like variety television. Conversely, the genre most preferred by those with university education – news and current affairs (23%) – recruited least support from both of the lowest educational groups at 13% each. Arts television is also most preferred by those with university education, but by a very low percentage (2%) comprising only 6 individuals. Comedy is most preferred by those with higher secondary qualifications (17%) – a taste that is most sharply distinguished from that of those with no educational qualifications (7%). Reality television is most liked by those with higher secondary qualifications, and least liked by those with university degrees. Those with vocational qualifications show the highest levels of interest in documentaries (21%) and sport (18%), tastes that are marked off most sharply from those of the higher secondary (6%) and lower secondary (9%) groups respectively. Drama and cookery, home improvement and gardening programmes are most liked by those with lower secondary qualifications at 11% and 6% respectively. Drama recruits its lowest support from those with vocational qualifications (6%).

It will again be useful, as a way of visualising the relations between these different aspects of genre choice, to consider a multiple correspondence analysis of the social space of television (Figure 2). There are some significant differences between the organisation of this space and that for film. There are, first, a number of genres, some of them of interest to only small sections of the sample (arts programmes and reality television, the preferred choices of only 9 and 18 individuals respectively), that are relatively isolated from other genres in a space of their own. We have therefore, for
purposes of comparison, grouped these together with other genres in the same quadrant. An exception, however, is sport which, although in the same quadrant as comedy and films, is so overwhelmingly of interest to men that we have treated this as a separate category for the purposes of further exploration.
Key:

- TV Genre preferences
- Watch TV events
- Socio-demographic variables

This results in five groups whose distinguishing characteristics are summarised in Table 9. It will be useful to put the spotlight on each of these groups in turn.

(i) Respectable television (36%; 559 cases)
Located in the bottom left quadrant, comprising news and current affairs, dramas, documentaries and arts television, the first three of these genres are close to the centre of gravity of television viewing practices, recruiting the largest interest of both men and women, all levels of education except for those with higher secondary qualifications, all social classes except for those who have never worked, and of all age groups except for the 18 to 35 year olds. Like mainstream cinema, it also accounts for the largest percentage of the sample – 36% (559 respondents). However, it differs from mainstream cinema, first, in its bias toward the over 55s and, second, in being the area of television that correlates most positively with level of education in a ratio of roughly 1.5:1 of the university educated compared to those with no education qualifications. There is a similar class gradient of around 2:1 separating the large employers and all levels of managers and professionals from routine workers – the only area of preference to ascend consistently with class. In all these respects, then, although like mainstream cinema in numerical terms, respectable television is much more akin to respectable cinema in terms of the place it occupies in the social space of television – and both are, in fact, close to each other at the bottom of the field. We can note again here the higher level engagement of those in the White Other group with this area of television output – confirming the picture of this group as one with the most consistently ‘high’ media tastes in the sample.

(ii) Old popular television (14%; 214 cases)

Placed, like older popular cinema, in the bottom right quadrant, this set comprises quiz and game shows, cookery, home improvement and gardening shows, and police and detective series. This set is most evidently defined by its age structure with a ratio of roughly 2:1 between the oldest and youngest and strong representation from the 35-
54 year olds, and by the roughly 2:1 ratio of women to men. Routine workers are represented most strongly with a more-or-less steady but gentle decline from 17% to 11% of large employers and higher level managers and professionals. Those without educational qualifications are most likely to be found here and, alongside women’s popular television, this is the area of television where those with university education are least congregated. Again, though, the gradient is a relatively modest one. With regard to ethnicity, this area of television holds few attractions for those in the Other Origin group.

(iii) **Mainly women’s popular television (17%; 262 cases)**

Comprised of soaps, variety television and reality television (which, however, recruits its support evenly from men and women), this set recruits support from women to men at a ratio of 7:1 and is tilted toward younger women, although with significant involvement from women throughout the age ranges. It accounts for 17% of the sample (262 respondents). Support is strongest from those classes in which women predominate - semi-routine and intermediate – as well as from routine workers. It is lowest in the two employer classes and among lower supervisory workers – all classes where men are significantly in the majority. The ratio between highest and lowest level of class support is the highest for any of the five sets of genres at 4:1 between semi-routine workers on the one hand and large employers and higher level managers and professionals on the other. The same is true of education where interest descends consistently with every level of education from 30% of those with no qualifications to 10% of the university educated. In contrast to what we find in relation to film choices, this strongly gendered group of programmes is not of strong interest to either the White Other or the Other Origin groups.
(iv) **Sport (12.8%; 200 cases)**

This registers more modest and less consistent variations in regard to education and also a lower ratio of difference in terms of class of a little more than 2:1 between the highest of 20% for large employers and higher level managers and professionals and 7% for intermediate workers – an effect, however, that is just as much one of gender as of class. The effect of age is negligible. The high level of interest in sports television on the part of those in the Other Origin group is notable.

(v) **Younger popular television (19%; 302 cases)**

This set is made up of comedy, situation comedies and films. It is the second largest grouping but still much smaller than mainstream cinema which, however, it resembles in many ways and is spatially proximate to it. Its gender balance is tilted slightly in favour of men but its age structure is tilted strongly toward the young – indeed, more markedly so than for mainstream cinema with a ratio of a little over 2:1 between the youngest and middle age groups and of a little less than 4:1 between the youngest and the oldest groups. Also like mainstream cinema this as an area of the social space of television in which the interest is strongest from those with lower secondary and higher secondary educational qualifications. Clearly, then, many of those in this genre set will acquire higher levels of education as they complete their educational careers, just as they will prove to be socially mobile in class terms, with ascent particularly likely from those currently in intermediate occupations and in lower professional and management positions. Those in the White Celtic group show the lowest level of interest in these genres.
Table 9 (a): Genres and the social space of television - Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Younger popular television</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Mainly women’s popular television</th>
<th>Older popular television</th>
<th>Respectable television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 (b): Genres and the social space of television - Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Younger popular television</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Mainly women’s popular television</th>
<th>Older popular television</th>
<th>Respectable television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No quals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE/O Level</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Level, Higher</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (c): Genres and the social space of television - Occupational class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSEC</th>
<th>Younger popular television</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Mainly women’s popular television</th>
<th>Older popular television</th>
<th>Respectable television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSEC1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
NSEC1: Large employers, higher level managers and professionals
NSEC2: Lower level professionals and managers
NSEC3: Intermediate occupations
NSEC4: Small employers and own-account workers
NSEC5: Lower supervisory higher level technical workers
NSEC6: Workers in semi-routine occupations
NSEC7: Workers in routine occupations
NSEC8: Never worked

Table 9 (d): Genres and the social space of television - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Younger popular television</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Mainly women’s popular television</th>
<th>Older popular television</th>
<th>Respectable television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (e): Genres and the social space of television - Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Younger popular television</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Mainly women’s popular television</th>
<th>Older popular television</th>
<th>Respectable television</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White English</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Celtic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Origin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are, then, some parallels between the social space of television and that of film in that there are clearly age-marked differences between the ways in which the space is structured by practices of distinction. The popular genres most liked by women and by older viewers comprise the ‘low’ genres within the television space with the genres of respectable and younger popular television marking two different sets and strategies of distinction on the part of older and younger viewers respectively.

This reading of the space is corroborated by the ways in which preferences for the particular programmes we asked about are distributed within it. Tables 10a and 10e thus shows that the programmes classified as soaps/reality and those as popular drama have ‘low’ associations relative to the other three groups of programmes in view of their strong association with lower levels of educational attainment and lower class positions. They are, however, marked variations in their age profiles with soaps/reality registering little variation across the age ranges, whereas a liking for the popular drama programmes increases steadily from 17% of the 18 to 34 year olds through 30% of the 34-55 year olds and 44% of the over 55s. If the programmes classified as ‘serious television’, new drama and new comedy all register significant
increases with both level of education and class position, their positions with respect to age are very different. In the case of serious television, support from the over 55 year olds is double that from the middle-aged group which, in turn, is double that of the youngest group. New drama, by contrast, is most popular with the middle-aged group and half as popular with the over 55s as with the 18 to 34 year olds while new drama – especially popular younger women – is twice as popular with the youngest viewers compared to middle-aged ones and close to a ratio of 7:1 compared to the over 55s. The strong presence of American imports in these programme clusters supports the contention that younger managerial and professional groups look increasingly to quality American television rather than to British produced television as a way of marking out their distinctive socio-cultural trajectories. The strong interest in new comedy on the part of the white, but non-British, members of the sample lends further support to the role of quality American television in creating a shared cosmopolitan culture for the well-educated and upwardly mobile under 40s (Savage et al, 2005)

Table 10(a): Television programme choice (row%) - Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soaps/reality</th>
<th>Popular drama</th>
<th>‘Serious television’</th>
<th>New drama</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No quals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE/O Level</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Level, Higher</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10(b): Television programme choice (row%) - Occupational class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soaps/reality</th>
<th>Popular drama</th>
<th>‘Serious television’</th>
<th>New drama</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSEC1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
NSEC1: Large employers, higher level managers and professionals
NSEC2: Lower level professionals and managers
NSEC3: Intermediate occupations
NSEC4: Small employers and own-account workers
NSEC5: Lower supervisory higher level technical workers
NSEC6: Workers in semi-routine occupations
NSEC7: Workers in routine occupations
NSEC8: Never worked

Table 10(c): Television programme choice (row%) - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Soaps/reality</th>
<th>Popular drama</th>
<th>‘Serious television’</th>
<th>New drama</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10(d): Television programme choice (row%) - Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soaps/reality</th>
<th>Popular drama</th>
<th>‘Serious television’</th>
<th>New drama</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10(e): Television programme choice (row% - Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soaps/reality</th>
<th>Popular drama</th>
<th>‘Serious television’</th>
<th>New drama</th>
<th>New comedy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White English</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Celtic</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Other</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Origin</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have left sport out of the picture until now not because, as an incautious reading of Table 9 might suggest, it is an area of shared tastes between all men irrespective of their ages, educational backgrounds or class positions. This is merely a reflection of the failure of the question we asked about television genre preferences to distinguish between different kinds of sport on television. A question in a later section of the questionnaire which asked our respondents to identify the kind of sport they most liked to watch, which ones they would choose as a second preference, and which ones they liked to watch least, whether on television or at a live event, provides a corrective to this. The dendogram produced by a hierarchical cluster analysis of responses across these questions yielded three distinct clusters:

Cluster 1: Ice hockey, boxing, wrestling, darts, snooker, and speedway and stockcar racing.

Cluster 2: Soccer, rugby league, cricket, basketball, horse racing, swimming, gymnastics, athletics and formula one racing.

Cluster 3: Rugby union, Tennis, gold, skiing.
While there is a low degree of variation in preferences for watching the sports in the second of these clusters when related to both occupational class and education, the same is not true of the first and third clusters which register significant differences in relation to both of these variables. Those with university degrees are more than twice as likely to watch the sports in the third cluster compared to those with no educational qualifications, for example, whilst the ratio of those without qualifications to the university educated who like the sports in the first group is a little over 2.5:1.

As a final note, the correspondence analysis we have reported on here also allows us to see how the ‘television events’ discussed earlier are placed relative to other preferences within the social space of television. We thus find knowing about and liking the world cup in the upper left quadrant, but closes to sport and, of all the TV events, the closest to the centre of the field. Watching the Queen’s Christmas message is located in the bottom right quadrant, closest to quizzes and game shows and clearly a preference strongly associated with older viewers. Watching the Grand National is located in the same quadrant but closer to the centre of the field, and watching general election night on television is located in the lower left quadrant close to news and current affairs and documentaries. In view of the degree to which, as we noted earlier, Afro-Caribbean, Indian and Pakistani respondents are distanced from these aspects of the national television culture, this offers a good prompt to return now to the questions concerning the relationships between ethnicity and national cultural capital with which we started.

National cultural capital
It will be useful here to stand back from the detail a little and to review the general tendencies regarding the relations between the ethnic file as a whole and the main sample. One striking difference in relation to film – that relating to the genre set in which women have the strongest interest – reflects the inclusion of Bollywood within this set (Chart 10: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Table). For while women within the ethnic file like this a good deal more than the men, it recruits far more support from Pakistani and Indian men than any of the other genres in this set do from men as a whole. Perhaps the most consequential finding here, however, is the strong disconnection of black and Asian Britons from ‘respectable film’ – the set with the strongest national associations – and from the war/westerns/musicals set of ‘older popular cinema. But the stronger interest of black and Asian Britons in the ‘younger popular film’ set is equally notable.

Chart 10: Ethnic file/main sample – film

This is echoed, in the case of television, by the high rate of interest of black and Asian Britons in the ‘younger popular television’ set, and the lower rates of interest in relation to the main sample that are evident for both ‘respectable’ and ‘older popular’ television – again, both groupings with strong national associations (news, current affairs, nature and history documentaries in the case of ‘respectable television’; quiz
and game shows, cookery, home improvement and gardening shows, and the more international police and detective series) in the case of ‘older popular television’ (Chart 11: see Appendix 2 for accompanying Table). And, as we have already seen, the low rate of interest on the part of black and Asian Britons in ‘women’s television’ reflects a disengagement from some of the key examples of what we might call ‘regional popular television’ – soap operas like *Coronation Street*, for example.

**Chart 11: Ethnic file/main sample – television**

![Chart 11: Ethnic file/main sample – television](image)

Of course, it is not only in relation to film and television that we find these tendencies. In the case of visual art, for example, 62% of the ethnic sample had not heard of Turner, the most well known of all the artists we asked about, compared to 27% of the main sample and 22% of the White English group. We see a similar pattern for Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*: 34% of black and Asian Britons had not heard of this compared to 7% of the main sample and 4% of the White English. In these cases, however, and in contrast to the pattern we saw in relation to ‘television events’ (Table 2), which – except for the World Cup – those born in the UK were less interested in than were the older members of the ethnic file who were born overseas, the level of interest increases noticeably in the case of second or third generation migrants. Forty-two percent of the UK born had heard of Turner compared with 35% of those born
overseas and, in the case of *Pride and Prejudice*, the respective figures are 17% and 47%.

It would be premature to draw any general conclusions from these figures regarding the relative degrees to which the position of first and subsequent generations of migrants changes in relation to different areas of what Hage calls national cultural capital. It is likely, for example, that the sharp increase in familiarity with *Pride and Prejudice* reflects the high exposure this enjoyed at the time of our survey in being voted the most liked book in the BBC’s *Big Read* project. And the evidence provided by levels of participation in different areas of cultural activity – as distinct from our evidence about likes and knowledge – point in a different direction. In Table 11 we compare things which members of both our ethnic and main samples never do. Here, watching broadcast television and, more dramatically, going to the cinema increase significantly for second- and third-generation migrants, as do eating out, going to the theatre and going to night clubs and, to a lesser extent, of going to pubs. There is a similar tendency in relation to visiting art galleries. There is, however, virtually no change in levels of participation relating to going to museums, art galleries, bingo, orchestral concerts, and a notable decrease so far as visiting stately homes and historic houses – key institutions of national heritage – are concerned.
Table 11: Never do – born overseas, born UK and main sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never do</th>
<th>Born overseas</th>
<th>Born UK</th>
<th>Main sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to cinema</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to museums</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to pubs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to rock concerts</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to opera</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to bingo</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to orchestral/choral concerts</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to stately homes/historic sites</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to theatre</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to art galleries</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to night clubs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eat out</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch broadcast tv</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, it is important not to jump to conclusions here since it is, in many of these cases, difficult to distinguish a generational effect from that of age. As we have seen, most of the members of the ethnic file born in the UK are mostly under 40 and this goes a good way to explaining many of the differences here. Religion, too, is a factor: close to 30% of the ethnic sample do not go to pubs on religious grounds, whereas this is true of only 2% of the main sample. Nonetheless, data of this kind does open up interesting policy questions concerning the relative capacity of different areas of culture – many of them publicly funded – to function inclusively or divisively in relation to racialised differences. We shall, however, be in a better position to explore these more fully when we have taken account of our qualitative evidence relating to film and television use. It is to this latter issue that we turn in the next chapter.
Chapter 2: Media Talk

This chapter is based upon the findings of the qualitative part of the CCSE project, made up of talk about film and television from focus groups (held prior to the administration of the questionnaire) and household interviews (conducted with re-contacted survey respondents, some 4 to 8 months following their survey ‘interview’). The chapter begins with an account of the process of the qualitative phases of the research. It goes on to examine specific talk emerging from the focus groups about cinema attendance and television participation before engaging with the trends and patterns of preferences articulated in our household interviews in relation to some of the categories of film and TV and patterns of ‘social space’ established in the previous chapter. There then follows a discussion of the film and television preferences of the members of our elite sample. The chapter concludes with an account of the distinctive ways in which tastes for TV and film were articulated within the focus groups and interviews amongst the three minority groups, Indian, Pakistani and Afro-Caribbean.

This qualitative component stands as interesting data in itself, but also allows us to reflect upon, confirm or qualify the kinds of trends and patterns of media participation that the previous chapter has revealed. Crucially it allows the meanings of the trends and patterns, in terms of particular preferences or dislikes for genres of film and TV identified on the survey, to emerge. Examining how tastes are articulated, how knowledge is expressed and how forms of participation are experienced are as important components of our data as the statistical measurement of taste, participation
and knowledge. Such articulations are central to a nuanced understanding of the role of film and media in debates about cultural capital more generally.

‘Asking the audience’ what they think is an important tactic of the contemporary film and television industries, informing both market identification and, via test screenings, focus groups and on-line fan communities, the production of media texts themselves (Gomery 2003, Harbord 2002, Shefrin 2004). In addition numerous sociological studies have also demonstrated the ways in which talk about film, and television in particular, are vital components of everyday discourse across a range of social and cultural positions (Ang 1991, Moores 1993, Silverstone 1994). This ubiquity gives film and media an important and distinctive place in contemporary debates about cultural capital.

For us, it has two particular effects. Firstly, the ease of access to TV and film complicates the ability of film and television texts to ‘do the work’ of cultural capital, to be rarefied and consecrated in the ways in which particular paintings, books or pieces of music are. The relatively recent historical emergence of academic inquiry into film similarly implies the relatively recent (compared to literature or music) establishment of a hierarchy of good or bad films. Alongside this is a ‘popular’ canon of films in which popular appraisal is linked with box-office success, video or DVD sales, or television ratings. 19

The intimate relationship between ‘promotion’ and critical appraisal in the film media muddies this further, as does the relationship between art and commerce in contemporary thinking about the cultural industries. These factors make what people
say about film and TV and the uses this talk is put to pivotal in policy concerns. Hill points to the controversy surrounding the use of National Lottery funding, via the UK Film Council, to fund the critically panned comedy *Sex Lives of the Potato Men*.

‘Although accepting that the film was not without its flaws, the Film Council nevertheless publicly defended it on the grounds that it was not only likely to make money but also appeal to audiences who, unlike many middle-class critics, actually purchased lottery tickets’ (Hill 2004:34).

A similar argument can be made about television. If everyone participates in and has access to television, as our survey evidence suggests, then the kinds of television which might be considered good, in a cultural hierarchy, is less clear. Television instead seems to stand, in discussions of cultural hierarchy (including those in our study), as an example of a diminished, trivial or frivolous form that is taken seriously in relatively few cases.

Secondly, for researchers into cultural capital, the near universality of participation (identified by the survey and confirmed by talk in both focus groups and household interviews) means that people are used to articulating their tastes for film and TV and are therefore more able and willing to engage with a study of this kind. TV and film were, in both the focus groups and the household interviews, the topics that generated the greatest ‘volume’ of talk, across all social and cultural backgrounds. Thus TV and film allowed us an easier ‘way in’ to talk about cultural participation with some groups and allowed us and them to make illuminating connections between, and to explain the reasons for, their relative participation in the fields of film and television and their relative lack of participation in other fields.
Who spoke to us

The Focus Groups

The qualitative component had two stages. Firstly, from March to September 2003, twenty-five focus groups were arranged in seven locations across the UK. These were chosen to reflect urban and rural, provincial and metropolitan settings, and to take in the different national contexts of the UK. The groups were also designed to reflect different ages, socio-economic status, and ethnicities and to take in different sexual identities (a list of the groups is in Appendix 3). Researchers assembled the groups in a number of ways, using established groups (such as a gay men’s support group) approaching community centres (in the cases of Pakistani professionals and Pakistani manual/clerical workers), approaching workplaces or ‘snowballing’ from personal contacts.

The groups ranged from two to nine members, with an average of six respondents. Each group was allocated two special topics for discussion. These were selected from a list of seven designed to cover a range of forms of cultural participation, with the aim of generating around two hours of discussion per group. In addition to these special topics, there were topics to be discussed by every group, including ‘major leisure activities in and about the home’, a topic which in most groups became an extended discussion of TV and film viewing in the home. The groups were conducted, both to help in the design of the larger survey (ensuring that the activities and forms of participation which we asked about in that part of the study had resonance beyond the specific cultural knowledge of the research team) and to begin to draw out the
meanings and values that participants invested in their cultural lives. Moderators, drawn from the research team and from the Open University’s network of Associate Lecturers were encouraged to orchestrate an informal discussion. This was in recognition of the demands of this particular methodological tool for ‘flattening’ relations of power between researchers and researched, but also in recognition of the sensitivities of questions of taste and participation amongst groups which were, in some cases, meeting for the first time.

There are advantages and disadvantages to focus groups as a means of conducting research in the general area of cultural capital (see Silva and Wright 2005) but, with a cautionary recognition of the focus group material as part of the broader study rather than a stand-alone endeavour, we can see some rich and informative discussions emerging from them.

The Household Interviews

The second qualitative phase of the study involved 44 household interviews held with respondents to the survey and, where appropriate, their partners. A question on the survey asked respondents if they would be willing to take part in a follow-up interview and the sample for this stage of the research was determined from these responses. A letter was sent requesting participation in a follow-up interview, followed by telephone contact by the interviewer. Interviews, again drawing on the Open University’s network of researchers, together with members of the research team, were held across the country, including participants in Belfast, South-West Scotland, Wales, the North-West of England, London and the Midlands. Partners were asked to participate as part of the broader concern of the project to examine the ways
in which cultural capital relates to household composition. In most cases they agreed.  

Again, the interview sample was designed to include respondents from a range of socio-economic positions, to take in different ethnicities, different sexual identities and, crucially, different levels of cultural capital. The spread of interviews can be seen in Appendix 4. Whilst we aimed for a theoretical sample which took account of all these differences, in practice our interview sample was skewed towards those with higher levels of cultural capital. This reflected the higher rate of refusal upon re-contact by those in lower socio-economic groups and from the minority ethnic groups.

The interview schedule included questions about a range of cultural activities, designed to build on and complement the survey questionnaire. Interview participants were thus able to expand, clarify or correct their survey answers about film and television preferences, reading preferences, taste in music or food, as well as to provide more discursive accounts of the meanings of these preferences in the context of their lives. So much by way of background. We look first at what this evidence tells us about film preferences.

**Favourite Films**

In addition to clarifying and elaborating their survey answers, respondents to the household interview phase of the study were asked to identify a favourite film or favourite book. Because of the relative size of the sample, these selections are less meaningful from an analytic perspective but these questions did allow for the opening
up of the topics with participants, particularly around their own perceptions of quality and value in the context of film. A list of the favourite films selected is provided in Appendix 5. Some respondents chose more than one favourite, though some could not identify a favourite, either through lack of engagement with film in that way, or through a preponderance of favourites they could not decide between. It is interesting to note that many of the preferred films were ones which had become favourites through repeated viewing on television, such as *Grease, Where Eagles Dare, The Italian Job*, and *The Sound of Music*. As such they were arguably more a part of a ‘television’ canon than a reflection of possible hierarchies in the aesthetic appreciation of cinema.

Whilst the reasons for choosing a particular film were diverse, interview respondents rarely drew on aesthetic criteria or complex or sophisticated appreciation of plot or style. Indeed, as earlier qualitative research into film has shown (BFI 2000), films are rarely talked of as anything other than entertainment. What our qualitative interviews allowed was a way for respondents to contextualise their choices in their own lives. This is nicely illustrated by the example of Allie,24 an agricultural supplies merchant interviewed in a small town in the Ayrshire coalfield. A father of two, whose wife is a schoolteacher in nearby secondary school, Allie is classified by our sample, by virtue of his wife’s qualifications, as being in a high cultural capital household. His own cultural participation, though, is limited by time, and by his own declared lack of interest in such matters. Asked his favourite, Allie replies

*Allie: Probably *Top Gun*. That’s probably a common answer.
*Interviewer:  No, no, no, you’d be surprised. But more interestingly why *Top Gun*, what was it about that film?
*Allie: The kind of pilot, what would you call it just it was thrilling, it was full of action, some female entertainment.
*Interviewer: You mean the love kind of
*Allie: Yeah, there was a love story in it as well. It was just you know happy school memories
*Interviewer: So it linked to a particular time in your life as well
*Allie: Yes, ah ha. Where I stayed as a child, we stayed in a hostel from Monday to Friday, we had to board, high school was sixty miles away so the only, we stayed it was a mixed hostel, forty boys, forty girls so
*Interviewer: While you were living there you saw -
*Allie: - that was one of the films and it was a big night this was on and it was watched about every Wednesday night for three or four weeks afterwards, the same film. It’s just a memory that’s stuck.

The choice of *Top Gun*, a blockbuster film made 20 years previously, could be explained in a number of ways. Part of the ‘mainstream cinema’ category identified in the previous chapter, as an exemplary, definitive, action adventure, the preference for such films could be construed (as indeed they were by Bourdieu) as merely evidence of an unsophisticated cultural palette. In fact, the talk reveals some intriguing elements to this choice. The idea expressed by Allie that ‘that’s probably a common answer’ points to a conception of himself as part of a typical, normal audience for films. This kind of identification was not uncommon, particularly amongst men, who were often keen not to have their cultural tastes distinguish them in obvious ways. For Allie, growing up in a rural area of South West Scotland (his father was a tenant farmer) the range of opportunities for cultural participation might have been limited. Thus a trip to the cinema took on far greater personal significance than it would for a respondent in an urban or metropolitan setting, where such experiences are, for some at least, far more a part of the fabric of everyday life. Moreover, whilst Allie refers to the plot and genre of the film (the action, the romantic interest) as explanations for his choice, it is arguably not the film itself that is being ‘liked’ here so much as a nostalgia for a time, prior to work and family commitments, when he could repeatedly
enjoy the pleasures of a film and the pleasures of the company of his friends.

Intriguingly *Top Gun* is also selected as a favourite film by his wife.

Such complexities surrounding tastes and forms of participation, intimately linking them with personal biographies, might be missed by a quantitative approach alone. The following section will use this aspect of the qualitative material to consider reasons given for and against cinema attendance.

**Cinema attendance**

The previous chapter identified the relatively small number of the main sample (18%) who visited the cinema more than once a month. This relative rarity of an unabashed enthusiasm for cinema attendance is echoed in the qualitative phase, notably in the focus groups. A relationship was also identified between cinema attendance and socio-economic class (with 41% of those in routine occupations reporting that they never go, compared to only 7% of those in higher-managerial professional occupations) and with age, where over 50% of the over 55s never attend compared to only 7% of the youngest group. These patterns are largely confirmed by the talk of the focus groups, where it was in the younger, professional and middle-class groups that regular cinema attendance was most likely to be reported. A notable exception emerged in talk with the retired professionals/middle-class pensioners group, where a high level of cinema attendance was reported. Alongside the question of whether or not to attend at all, there emerged another question relating to the type of venue that focus group members preferred, with distinctions existing between ‘popular’, ‘mainstream’ or ‘multiplex’ cinemas and ‘art-houses’.
Reasons given for non-attendance ranged from financial restrictions, the inconvenience of having to travel (particularly marked in the rural groups), to a dislike of the peculiarities of the cinema space, in contrast to watching films at home. Participants with young children reported that caring and childcare commitments both prevented their regular attendance (in some cases exacerbating the perceived financial costs) and influenced the likelihood of attendance. ‘Giving the kids a treat’ was a common reason for going to the cinema in families with children. Adult viewing of preferred films in these families was more limited to the domestic sphere. The speed of transfer from theatre release to DVD/video to television (particularly satellite television) meant that parents within groups where interest in film culture was high could still engage this interest in a domestic setting.

Financial considerations were predictably central to the infrequency of cinema attendance for members of the low paid women’s group and the benefit claimants group (both held in Belfast). In these two groups, the addition of child-care considerations, either paying for a babysitter to allow adults to attend, or paying the additional cost of children and their sweets and drinks, meant that a trip to the cinema would take up too much of their weekly income to be viable.

Questions of cost were also a central explanation for rare attendance in the skilled and semi-skilled groups of manual workers (both held in Swansea). In the latter case a particular tension emerged between the conception of ticket prices, combined with the cost of refreshments, as ‘rip-offs’ when combined with the relative financial cost of viewing a film on a video or DVD (including, in the case of the skilled workers, the use of pirate videos or DVDs) in the home. In the domestic context, members of the
skilled workers group argued, one could consume the refreshments of one’s choice, one could feel more comfortable and, importantly, one could chat. The inability to smoke and drink in the contemporary multiplex cinema space increased the opportunity cost of this form of participation. More tellingly though, a sense emerges of the lack of comfort of this group of skilled workers, who were all under the age of 35 and relatively au fait with the personalities and trends of contemporary popular film, in the specific, managed, space of the cinema. Interestingly, in one of the rural groups, held with landowners and managers, the local village cinema retained a bar, making it a preferred venue than the larger complex in a nearby town.

In other groups, where a greater volume of cinema attendance was reported, cost was less of a factor, becoming so only when issues of childcare emerged. Some members of groups reported particularly high levels of participation. Leo, a marketing manager in an electronics firm from the Afro-Caribbean professionals group, claimed to have been to the cinema ten times in the month prior to the focus group; Pete, a post-graduate science student from the young professionals/student group went every week; Cynthia, a retired medical secretary from the middle-class pensioners group also went every week. Such high levels were enabled in part by their urban location. Members of the London-based groups in particular reported the plethora of choices available to them and the distinctions they made between relatively local, though still significantly sized venues, and the large West-End cinemas, reserved for ‘special occasions’. For Pete and Cynthia their location close to a specialist arts cinema offered both access to their preferred genres (Pete had a preference for American independent cinema of the Coen Brothers; Cynthia preferred Ealing comedies and literary adaptations) and an amenable venue. Another member of the middle-class
pensioners group, Joan, a retired librarian, agreed with this assessment, commenting that her local arts cinema was ‘a comfortable, cosy place to go to. And there is somebody you know there usually.’

The difference between the relative lack of comfort of the skilled workers above and the ease in the setting of regular participants is accentuated when the talk specifically concerns types of cinema, the most obvious distinction emerging between multiplex and art house films. In a number of groups (notably the ‘culture professionals’, the young professionals/students) this distinction became synonymous with the types of films being watched, with ‘art house’ films being interpreted as a more cerebral, or authentic form of participation and multiplexes associated with a less critical interpretation of mass culture – though one that these groups could associate themselves with in a negotiated way. This exchange, between a theatre marketing officer, Zara, a contemporary art gallery education officer, Tina, a 23 year old recent fine-art graduate working as a clerical and gallery assistant, and Linda, an art gallery marketing officer draws these issues out.

*Zara: I think this thing the expectation is that you go to the Gateway you expect to be challenged by what you see on the screen whereas if you go to Showcase or Warner’s, just - I don’t expect to be challenged
*Tina: It’s mainstream
*Shelley: One’s quite throw away isn’t it and the other one’s quite sort of intellectual I suppose because that’s where I think like you were saying about sort of Hollywood blockbusters in a way I don’t really wanna go and see things, I don’t want to spend my money on things like that because I kind of think well I’m just lining some fat cats’ pockets with this and when I go to see something at Gateway I kind of feel like I’m doing something good because a) it might be more interesting and might educate me in some way and at the same way as well, in the same way as sort of helping to fund more of a like side line industry like an independent industry where people are trying to do things on smaller budgets so I don’t know, you sort of feel like you are adding to something that should be kept alive or, whereas Hollywood things I kind of, I sometimes feel really like I shouldn’t be going to see this, this is really bad because it’s not -
*Linda: - the equivalent of a cream cake then!
The notion of the arts cinema as a place to be ‘challenged’ or educated, with the multiplex as mainstream, implies a persistent form of hierarchy in film participation, with the venue, rather than the subject matter or genre of the film, being the primary source of distinction. Art cinema is here, explicitly in Shelley’s account, associated with a rejection of corporate or global forms of cultural production in favour of support for ‘independent’ producers, perceived to be struggling. The feelings of self-reproach that emerge from participation in mainstream culture is re-cast by Linda as a guilty pleasure, which the members of this group, rich in cultural capital, are able to keep a distance from and ironise.

This ability to move between types of venue and forms of participation is clearly not spread evenly across groups. In the skilled manual/clerical worker group, we see a quite different conceptualisation of the ‘art house’ space, and a specific perception of the audience at this kind of venue in this exchange between Kate, a 22 year old care-home nurse, Daz, 28, a telesales assistant, Jess, 25, who worked ‘on computers’ for a bank, Steve, 26, who worked as a satellite television engineer, Chas, 26, a plumber and Wayne, 26, a window-fitter.

*Kate: [laughing] I don’t know. Can you imagine Wayne phoning everybody up and saying, ‘Come to the arts cinema?’ We’d all laugh our heads off.
[General laughter]
*Moderator: Having said that, that everybody would laugh their heads off if Wayne did this, what sort of people do you think go? In general?
*Kate: People with interests.
*Daz: I reckon people who’ve got something to do with it.
*Chas: Yes, yes.
[Consensus]
*Jess: That they are going to benefit from it and stuff.
*Wayne: Like they are doing it for courses and stuff.
*Moderator: So they are doing it for a purpose?
*Steve: Yeah. People who are, well, its not just their leisure time.
They are actually doing something. It probably is their interests but that’s what they’re doing on a course as well.

*Kev: I think a lot of old people. Middle aged people who don’t really go out.
*Chas: A lot of old people I think.
*Steve: People who don’t go out socially, drinking and that.
*Kev: Retired people I think. Like museums and that are full of oldies. And art galleries and stuff like that, there’s all oldies in there.

What emerges here is the alien-ness of an orientation to film as anything other than entertainment. This feeds into a perception of ‘art cinemas’ as analogous to museums and art galleries in ways that this group does not value. Specifically they are not sites for the kind of immediate, sensory or bodily pleasures they associate with their own leisure interests (they are for people who don’t ‘socialise’ or drink). Rather they are strongly and negatively associated with education and with age.

The Social Space of Film & Television

This section will use the talk, primarily from the household interviews to build on our understanding of the various categories of taste that emerge from our survey sample.

Film and television are combined here for three important reasons. Firstly, as the survey established and the above discussion has suggested, participation in film culture through regular cinema attendance is limited to a relatively small group.

Secondly, whilst we planned to talk about film and TV separately in the design of both the focus groups component and the household interviews, the distinction between them was less clear in the talk of our respondents. This is demonstrated by the ways in which some groups, notably the pensioner focus groups and some household interview respondents, made little distinction between television dramas and films or even referred to films as ‘plays’. Films were also largely consumed in
domestic settings, either through broadcast media or through the use of hired video or DVD. Finally, in the household interviews, not all categories generated significant amounts of discussion. This may be, in part, an artefact of the process of identifying the qualitative sample, which was based upon ethnicity, location, cultural capital and household type, rather than preferences. It is worth noting, though, that few people in the qualitative sample disliked ‘mainstream cinema’ (action, thriller & adventure or comedy), no-one we interviewed at this stage chose ‘respectable cinema’ (documentaries, costume dramas and literary adaptations) as a particular favourite genre and only one respondent liked ‘older popular cinema’ (war films, musicals and westerns). Similarly very few people in the qualitative sample disliked ‘older popular television’ (quiz and game shows, cookery/home improvement, police & detective) or ‘younger popular television’ (comedy, sit-coms and films).

With these, perhaps revealing, limitations to the data in mind, this section will proceed by examining explanations for likes and dislikes in categories which generated the most polarised views (such as mainly women’s popular television, and younger popular cinema) and other categories which generated revealing talk about the possibility of hierarchies in film participation. It will begin, though with a consideration of a form of TV which gained almost universal approval.

‘Respectable Television’ (news/current affairs, documentaries and arts)

The way in which this preference was articulated was subtly different between respondents who chose history and documentaries as their favourites and those who chose news and current affairs. In the case of the former, this preference was typically informed by a desire to ‘educate’ or challenge oneself through television. Specifically
dismissing the passive, entertaining viewing, Euan, a professional working in the heritage industry, explains his preference in these terms

*Interviewer:* You say you watch a lot of nature and history – what do you like about those?
*Euan:* I like to, I can’t watch comedy and sit-coms because I don’t think that I’m learning anything from it. I like to think that I’m gaining something which is what’s quite nice about history and documentaries, news and current affairs. I think there’s so many people that have no idea what’s going on in the world, it’s a travesty really, you know we should pay more attention to these sorts of things. Yeah, it ties into things that I can’t read novels, I have to read factual books, I feel I’m getting some knowledge from it.

*Interviewer:* It’s interesting that you say about learning from TV, because people often think of TV as to relax, but you don’t view it that way?
*Euan:* I don’t, no, I only tend to put it on if I’ve seen there’s something advertised I want to watch. I don’t have it on as background, which some people do, I can’t - sometimes I put it on for the dog when I go out.

For this respondent, viewing is clearly a marker of distinction. His genre preference is used as a means of distinguishing himself from other people, the kind of people who take no interest in news and current affairs and also the kind of people who like the television on as background. Whilst this respondent was relatively rich in cultural capital, (a professional worker in the heritage industry with a post-graduate qualification), this position did not afford him the security in this position that Bourdieu ascribes to the enlightened or cultured individual, betrayed by his self-diagnosed inability to engage in novel-reading as opposed to ‘factual books’. The respondent is keen to make reference to other forms of cultural engagement, reading, in explaining his preferences. The implication is that his orientation to culture, be it reading or TV, is always one focussed on a concern with personal development in various ways. Television has, in this view, rather limited, only occasional, use for this purpose.
Preference for news and current affairs, the most popular single genre across our survey sample, was more usually explained in slightly different terms, not necessarily as learning about new things, or developing oneself but more through terms such as ‘keeping up to date’ or keeping myself informed’ or ‘keeping in touch’, in various ways. Stafford, an Afro-Caribbean man, with low cultural capital by our measure (he was a metal worker from Birmingham, with no formal educational qualifications, nearing his retirement) draws practical knowledge and a kind of ontological comfort (similar to that described by Silverstone 1994 or Savage et. al 2005) from his engagement with television news programmes.

*Stafford*: Just to know what’s going on in the world and what’s happening to the other people, you know and what probably I can say to myself, well ‘I have to be careful because so and so may make an economic change or, you know, how the currency rate is, what’s happening on the other side.

*Interviewer*: So are there particular issues you follow?

*Stafford*: Probably, because I’m not from here, I came here when I was in my teens but I still like to know what’s happening around the world, in the Caribbean and places like that. Because I still have some kind of communication with my family there.

*Interviewer*: And you’re able to follow that through watching the news?

*Stafford*: Just on the TV, we can sometimes, you know, all the morning stock exchange, what they’re saying, develop the ideas from there. Or what you see in the newspapers, bits and pieces. But I don’t go in to it in depth.

‘Not going into depth’ was another idea that recurred in interviews, the implication being that watching news and current affairs programmes (which, in our interview sample was generally translated into daily news broadcasts) was a kind of reassurance that all was well or predictable in the world, as well as the comfort derived from a continued form of contact with a diasporic ‘home’ in the Caribbean.

There was certainly recognition that watching news was somehow an important thing to do, as expressed by Karim Majid, a driving instructor from Bradford.
Karim Majid: I guess it’s because, I’ll tell you the truth now, so- I’ve gone through the phase of, you know, when you’re a kid you look at, you watch kids programmes and you don’t pay attention to politics and things and the world around you and as you grow up, I think, it’s a natural growing process isn’t it, you take more notice of the world around you and one way of doing that is listening to the news. Not that I believe it all but you know, it’s, I look at it not as entirely in a trusting way but I look at it as a point of view.

Here, news is explicitly cast as a correct, adult, use of television. Preference for news is indicative, in Karim Majid’s view of himself as a fully mature member of society, but one with the skills to be a discerning, critical viewer of news programmes. A revealing corollary to this conception of television is found in the talk about the type of television which generated the strongest evidence of dislikes.

‘Mainly Women’s Popular Television’ (Soaps, variety and reality TV)

If news and current affairs and documentaries were almost universally conceptualised by our interview respondents as a ‘proper’, legitimate use of television, the genres making up ‘mainly women’s popular television’ generated some interesting tensions and differences. Notably these were between accounts of reality TV, which were universally negative, and soap operas, which included some contested expressions of enthusiasm.

Reality TV was generally disliked by men and women and, when it was participated in, tended to be done in families with children of teenage years and above. Perhaps because of this, the tendency was for adults, both men and women, in the interview and focus group samples to dismiss it as trivial. The broadcast of Big Brother and I’m A Celebrity Get Me Out of Here coincided with the period of the interviews and so it was programmes such as these which were held up as representatives of the genre.
The novelty of such programmes perhaps allowed them to become synonymous with decline, both of broadcasting standards and, in this account from Frank, a 35 year old farmer and father of three from Armagh, societal values more generally.

Frank: I don’t like Big Brother because I think this is what’s wrong with society now to try and pump, like don’t get me wrong, I like a drink meself but I think it’s wrong to pump people up full of drink to make them have sex and fight and use foul language and all that. Don’t get me wrong, I’m not a person that’s angry, but I just think that’s wrong with the modern society now.

Such programmes were variously conceptualised as ‘humiliating’, ‘manufactured’, ‘pointless’ and ‘tedious’ by people from a range of social positions, with not a single enthusiast emerging from the qualitative sample. Given the relative popularity of such series this may be suspicious, but it might point to the intensive participation of younger groups.27

Soap operas were more likely to polarise opinion, often along gender lines. Dismissal of soap operas as a genre was common amongst men (only one man in the household interview sample expressed a preference for soap operas) and was often premised upon a perceived lack of reality of the plots and characters, or the ‘depressing’ nature of the story lines. Soap enthusiasts tended to be cautious in the expression of their preference, saying things like, ‘I know they are rubbish but…’ reflecting recognition of a hierarchy of TV participation. The regularity and recurrence of soaps allowed for the development of particular orientations to characters and plots, as well as the weaving of participation into the everyday lives of respondents. Watching soaps was, for some women, a means of ordering the day and claiming space within the domestic sphere, in a way that was often recognised and reflected in the rejection of soaps by men – the implication being that such texts were not ‘for them’. Some enthusiasts
explained their preferences in terms reflecting the particular characteristics of the
genre, the long-term development of plots and the possibility of ‘getting to know’
characters, in a way which allowed for reflection on their own lives and experiences.
Thus Rita, a 67-year old pensioner from the outskirts of Glasgow, who described
herself as working as a housewife and mother for most of her life, made an explicit
connection with the world of soaps by suggesting that ‘soaps are just people like
myself, only they’re on TV and we’re not. You look at the same everyday things
happening, them that’s happening here’. Similarly Poppy, a 47 year-old social worker
from West Yorkshire emphasises the ‘reality’ of the soap genre and their ability to
engage what she conceptualises as pressing socio-political or personal matters in a
beneficial way, thus

Poppy: I like the real life issues they bring up, I do, because it happens to us all. And I
can relate with some of them what’s happening...if you’ve been through that
experience yourself, yeah, and a few of them, I have and no doubt everybody else has.

Conversely it is these claims to reality which informs the dislike of soap opera, as
expressed by Maria, a language teacher from West Yorkshire,

Maria: I think it’s because they’re so depressing and so far fetched. They’re supposed
to mirror life but you don’t see the amount of life that goes on in those soaps in a
normal street. For example, you get so much happening in one week and you think oh
what happens in this street in a week? Virtually nothing. So because they’re so
unrealistic and they’re supposed to portray real life annoys me. Some of them are so
depressing, for example Eastenders, it’s murders and death, so what’s the point.
There’s enough going on in the world without watching that, so I hate that.

One might expect such a conceptualisation of popular culture from a woman
relatively rich in cultural capital. However, at the same time, talk about soaps amongst
educated and professional women, such as Poppy quoted above, in our household
sample was as likely to be based upon a recognition of the particular qualities of the
genre, as well as the ability to discern within the genre. Thus Cherie, a freelance
professional in the heritage industry from Yorkshire, is able to distinguish between a
perception of *Eastenders* and her admiration for the acting, writing and production of
*Emmerdale* and *Coronation Street*

*Cherie:* They both have humour in them for a start. They actually give you character
development, people don’t - they’ll run a plot line for months and months and months
and months and the character evolves like a real person would, whereas sort of places
like *Eastenders* suddenly someone has a complete character switch overnight, it’s just
ridiculous. They have, little gentlenesses in them, I mean like if you look at the
relationship between Vera and Jack Duckworth I think it’s very real because, they
grizzle and bicker and stuff but there’s that fondness between them you know. I just
think they’re very well done, I mean they heighten life but I think they’re just really
brilliantly scripted and they’re really, really well acted.

Such distanced readings point to the more complex position of soap, compared to
reality television in a hierarchy of television appreciation. Whilst the latter is
universally dismissed by the members of our qualitative samples, within the former
there is the possibility of a ‘sophisticated’ audience, conceptualising the texts in a
‘sophisticated’, distanced way, along-side an audience for whom such texts offer
immediate forms of comfort and self-recognition.

The distinctions between these two types of audience are not clear-cut, in terms of
social position, though the persistent notion of hierarchy in television in relation to
soap opera is nicely revealed by a comment from a member of a London based
‘professionals’ focus groups.

*Inka:* I will watch an episode of *Eastenders* every week, couple of weeks.
*Moderator:* Because?
*Inka:* I need to be able to talk to the caretakers and, I don’t know receptionists and
whatever, ‘cos I train them every day so I need to, well not every day, some days, I
need to be able to talk to them and relate them in some way because I don’t like live
in the same world they do.
Here Inka recognises the possibility of soap as a cultural form able to traverse boundaries in a very practical way – enabling forms of social interaction with her subordinates. The implication of ‘different’ worlds also suggests the caretakers and receptionists would be less likely to traverse the boundaries into her cultural world.

‘Younger Popular Cinema’ (Sci-Fi/Horror)

This category of film generated some interesting polarised opinions. As with soap opera, a primary point of departure between those who liked and disliked this category and the genres that make it up (science-fiction and horror) concerned notions of ‘reality’, and the ability or otherwise to suspend disbelief. There were also significant differences between the genres that made up these categories. Science fiction films were recognised within our sample as having some value as complex texts. Horror films, much like reality television, were synonymous, across a range of social positions, with bad popular culture, characterised by blood and gore, silliness and ‘make believe’.  

Whilst soaps tended to generate tensions between genders, for this category the tendency was that if a respondent liked science-fiction, the likelihood was that their partner would like it too. This is typified by the case of Naomi and Terry, a couple from South London. This household was identified as one of ‘low’ cultural capital, given that Naomi, the survey respondent, reported no formal educational qualifications. Terry works as a warehouse manager, whilst Naomi is a full-time mother of their two sons, one approaching school age and the other 16. Terry expressed particular enthusiasm for the original Star Trek television series, which he watched regularly on DVD, as well as more contemporary series and films such as
Supernova. He was also an enthusiast for science fiction literature and expressed a particular interest in fan culture, describing himself as a Trekkie and expressing a wish to attend fan conventions. Naomi’s enthusiasm was for the X-Files, which she described as her favourite TV programme, film and book, as well as describing playing Play Station games related to the series and listening to audio-books. She explains this as one element of curiosity about ‘what’s out there’, in relation to the paranormal and unexplained, which is linked to a spiritual curiosity.

A similar shared interest in science fiction films occurs in a household selected as one with ‘high cultural capital’. Dougie, a university research scientist and Annie, a part-time creative writing tutor, who was writing a science-fiction novel, both chose The Matrix as a favourite film.

Jenny, who also chose Terry Gilliam’s Twelve Monkeys (starring Bruce Willis) explained the preference for such texts, which she clearly interprets as complex and multi-faceted in these terms

Jenny: And they’re both to do with states of mind and how you perceive reality. The Bruce Willis one it’s about does he really travel back in time to try and save the world you know - or is he a mental hospital patient. And The Matrix it’s about how you perceive reality as well and that kind of thing fascinates me,

Recognition of the complexity of science fiction films is also found in this account from Fruitbat, a year 26 old optician from West Yorkshire about his favourite, Blade Runner

Fruit Bat: Ok well in Bladerunner it’s a futuristic society that contrary to sort of a lot of other things wasn’t a beautiful utopian society, it was quite bleak. Which is more believable, I think. And yet everything, despite being futuristic was pretty much the same which is again true, people haven’t changed at all. In fact an interesting concept
giving life to someone and then arbitrarily taking it away when we get a bit afraid of it. Again very believable. Also in Bladerunner you had some robots and they were on a journey of self-discovery themselves, they just wanted to live. So I thought that was very interesting. Learning about life and death from their point of view.

Here science-fiction is interpreted as a form of social commentary or critique, located in a particular tradition which deserves to be taken seriously, to be treated as ‘art’, rather than merely entertainment.

Science-fiction texts, then are, like soaps, forms of popular culture which can complicate hierarchies of taste. As with soaps, though, the key point of disagreement between those who like and dislike film in this category is about their proximity to reality. Robert, a 67 year old retired builder who lived with his daughter in a council house in South West Scotland, described his objection thus:

Robert: Well the science fiction it’s all flashing lights. There’s nothing in it. It’s just make believe, it’s impossible today what they do in science fiction films.

This position was, in contrast to Robert’s preference for old films. He mentions stars such as Bette Davies and Burt Lancaster and films such as the Great Escape or Gone With the Wind, which he conceptualises as about real-life events that could or did ‘actually happen’. Such a position may be influenced by age and a lack of connection with emerging forms of cinematic representation (special effects etc.), compared to the particular and spectacular cinematic experiences of youth. However it is also present in the objections of much younger respondents. Rachel, a 26-year-old housing advisor from the north-west, similarly dismisses science fiction as ‘make believe’.

Joe, a 30 year-old electrician and site foreman from Oxfordshire, dismisses horror
films, not from a particular experience of them but from a perception of them that clashes with his notions of what might be valuable in cultural participation.

Joe: No, I’ve never, I don’t think I’ve ever really sat down and watched a horror film because you know it’s just make believe and it’s just rubbish in my opinion
Interviewer: You don’t like it because it’s make believe?
Joe: Yeah, I think probably yeah, it’s make believe, it’s not really true, it’s just a load of nonsense. No, if I had a choice between a horror film and anything else, I’d probably watch the anything else.

As with soap operas and reality television, liking or disliking ‘young popular cinema’ does not map simplistically onto differing social positions or differing levels of cultural capital. The evidence of the qualitative sample is that taste for science fiction is less clearly divided by gender. In both ‘mainly women’s popular television’ and ‘younger popular cinema’ there are competing conceptions of value. On the one hand there is a dismissal, generally indicative of a relative lack of engagement with the form based on perceptions of its characteristics (‘flashing lights’, ‘blood and gore’ for sci-fi or horror film or ‘depressing’ fantastical stories for soap operas). On the other there is a negotiated acceptance of forms of value, albeit one’s which discriminate within genres, across a range of social positions.

Arts cinema (Art/Alternative; Film Noir)

Consideration of the talk of the previous two categories has demonstrated the complex relationship between social position and taste in the specific fields of film and television. One interesting element of this relationship is how both likes and dislikes for some popular texts, notably soap operas and science-fiction, range across social positions. Such a finding might trouble a strict Bourdieusian interpretation of homologies of tastes in which ‘popular taste’ is firmly located within lower socio-
economic groups, and the upper-middle classes only have tastes for legitimate forms of culture. The final section of the social space of film and television, considering talk about the category ‘arts cinema’, suggests a more coherent relationship between taste and social position, in a way that echoes the findings of the previous chapter concerning the possibility of continued practices of distinction.

The survey revealed a small but theoretically significant number of enthusiasts for this category of film. Our qualitative phase generated relatively little talk about this from relatively few people (from both the focus groups and interviews) though, again, this talk is significant. As the earlier section on cinema attendance revealed, attendance at ‘art house’ cinemas, was limited to groups amongst the middle-classes (retired professionals, young professionals and students, cultural professionals). Here ‘art-house’ was strongly contrasted with ‘mainstream cinema’ and was placed alongside classifications of films as ‘challenging’ as opposed to ‘entertaining’.

The interviews revealed that preference for this category was similarly limited, with only three respondents articulating a particular predilection for films of this type. These three were James, a 38 year old lecturer in an arts and humanities subject in a South Wales university who offered Ingmar Bergman’s *Fanny and Alexander* as his favourite film; Jenny, the creative writing tutor and writer from the west Scotland quoted above regarding her preference for science fiction but also keen on the films of Ken Loach; Cherie, the heritage worker also quoted above in relation to her preference for soap operas, who described a fondness for film noir (which she termed ‘cinema noir’) based upon her perception of its aesthetic. She identifies *Gilda* as a
particular favourite, attracted to the darkness of its subject matter and its stars, explaining:

Cherie: Well it’s a cinema noir thing, I like the - I like all the movies of the sort of thirties and forties where the men are sort of Humphrey Bogart, these tough types, and the ladies are all fantastically dressed with fabulous hair. I think that’s the visual thing of it you know.

Enthusiasm for this category, then, whilst numerically limited, is specifically socially located not just in the young professionals indicated by the previous chapter but, from our household interviews, in a quite specific area. These three are cultural specialists of various forms, what Bourdieu might term ‘cultural intermediaries’, who are able to both engage selectively and in appropriate ways with popular texts but also maintain specialist and distinctive forms of taste.

The telling contrast is with those, again few, survey respondents who disliked films in this category. Here the explanations reveal the persistent distance between a specialist interest and popular taste, as well as revealing the importance of knowledge of questions of cultural capital. For Terry, the warehouse manager and sci-fi enthusiast, his dislike of ‘film noir’ is based upon a mis-recognition of the genre,

Terry: Well I mean to me film noir is normally all foreign so it’s all subtitled and everything else, therefore you can’t really end up getting into them, or I can’t, can’t get into them, it’s just like brain doesn’t work. So like normally I end up watching a film just to relax and switch off and take your mind off everything else before you go and crash out or bed or whatever in the late evenings.
Similarly, Sandra, a 33 year old full-time mother of two from North London mis-
recognises film noir as ‘modern arty films’ and dislikes them because of a perception
of the genre,

*Sandra*: It’s quite heavy and black and it’s actually, I suppose it does affect your
emotions but it doesn’t, it’s not inspiring and uplifting in any way

These respondents reveal two important points. Firstly the misinterpretations of the
genre are significant. Knowing what ‘film noir’ is appears, in itself, to be indicative of
higher levels of cultural capital and higher levels of particular specialist forms of
interest in film. These forms of interest do not spread across social positions in a way
that knowledge of or preference for women’s popular television (particularly soaps) or
young popular cinema (particularly science fiction) do. Secondly, the idea of film as
‘challenging’ as opposed to relaxing or entertaining (in the case of Terry, too tired
from work to do anything other than ‘switch off’) has limited currency outside of a
specific social location. This is true of most of the members of our ‘elite’ sample to
which we now turn

**Film, television and elite practices**

We report here on the findings of our interviews with eleven people recruited, not
from the members of our survey sample, but through a variety of personal and
institutional connections in order to find out about attitudes toward, and degrees and
kinds of immersion in, film and television on the part of individuals who had achieved
particular prominence in business, public service, political or academic life.\(^{32}\) Seven
of these were men, and four were women, and their average age – reflecting their
achievements – was well above the main sample average: most were over 50 and
some were in their 60 and 70s. Except for one woman, who had risen to political
prominence through the trade-union movement, and one of the men, who did officer
training at Sandhurst, all had university educations, and to postgraduate level in some cases. Behind these common educational careers, however, were significant differences in social origins and background. While some of those we interviewed had ascended to prominent positions from working-class backgrounds, others had built their careers on the basis of their parents’ middle-class social positions, and, in two cases, had inherited property, a country estate in one case, and a stake in a major family retail business in another.

Unlike most of our main sample, these interviewees had developed interests in one or more of the visual arts (in some cases with not insignificant collections), theatre, and music. They were also frequent art gallery visitors, were mostly members of heritage organisations and were frequently visitors of stately homes. They were consequently knowledgeable about these matters and, contrary to our experience in most of the focus groups and household interviews, often talked about their interests in these areas at some length and with some animation. In relation to film and television, however, they often claimed to be less knowledgeable and less involved.

This is, of course, an interesting finding in itself, suggesting a somewhat more distant relation to these media and, in some respects, a self-conscious concern to distance their cultural tastes and interests from popular ones. This was most true of James, a retired senior civil servant with traditional European high cultural tastes, who explained his preference for watching films at home as follows:

I do rely on television a bit for films. My wife prefers going to the cinema more than I do. I find the atmosphere of the cinema on the whole somewhat repellent, I do not like popcorn, I do not like the smell of it. And the cinema seems to be a place for popcorn and the occasional film. I do not like loud noise and the cinema noise is
very often deafening. Although I worked with the advertising world, I find sort of
advertising and all that stuff, having to sit through twenty minutes of stuff you do not
want to see, thrown at you at monstrous volume is somewhat inimical to the mood
you want to be in for a good film.

However, a distant relation to the media was most evident in the ‘hardly ever’
response that our question about frequency of television viewing typically evoked.
Many of the men reported that they watched television a lot for sport, but in ways that
suggested this was not really watching television – it was the sport they were
interested, not television, as if they were watching sport through television rather than
actually watching television. So far as more general patterns of viewing were
concerned, the response of Eleanor, the finance director of a large investment
company, indicating decreased viewing with age (and thus standing at odds with the
main sample) was typical:

*Interviewer:* Do you do things like watching TV?

*Eleanor:* No. Funnily enough I have watched less and less television over the years,
it’s really declined over time. I used to watch quite a lot, I was one of the sort of
people who would, if I had to. I was at home on my own in the evening, I’d put the
television on, almost because that’s what I did. I don’t know when I, I can’t give you
the moment when I stopped and for a long time I knew what was on television and
then would switch the television on because I knew what was on. I’ve moved even
further down that line that now unless somebody says hey by the way there’s a good
programme on, you should watch it, I am very unlikely to turn the television on. And
I can’t explain to you what it is that’s changed but I recognise something has and I
really watch …

*Interviewer:* You’re quite busy with something else?

*Eleanor:* Yes, and so much so and I think this is my proof to me, not the proof to you,
I only have the terrestrial channels on my television set so I can only get five
channels, never thought about getting Sky or cable or whatever else.

Channel preferences were consistently for BBC channels in both the terrestrial and
digital environments – where history channels were also frequently referred to - and
the preferred genres were history documentaries, news and current affairs, and
television dramas with programmes like Panorama, News Night, Question Time,
University Challenge, A Touch of Frost, The Bill, Spooks, Absolutely Fabulous, Midsummer Murders, Pride and Prejudice and In the Footsteps of Churchill being specifically mentioned, as also were satirical shows like Have I got News for You and Dead Ringers. Soap operas, however, were almost universally disliked, and sometimes strongly so. For Caroline, from a working-class background in the East End of London but who had become a prominent political figure through her roles in trade unions and the Labour Party, soaps were to be avoided in view of their potential to corrupt and degrade:

I can’t be doing for one iota with a soap or reality TV. I think reality TV is just banal, really and soaps, they’re so…I was thinking to myself last night that Eastenders, I think it was, came on and before I switched over, they were having a row already, you know and I felt, you know, why doesn’t somebody make a programme about people who are nice to each other, it’s just so miserable and I think it has a huge impact on the way people behave, you know, just shouting at people’s faces, that all becomes quite acceptable. One of my daughters won’t let her girls watch it anymore because she says they pick up such awful bad habits and ways of speaking to people that it’s not nice.

Reality television evoked similarly strong antagonism on the part of Robert, a Cambridge-educated engineer who had progressed through a succession of senior manager roles to become CEO of a major international company:

I’ll walk out of the room if my son has got Big Brother on or any of these bloody things where they vote for people who then get kicked off. I literally you know, walk out of the room and go read a book or get away from it, I can’t handle it, right. I hate them, right with a vengeance. Shirley’s a bit more, my wife’s a bit more tolerant but I can’t stand them.

The opposition to reality TV was not, however, universal. Indeed, Keith, a member of the board of directors of a national family-run retail business, educated at Eton and, subsequently, at universities in Scotland and the United States, and with widespread cultural interests in the arts and theatre, found reality TV fascinating. Clearly a little
perplexed as to why this should be so, he justified his interest in this genre as a form of learning, thus bringing it into line with his other cultural television interests which had a strong documentary and current affairs accent.

The reality programmes that obviously are now quite a big part of television, I do, I find pretty absorbing, I mean I find them quite extraordinary and like everyone else I’m very hooked to this whole thing, I don’t know why, of watching either celebrities in action or what have you and however much I try and stop myself watching it, one does find that quite absorbing as television really and it’s very curious as to why one finds it so absorbing. But, that’s certainly been a part of television which is increasingly popular. There’s a programme on at the moment with Alan Sugar called *The Apprentice* which is on BBC2 on a Wednesday evening and I mean I find that fascinating, it’s a sort of business initiative programme with a team and I find that fascinating really as to how that’s all evolving and rather sort of strangely the talent shows I find you know, looking at human beings under pressure and how they perform and what have you. I mean you learn quite a bit from it I suppose.

There is plenty of evidence here, then, that, for this group as well as for the members of our main simple who had considerable resources of cultural capital, a sense of the divisions between ‘serious’ and ‘improving’ programmes on the one hand and less respectable, ‘trashy’ and, in some respects, depraving programmes on the other does inform the choices they make.

The picture is more mixed with regard to their film preferences. An important exception here, though, is James who, as we have already noted disliked going to the cinema because of the ways in which it bombarded the senses, leaving little room for the more critical mood he preferred when watching films. His film preferences exhibited a similar tendency with a strong liking for films by European art film directors and an aversion to Hollywood epics, musicals, and technological spectacle after the fashion of *Lord of the Rings* and the *Harry Potter* films. Ralph, a retired senior academic, also had particular love of French films, although he combined this
with more catholic tastes and very few sharp dislikes. A more typical response was to opt for instances of comedy, literary adaptations or costume dramas. This was true for Alistair, who had inherited a country estate and manor house and managed these as a family business. Defining his preferences in terms of these genres, he simultaneously indicated his lack of interest in horror films, Bollywood, fantasy and musicals. However, given that his second set of preferences was for war movies and westerns, it is clear that his choices reflected the influence of gender as well as that of class. This was true for Eleanor too. Her favourite films were romantic comedies – *Pretty Women*, *Four Weddings and a Funeral* and *Notting Hill* – or comedies, like *The Full Monty*. Her strongest dislike was for films whose narrative is organised around the threat of violence to women.

Like most of these interviewees, neither Eleanor nor Alistair were guided in their film choice by any knowledge of film directors. As Alistair put it:

Directors? No I’m not very knowledgeable about that, I’m afraid I’m the type of person who almost leaves when the credits flash up. And, no, I don’t, we don’t really go and see a film on the basis of a director, you do get to know of some of them but it’s been something that’s never really particularly interested me. As I say we go because we’ve heard the film’s good or it’s on a subject that we know we will like.

This lack of interest in directors was also frequently accompanied by a disavowal of any serious purpose when going to the cinema. For Keith, for example, although he and his wife go to the cinema only rarely, he told us that ‘when we do I find it generally speaking terrific entertainment, a great sense of escape and we would typically go and watch the sort of, I suppose blockbusters and secondary blockbusters that are being advertised’. And Robert, who, as we have seen, loathed reality television and who had quite high tastes in other areas – he was very knowledgeable
about modern art, and impressionism in particular, and went to the theatre regularly – had self-confessedly popular tastes in film.

Oh I think, I mean action thrillers you know the *Bourne Supremacy, Spiderman*, love the *Harry Potter* series, loved *Lord of the Rings*. I mean that’s probably the zone that I love, *Star Wars* originally. My favourite all time film is *Return of the Jedi*.

In summary, then, the evidence for these interviews suggests that a combination of high levels of cultural capital and significant levels of economic capital associated with senior management or professional positions is more likely to result in a distinctive set of relations to television than is true of film where responses are more mixed and varied. If this is a useful refinement of our survey data, how does our qualitative data add to, or qualify, our analysis of the media practices of minority ethnic groups? It is to this question that we turn in the next section.

**Ethnicity and Media Talk**

This final section reports on the specific findings of talk generated from focus groups and interviews with survey respondents drawn from the three main ethnic minority groups. This amounted to six focus groups (Indian middle and working class; Pakistani middle and working class; Afro-Caribbean middle and working class) and 13 interviews, from 11 households, three of which turned out to be mixed-race couples.³³

We interviewed in two households where the survey respondent was Indian, three where the respondent was Pakistani, and five where the respondent was of Afro-Caribbean descent. Given the relatively small number of respondents, this talk in itself cannot be considered representative but rather can again be used to explore and
explain some of the patterns of media participation and taste that emerged in the previous chapter. Whilst there were distinctive approaches to film and television in these focus groups and interviews, there were also significant similarities between these groups and the rest of the qualitative samples. News and current affairs were chosen as favoured forms of television, with reality television again emerging as synonymous with ‘bad’ television. There was also a high degree of familiarity with, and use of, domestic television technologies, including videos and DVDs.

The mainstream cinema category was popular across the groups, with action films being chosen as popular by Afro-Caribbean, Indian and Pakistani groups, and interview respondents.

Distinctive forms of taste connected with ethnicity tended, in this sample, to emerge within Indian and Pakistani groups rather than Afro-Caribbean. Chief amongst these were the high level of cinema participation, especially of Bollywood films, which were viewed by families together either at specialist cinemas or at multiplexes, and the high level of satellite television ownership, with forms of participation in the former group being more explicitly connected to diasporic identities. Some respondents, particularly older men within the household interview sample, had little connection with film culture at all and were far less likely, for example, to choose a favourite film, or to watch much television apart from news and current affairs. As with the main sample news and current affairs was again conceptualised as a ‘proper’ use of TV.

Focus groups with Pakistani and Indian middle and working classes revealed the importance of satellite channels, such as Zee TV, the Asian Channel and B4U, which
were watched as sources of entertainment, particularly Asian dramas or soaps, sources of information about new cinema (specifically Hindi or ‘Bollywood’ film releases) and sources of news. Siddique, a 42-year-old policy development officer in a city council argued that such channels provided important, ‘beneficial’ means of connecting with national and religious cultures, particularly for his children.

*Siddique*: When children get to watch these programmes on the Pakistani television channel they tend to learn about the culture the traditions. And certain aspects they question and say ‘Dad why have they said this? Why have they done this?’ and for me I think it’s good if they are watching that because they are learning our culture and they’ve actually getting some benefit from that, not only entertainment.

Shanaz, a 42 year old home-maker and mother of five from West Yorkshire preferred Asian dramas on satellite television to English soap operas because she considered it far easier to follow dramas in her ‘own’ language.

Questions of national and cultural identity are also significant, at least in part, in explaining tastes for film, with Hindi or Bollywood films being sources of some dispute among Asian respondents. Surbhitra, a 53 year old Indian woman, a retired newsagent and part-time school dinner lady from the midlands, enjoyed the ‘glamour’ and ‘make believe’ of Hindi movies, and the fact that they weren’t ‘too deep’ or serious. Moin, a Pakistani taxi-driver in his early twenties from the midlands contrasted 'western' and Asian film in terms of cost, as well as content, contrasting *The Matrix* – on which ‘they spent 269 million’ with the recent Bollywood success, *Devdas*. Whilst he enjoyed the former for its special effects, he had ‘never seen anything like’ the latter. The implication here seems to be that western filmmakers, despite their technical prowess, do not have the well-crafted story-telling skills of their Asian counterparts.
At the same time there were strong expressions of dislike of Hindi and Bollywood films in the Asian focus groups, based upon perceptions of their lack of reality and narrative naivety. Deepak, a manufacturing engineer and member of the Indian middle-class group describes this well,

*Deepak:* No way Indian films because I’m not into the business of someone doing a backward somersault off a 24 storey building and landing on his feet…and there’s a guy and a girl fall in love and they go round and sing a song, it’s ridiculous! It’s completely ridiculous so. And one minute they’re in India and the next minute they’re singing a song in Switzerland or something like that. So - no, it’s not my thing at all, I prefer to watch like an action movie or a comedy you know something, along the lines of like *Something About Mary* or - them sort of films and I really love.

The previous chapter outlined the importance of age as a factor in explaining the differing forms of engagement with media culture within the minority ethnic groups, with first and second generation migrants having differing tastes and distinctive means of negotiating with national and global media cultures. The focus group sample re-iterates this in relation to film, with younger respondents expressing some disquiet with the perceived conventions of Hindi or Bollywood cinema as part of a broader expression of their ‘dual’ identities as Asian and Western. Yousuf, an 18 year old factory worker from the midlands explained his preference for ‘English’ (though actually, American) films, thus:

*Yousuf:* People will be interested in Hindi movies but I am more English cos I don’t like watching Hindi movies because I don’t understand half of what they are saying. Like the Hindi movies, if you don’t mind me saying, but it’s like the same thing in every single film but with English movies it’s like a different story. You’ve got four or five different types with Hindi movies you don’t have comedy nor nothing like that and if you do it’s a bit weird.
Yousuf associated himself with young black culture, particularly hip-hop, which was reflected in his recent viewing of *Bringing Down the House* (a comedy starring Steve Martin and rap-star Queen Latifah) and action films such as the *Fast and the Furious* and the martial arts comedy films of Jacky Chan. The tension between western and Asian cinema is interestingly negotiated by Moin, self-proclaimed Hindi film enthusiast. He describes the distinction he makes between making a special trip to the cinema as a family, to enjoy a Hindi film, and the different pleasure of watching western films, ‘with the lads’. In part this distinction is made because of a perception of the moral content of western films, compared to the presumed ‘innocence’ of the content of Hindi/Bollywood films.

*Moin*: That is the reason I don’t enjoy taking my sister to the cinema to watch an English movie because that restricts the privacy that we have with one another. We don’t appreciate seeing anything of the sort whereas with a Hindi film I might drive my sister, my mum and everyone to the cinema. We will just have a day out on Saturday. It’s something that my family will remember and appreciate. We don’t do it much but whereas, as I have said. When I go to the cinema to watch *The Matrix* with all the lads it’s always a lad’s thing.

Moral content of films and TV was a particular concern within the Asian focus groups, and within some household interviews. Majid, a retired shopkeeper from the north-west made explicit connections between social problems, particularly street crime and violence and ‘styles’ that were copied from television by young people. Sexual content was a recurring theme of discussions with Indian and Pakistani group participants and respondents. Kamran, a 43 year-old classroom assistant described the need to protect himself and his family from this kind of material, which he felt was pervasive.
Kamran: We all share the same values, you know. Whenever I sit watching television, especially after 9 o’clock I always keep my remote control there, there is so much nudity, you know, unwatchable scenes, so you know, sometimes we got to be very careful. That’s why I cut and put cricket on. You know these unnecessary; you know they have accommodated sex there, everywhere. That’s why this is another answer because we don’t watch.

Nudity on film and television was, for Kamran, a point of departure with Western culture, which for him seem to explained a more general lack of connection with film and TV cultures amongst the Pakistani community.34 Abdul, a 35-year-old taxi-driver explained the distinctions he had to make in his choices of viewing for himself and for his family

Abdul: Comedies, Eddie Murphy or Jim Carrey. Jacky Chan films. They normally attract me, all the action and that. Like you say there are not many rude scenes in it so you can sit down with your family and watch those as well. I’ll tell you what; Austin Powers wasn’t too bad like that. I enjoyed seeing that as well. There were some scenes, you know what I mean. Not with kids, but I watched it. That one, there’s Ali G In Da House; you know what I mean I watched that. You do watch things like that but not with the kids.

Finally, as the previous chapter demonstrated, there was no connection evident in the qualitative samples with anything within the ‘arts cinema ‘category. The Afro-Caribbean professionals group did discuss the notion of ‘art-films’, in a similar way to other ‘professional groups’, contrasting between art-house and mainstream. In contrast to the culture professionals group, or the young professionals group (which were both predominantly white) art-house film did not emerge in this groups as particularly valuable in this dichotomy, with Laura tellingly describing ‘all that arty stuff, the National Film Theatre stuff, as a bit alien to me’.
Conclusions

This chapter has used the findings of the focus group and interview phases of the CCSE project to demonstrate the usefulness of qualitative approaches to questions of cultural capital in relation to film and television. Building on the patterns and categories established through the statistical analysis of the survey data in the previous chapter, it has presented our respondents’ explanations for the patterns of participation in, and taste for film and television that our study reveals.

Relationships between cinema attendance and occupational class were examined, with regular attendance being predominantly reported amongst professional groups. Non-attendance was explained through pressures of finance, time and child-care commitments, but also, crucially, through a lack of comfort in the contemporary cinema space, be it multiplex or ‘art-house’. This meant that some groups, notably the skilled workers focus group, whilst participating in film-culture in terms of familiarity with actors or current releases, tended to watch films in the home.

Domestic participation in film and television culture was also central to the consideration of the social space of film and television. Whilst television was rarely talked about with unabashed enthusiasm, ‘Respectable television’ emerged as the most popular genre, with documentaries and news and current affairs being talked of as proper and correct uses of television. Popular categories of film and TV, notably ‘Mainly women’s popular television’ and ‘Younger popular cinema’ were more contested but were shown to appeal to people across a range of social positions. Gender and age were shown here to be as significant as occupational class in shaping tastes. The case of ‘arts cinema’, though suggested, following the previous chapter
that, for all the possibilities of film and TV traversing and re-working hierarchies of cultural value, certain forms of distinction remain powerful markers of difference.

Finally the chapter considered talk with participants and survey respondents from the ethnic minority groups. Here, whilst there was considerable overlap in tastes with the ‘white’ sample, distinctive forms of participation were evident, particularly amongst the Indian and Pakistani groups. These included attendance at specialist venues for participation in diasporic film cultures and the use of satellite technology to connect with ‘home’, national and language communities. Taste for Bollywood films, though was contested in interesting ways, with younger focus group participants connecting with or rejecting these texts in ways which cast film taste as a forum for the negotiation of complex Western/Asian identities.
Chapter 3: The media field and other fields: comparisons and policy implications

In this report we stress the continuing importance of investigating cultural capital, understood as an integral mechanism in the processes of organizing and reproducing relationships of class inequality based on cultural competencies. These competencies, possessed by individuals, are part of a socio-cultural context where cultural capital is expressed in three main forms: **objectified** in the form of cultural goods, **embodied** in long-lasting dispositions of the mind and the body, and **institutionalised** as a result of certified skills and educational qualifications. Our study takes into account the operation of cultural capital in these forms both at the individual level and in relation to their socio-cultural contexts and considers these in relation to their social class implications and also regarding divisions of race and ethnicity and gender.

In Britain the concept of cultural capital was applied to education policy debates in the 1970s, focusing on the equalisation of educational opportunities. Currently the concept is evident in concerns that New Labour’s educational ‘reforms’ will enhance the capacity of the middle-classes to use education for intergenerational transmission of cultural capital, which can lead to better occupational careers for their children (Devine 2004). But the application of cultural capital to cultural policy debates and practice is less evident in Britain. We have, in reporting on our research elsewhere, identified four ways in which the concept of cultural capital has been modified when applied to policy debates in arts and culture in other contexts (Bennett and Silva, 2006). A summary of these is relevant for thinking about policy implications of cultural capital in reference to the media field:
1. The concept of cultural capital is embedded in the acknowledgement that a complex hierarchy of the arts exists in which gender and ethnicity, as well as class, are consequential. This complicates the roles of arts and cultural participation as a sign of cultural capital (DiMaggio and Mukhtar 2004), and is underlined by the significance of new forms of arts and humanities assessment in the educational system (Bevers 2005) and the diminished role of arts, in relation to science and business studies, for increased educational success and higher social position.

2. Cultural capital is seen as significant in relations of race and ethnicity and, more innovatively, it is perceived to have an effect on the degree of familiarity of ethnic groups with the national cultural canon, in the form of a ‘national cultural capital’ (Hage 1998).

3. Engagement with the notion of cultural capital has questioned the changes in the ability of the middle-classes to ‘graze’ across a wide range of cultural activities, consuming everything. This ‘omnivore’ thesis derives from US-based research conducted by Peterson and colleagues (Peterson 1992, Peterson and Simkus 1992, Peterson and Kern 1996). The thesis implies a need for cultural policy to increase the ability of everyone to ‘graze’ across both legitimate and popular culture in order to decrease social inequalities.

4. Bringing to the fore acknowledgment of changes and transitions within an individual life trajectory, the concept of cultural capital is required to account for plural positions occupied by individuals through their lifecourse and their
simultaneous participation in different spheres of social life (Lahire 2004). This thesis contests the existence of a unifying principle prevalent both in the idea of habitus (Bourdieu) or of the bipolar extremes of the notions of the omnivore – univore (Peterson). Tastes are thus found to be ‘dissonant’ or ‘consonant’ in many different ways to reflect diverse socialization processes and forms of insertion in the social. From a policy perspective, in order to affect changes in the distribution of taste, the concern is with exploring to what extent tastes are consonant or dissonant and the ways in which taste profiles affect patterns of inequality.

The notion of social exclusion in relation to cultural capital, central to our project, has been applied in British cultural policy (DCMS 1999) within a concern to promote more equitable patterns of cultural participation. Recent applications of the idea of ‘social exclusion’ have raised questions of moral integration and social order regarding issues of redistribution. They also have ignored important distinctions between cultural entitlement based on principles of social justice and those arising from citizenship issues concerning cultural diversity. Our findings in this report corroborated by further analyses (see Bennet and Silva, 2006), show that:

1. Those in lower positions in the social hierarchy (with lower levels of education and in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations) tend to have very little cultural capital.
2. Differences in levels of cultural capital between those in lower social positions and other occupational classes, and with different levels of education, are significant.
(3) Distinctions of levels of cultural capital are found within the higher occupational groups, as for example, between higher-level managers and higher level professionals.

These findings demonstrate the importance of taking into account the full range of indicators of social divisions to understand the implications of cultural capital theory for cultural policies. This is why we explore patterns regarding occupational class, levels of education, age, gender, ethnicity and location.

Considering these broad issues, how does the media field compare with other cultural fields? At this stage of our data analysis we have defined our approach to fields within the sociology of cultural consumption. Fields signify the articulation of practices of consumption of items belonging to a particular area of culture, with which individuals engage in different ways. While this is a somewhat narrow approach which suggests a correspondence between the type of item - and its position in the social hierarchy - and the hierarchy of consumers, we attend to ethnic, age and gender differentiations of the consumer and to their being in a pluralized world. Thus Bourdieu’s implied homology between social position and taste is destabilized as we engage in our exploration of the various fields with debates about the omnivore thesis, ideas of dissonance, and the roles of ethnicity and gender in cultural capital theory. In concluding this report, however, our concern is to consider the relationships between tastes in different fields rather than to elaborate on the implications of these for cultural capital theory.

A brief summary of our findings in different fields indicate that the dynamics of specific fields are less discrete than might be thought when each field is considered in
isolation. Particular relations to wider issues of cultural policy are evident across fields in exploring the relationship between culture and social inequality in contemporary Britain.

Our analysis of the media field has shown that gender and age are very important ‘classifiers’ of engagement. More broadly, our findings in this report indicate that choices of genre, programme and television channel (see also Bennett, 2006), as well as of film genres and directors, are closely interconnected and are affected by social and economic positions. However, privatized consumption in the home makes such social divisions regarding taste, knowledge and participation less marked. This is particularly relevant in relation to broadcasting, a space of ‘more or less open access’, where some genres, programmes and channels are differentiated in terms of education, age, gender and occupational class, with the ‘low’ genres being most distinctly marked by class.

This report has outlined some comparisons between the media and other fields. For instance, we noted that the effects of class are more marked in the literary and visual art fields than in the media field, and that university education is a more powerful discriminator in musical, artistic and literary tastes than in tastes related to film and television. We will now consider some of the general aspects of our findings in the fields of literature, visual art, music, sport and other cultural ‘leisure’ pursuits in order to place findings relating to the media field in a comparative perspective.

David Wright’s (2006) analysis of the literary field distinguishes between book culture, which is a minority practice, and more prevalent reading practices connected
to magazines and newspapers. He finds that class is important for participation in book culture, where hierarchies of literary value matter, and that it is linked to book ownership. It is notable, too, as we have remarked in this report, that minority ethnic groups are less engaged with such ‘English’ texts as *Pride and Prejudice* and *Harry Potter*. However, we hesitate to draw any firm conclusions from this. While findings of this kind are apparently relevant to concerns with the role of culture in promoting social cohesion, with a shared culture providing access to shared conversations and communities, the CCSE data suggests that books do not seem to be particularly important for this. Our data has more to say about how cultural policies could avoid reinforcing social hierarchies of value linked to reading practices.

If tastes for reading prestigious genres map onto relatively privileged socio-economic groups, so do taste, knowledge and participation in the field of visual art. Elizabeth Silva (2006) reports four significant findings in her analysis of this field. First, a widespread engagement with visual arts in terms of ownership of paintings, originals and reproductions, is found among the British population. Second, particular marks of social divisions are found. While ownership of visual art is significant, higher levels of possession correlate with higher occupational groups. A gender dimension is also found, in which women appear more engaged with visual arts consumption. However, greater ‘dis-engagement’ is found among those with lower cultural and economic capital. Third, the favourite type of art found among CCSE respondents is landscape painting, which may be a choice connected with a particular sort of lifestyle typical of the contemporary urban environment. Fourth, preferences for particular named artists appear to differentiate taste more than preference for type of art. The strong social differentiation of tastes and practices that is evident in this field indicates a need to increase involvement by minority ethnic groups, and by those who in general lack
economic and cultural capital. As in the case of the literary field, specific issues of the visual art field require further exploration in order to devise relevant cultural policies.

Just as looking at visual material is a nearly universal practice, so is listening to music. Engagement with music is a most popular cultural activity and it has a central role in defining ‘elite’ and ‘popular’ culture. Mike Savage (2006) points to three significant findings in his exploration of the field of music. Firstly, and somewhat surprisingly, classical music is the most liked genre while genres that are usually classified as ‘popular’ - like urban, world, jazz and electronic – were found by comparison to be liked less. Secondly, the major taste divide is age. Ethnicity and gender are also important dividers of taste groups. Those with higher education and occupational class express a taste for a larger number of genres. Thirdly, musical genre is a less discerning classifier of taste than the more detailed exploration of preferences for particular musical works. Talking about musical genres encourages stereotyping, whereas talking about particular works of music leads to less polarization.

A consideration of the field of sport allows a direct exploration of the role of embodied capital in contemporary British culture. Alan Warde (2006) finds that the most privileged people in terms of occupational class and levels of education have a stronger preference for rare sports and also that men of higher occupational class place particular emphasis on the social aspects of sporting participation. Higher class position correlates strongly with higher frequency of engagement in sport or physical activity among those at the top of the occupational class hierarchy. Warde finds that gender is highly important. Women participate extensively in sport but in a narrower
set of activities and appear to exercise mostly for fitness and relaxation, which are purposes different from those of men. Women participate less in sport than men but practice bodily maintenance much more. These differences seem to be linked to distinct versions of masculinity and femininity which, in the contemporary context, include a concern for diet and body management practices as ways of attributing value to self and to others. These sorts of value can be cashed in as ‘capital’ and thus can affect social position. Those who exercise most do so for fitness, are mostly in ‘middle class’ occupational categories, are women and graduates, and feel guilt and regret at not participating more. They are also knowledgeable about the health implications of exercise and sport participation.

As the literary field, the fields of visual arts, music and sport, as well as the media field, present particular engagements mapping onto clear social divisions, so do the engagements of our respondents with leisure activities. Modesto Gayo-Cal (2006) analyses participation and taste in a wide range of leisure pursuits. He finds strong links between levels of cultural capital and the leisure activities of respondents. But socio-demographic factors like ethnicity, gender, household type and, very strongly, age, affect leisure participation. A multidimensional approach is needed to deal with this field because while legitimate practices appear homologous with higher educational and occupational positions, distinctions are also found between the young and the old, and the white-English and the non-white, for example. This multi-dimensionality is also particularly relevant for the media field, as demonstrated in this report.
In all fields taste, participation and knowledge connect with social divisions. These are mapped onto different social spaces. There is affinity between tastes (likes and dislikes) across fields, confirming the general principles found by Bourdieu is *Distinction*, but taste and participation cluster differently indicating the significance of new patterns of division and the salience of age in contemporary cultural engagements. This informs some of the trends towards greater tolerance towards a variety of cultural items and signals some degree of omnivorousness among the most engaged groups. These trends suggest that cultural consumption is strongly related to social institutions and social connections. The finding that significant sections of the population are little engaged in a large number of the cultural items we investigated raises concern over issues of social inequality. Because significant divisions are noted among all spaces of lifestyles, including those respondents expressing ‘mainstream’ positions, the application of labels of ‘marginal’ or ‘social excluded’ to the groups least engaged does not offer an adequate basis for the development of cultural policies capable of addressing the relations between social and cultural inequalities more generally. We stress the need to consider how cultural capital relates to other forms of capital, chiefly the economic and social, to productively inform cultural policy debates.
Whereas the concept of social capital has become central to understandings of social participation and engagement across numerous policy domains, the concept of cultural capital has been much less developed. This is despite the fact that it has been subject to considerable theoretical elaboration in the work of the eminent sociologist Pierre Bourdieu since the 1960s, and has been subject to considerable debate in academic circles. This postscript briefly introduces how Bourdieu uses the concept and explores some of its more general characteristics in order to provide a broader theoretical context for the findings reported in chapters 1 and 2.

Bourdieu’s concept of ‘cultural capital’ (see Robbins 2005; Bourdieu and Passeron 1970; Halsey et al 1980) is fundamentally linked to his sociological interest in the nature of inheritance in contemporary capitalist societies. In earlier periods, inheritance worked predominantly through the transmission of property, usually in the form of landholdings, but also encompassing money and other goods and possessions. In modern capitalist societies, Bourdieu argues, the role of this kind of inheritance of economic capital is supplemented, and in important respects surpassed by, cultural capital. Educated, middle class parents pass on their own educated dispositions to their children, who hence have the capacities to perform well in the educational system, obtain relatively high qualifications, and thereby move into privileged social positions themselves. Rather than the scheming of aristocrats to pass on property to their children, privileged middle class parents today instead seek to bring their children up with the right aptitudes to succeed educationally (see Devine, 2004). Given the close association between educational attainment and occupational
destinations, this allows the children of the middle classes to become successful and reproduce their parents’ advantages.

For Bourdieu, cultural capital is not only a basis for the educational success of children. It is also a source of social power in its own right. In his famous work *Distinction: The Critique Of The Judgement Of Taste* (1984), he showed how it operated as a major axis of the structure of social class differences. Possession of good or refined taste acts as cultural capital, signifying elevated social position in routine situations of social interaction. The middle classes lay claim to social superiority because of their capacity to recognise and appreciate particular, highly valuable, cultural forms. Thus, Bourdieu argues, taste acts a weapon in social struggles, displayed through cultural preferences. This requires that some items and practices are acknowledged as worthy, in Bourdieu’s terms, as legitimate. Together, the educational system and the cultural industries, despite constant competition and contestation, establish what shall constitute legitimacy. What made him suspicious was the constant coincidence of middle class preferences and legitimate culture. It was experience, competence and ease with legitimate culture that marked out those with large amounts of cultural capital, and they tended to be members of the middle and especially upper middle class. Cultural capital then is a multi-faceted resource implicated in class distinction and inter-generational transmission of privilege.

For this circuit of reproduction to take place, Bourdieu differentiates three forms of cultural capital. Firstly it exists in ‘embodied’ form, as the bodily and mental skills, aptitudes and values, the command of which dispositions allows the privileged middle classes to display refined taste and to perform well in the educational and
occupational systems. These dispositions depend on fixing certain cultural goods as valuable, and engagement with those particular objects or practices constitutes ‘objectified’ cultural capital. Thirdly, there is institutionalised cultural capital in the form of educational credentials awarded by educational institutions which guarantee external recognition of the particular cultural capital of the middle classes. These three forms of cultural capital need to be seen as operating in a circuit in which they each require, and indeed mutually constitute, each other. The embodied cultural capital of the middle classes requires the existence of institutions which can validate it as ‘universal’, and this in turn requires specific cultural works and goods to be defined as better and superior to others.

We can see from this brief account how Bourdieu elaborates a critical concept of cultural capital, which takes established cultural hierarchies as the ‘problem’. Much of his work seeks to expose the ways that cultural practices associated with literature, art, music, museums and art galleries allow dominant groups to mark their privileges, albeit in opaque ways. It has not been our purpose in this report to explore the many issues raised by Bourdieu’s provocative account. However, it is useful to see how Bourdieu’s account of what is to count as cultural capital can be elaborated in a number of rather different ways. In *Distinction*, Bourdieu offers a number of different ways in which possession of cultural capital might be expressed and identified.

1. The first is the adoption of the *Kantian aesthetic*, wherein the ability to appreciate ‘abstract’ cultural forms, distanced from the practical necessity of daily life, is acknowledged as a crucial component of cultural capital. Whereas the working class lack the resources and capacities to abstract from lived necessity, the middle and upper classes, by virtue of their relative
security, can treat their distance from necessity as an absolute cultural value, and hence turn their specific cultural concerns into a universal. This is most likely to manifest itself in relation to traditional forms of high culture (a liking for classical music and opera, for example) and, perhaps more especially, in modernist and avant-garde cultural practices. Here cultural capital finds its ultimate expression in the appreciation of artistic modernism.

2. A second indicator of cultural capital is participation in socially exclusive activities. Attendance at the opera, appreciating portraits of upper class families, and their animals and property, and participation in elite sports like skiing or hunting do not in any obvious way depend on a Kantian aesthetic, but do depend upon a sense of difference from popular culture. Here the value of cultural capital is established because of the difficulty of gaining access.

3. A third version defines cultural capital as competence with respect to whatever is legitimated by the education system which is most easily mobilised by the professional middle classes and can be employed as a key aspect of trans-generational strategies of inheritance. This point picks up on Bourdieu’s emphasis on the ultimate arbitrariness of whatever is institutionally venerated, and allows for changes in accordance with shifts in pedagogy: for instance as classics becomes an insignificant part of the educational curriculum, so we might expect that a taste for Greek and Latin no longer serves as a key aspect of cultural capital, whereas computing and IT skills might become more important.

These three different definitions indicate how closely Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital has been formed through his interpretation of the role of music, literature, and
the visual arts. We should, therefore, highlight two other, more recent approaches to cultural capital which may be more pertinent in the fields of television and film.

4. In recent years, a fourth possible indicator of cultural capital has been explored, the idea of cultural omnivorousness. This concept, developed by Richard Peterson (Peterson and Simkus 1992), initially sought to show that middle class taste was no longer confined to legitimate items but moved between different genres and tastes, in a way which was consistent with claims that ‘post-modern’ cultural formations entailed the ability to sample and mix and match cultural forms (e.g. Savage et al 1992). Subsequently, however, it has been argued that omnivorousness itself can be a contemporary form of cultural capital, since the ability to range between cultural forms requires a distance which only the privileged possess: in this respect, the cultural omnivore relies on a particular kind of Kantian aesthetic (Bryson 1996). Embodied cultural capital rests precisely on a disposition to reflect on, and appreciate different kinds of, cultural artefacts, and in this process, television and film may be central to omnivorousness.

5. Finally, there is also the argument which we have mentioned in the introduction that in an increasingly globalised environment, cultural capital is bound up with territorial claims, especially those of the nation. Bourdieu himself says relatively little about this dimension of cultural capital, though it is implicit in much of his writing (see Savage et al 2005). Later writers have noted how the potential for familiarity with the ‘national canon’, as well as an adeptness with national cultures as different forms of life, are important features of cultural capital in an increasingly cosmopolitan environment (Hage
1995; McCrone 2005). Here objectified cultural capital is related to a knowledge of the national canon and distance from, ignorance of, and disparagement towards, cultures from other locations. Again, television and film can be identified as central to the creation of this kind of national cultural capital, through its concern to establish imagined national communities (see Scannell 1996).

We can therefore see why, even if television and the media do not form a central part of what we might term ‘classical’ high culture (as in definitions 1-3 above), it is possible, as our report suggests, for new kinds of closure and exclusion to be generated around them.

To appreciate the significance of this, we need to make a further methodological point. There is a temptation to consider particular kinds of cultural practice as themselves essentially elitist, or populist, middle brow or whatever. This, however, would be to indulge in a game of social stereotyping which Bourdieu claims to repudiate. Bourdieu argues that there is no intrinsic reason why going to the opera, for instance, or, in the area of television and film media, watching BBC2, Panorama, or the films of Ingmar Bergman should necessarily be indicators of cultural capital. Rather, it is necessary to establish that certain practices are relationally defined against other practices in order for them to be defined as cultural capital. It is from comparison that meaning derives. His reasoning here is closely linked to his use of the concept of field and needs to be carefully unpacked.
The concept of field emerged in his thinking in the 1970s, a decade later than that of cultural capital (Robbins 2005), as he became particularly interested in the creation of the ‘art field’. Bourdieu observed that most analysis of art – as of TV, film, literature and other cultural works – takes one of two forms. One focus is on particular works – texts - taken out of context and examined in their own terms. Here, the emphasis is on the intrinsic characteristics of the ‘great’ work, its producer, and sometimes its audience, where the importance of the work studied is taken for granted and not itself taken as an object for investigation. This leads to connoisseurship and the sacralisation of chosen works of art as intrinsically deserving of appreciation, where the choice of such works is left outside the frame of analysis. A second, less usual strategy, Bourdieu observes, is to reduce the work to the context itself, so that the work is explained by its economic, political or social environment (see Bourdieu 2005, 32). This, paradoxically, often does not challenge the kinds of works which are chosen for analysis, but simply explains them in different terms, according to their external context.

Bourdieu’s conception of field points to a third form of analysis, where works define themselves with respect to other works with which they jostle, compete and co-exist. It is hence an attempt to refuse either the autonomy of the work of art, or its reduction to its context. Bourdieu argues that ‘in a field, agents and institutions are engaged in struggle, with unequal strengths, and in accordance with the rules constituting that field of play, to appropriate the specific profits at stake in that game’ (Bourdieu 1993: 88). He frequently adopts the metaphor that a field is a ‘game’, the rules and apparatus for which energise combatants to perform so as to be able to win its prizes. Within any field there are stakes, which serve to unite contestants around a shared
acquiescence in the rules of the game, even whilst they compete with each other. Such
stakes link producers with consumers around shared projects, enthusiasms, and
interests.

This concept of the field is valuable since it insists that we do not indulge in crass
social determinism, seeing cultural activities as directly associated with particular
social groups. It demands that we also look at the relationship between different kinds
of television and film watching in its own terms, to work out which kinds of viewing
(for instance) are separated from each other, so that we can understand the internal
tensions and links within the field itself. Bourdieu argues for the proliferation of semi-
autonomous fields in modern capitalism, all of which are bounded from each other,
and all of which constitute (partially) ‘autonomous’ spaces, with their own logic and
rules. Since cultural capital therefore is created and accumulates within the cultural
field, he is able to prevent it become a totalising concept.

We have, in the foregoing, drawn loosely on this field-based approach by exploring
the extent to which television and film tastes are relationally defined against each
other. To what extent do those who like ‘serious’ television not like soap operas? Is
popular cinema clearly demarcated from ‘art cinema’? Only by unravelling these
relationships within the fields concerned, and only by refusing prior judgements about
what kinds of cultural appreciation are to count as distinctive, elitist, or exclusive, can
we develop a suitably nuanced understanding of the social organisation of media
practices in contemporary Britain.
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Endnotes

1 The research was conducted by the authors of this Report for the ESRC project Cultural Capital and Social Exclusion: A Critical Investigation (Award no R000239801). The project was also supported by a research award from the British Film Institute and assisted by an advisory committee with representation from the British Film Institute, the UK’s four national Arts Councils, the Office of National Statistics and the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.

2 We have reported on our findings in relation to other aspects of cultural practice in contemporary Britain in Bennett and Silva (eds) (2006).

3 The survey was conducted between November 2003 and March 2004 by the National Centre for Social Research. See Thomson (2004) for the technical report.

4 The exact numbers, recruited via both the main sample and the ethnic boost sample, were 82 from the Afro-Caribbean community, and 86 and 88 respectively from the Indian and Pakistani communities.

5 The focus groups comprised between 4 and 8 participants per group, involving a total of 143 participants, including 74 women and 69 men. Their composition was varied so as to achieve both middle-class and working-class groups within the Afro-Caribbean, Indian, Pakistani and white sections of the population as well as different groups of specific occupational statuses - professionals (male and female), managers, landowners and farm managers, agricultural workers, skilled and unskilled workers, and the unemployed, for example. Class groups were also differentiated in terms of age, with specific regard to both the young and the elderly, and separate groups were organised for gays and lesbians. The groups were conducted in 6 areas in the UK in order to take account of regional and national differences as well as of differences between urban and rural areas and those between metropolitan and provincial cities. Focus groups were held between March and July 2003 in London (8), Birmingham (2), rural Scotland (3), Belfast (2), Swansea (3), and Nottingham (7).

6 Household interviews were conducted with 30 respondents from the survey and, in some cases, their partners, yielding a total of 44 interviews. The selection of households was based on a theoretical sample which aimed to take account of the distribution of households in terms of (i) cultural capital composition, (ii) the presence or absence of dependent children, (iii) geographical location, and (iv) a division between ‘white’ and minority ethnic composition.

7 Television was, at the time, a relatively new medium in France with the ownership of television sets at 13% of French households at the time when the survey on which Distinction is based was first administered (Lahire, 2004: 628). See Bennett (2006) for a further discussion of these matters.

8 This has been especially true of American work associated with the omnivore theses (see Peterson, 1992; Peterson and Kern, 1996; and Erikson, 1996) which has focused mainly on music. The same is true of the work of Chan and Goldthorpe (2004), two British sociologists who have recently engaged with these debates.
main exception is Bennett, Emmison and Frow (1999) which is based on an Australian survey that accords detailed attention to both film and television.

9 We review this literature more thoroughly in chapter 1; for now, Jacobs (2001) provides a good example of the tendency we have in mind here.

10 This is true of a series of books devoted to reading quality television published by I.B. Tauris. See, for example, Akass and McCabe (2004).

11 The questions are reproduced in Appendix 1.

12 The file also includes other black and Asian groups from the main sample bringing the overall total in the ethnic file to 265. However, as each of these is too small to merit separate analysis, they are not accorded any separate attention here. They are, though, included in comparisons between UK born and overseas born members of the ethnic file.

13 The three main channels identified here were Asian Network, ZEE TV and B4U. The main documentary channels, as described by respondents, included Discovery, Discovery Health, Discovery Science, Discovery Wings, History, History UK, National Geographic, Natural History, Animal Planet, Civilisation. The main lifestyle and hobby channels included Men and Motors, UK Food, UK Bright Idea, Travel & Adventure, Sky Travel, Travel Channel, Discovery Home and Leisure, QVC, Craft Channel, Bidup TV, and Food Channel. The main popular channels were ITV2, Paramount, Sky 1, UK Gold, UK Gold2, Living TV, UK Horizons, Comedy Channel, E4, and Granada Plus. The movie channels were Sky Movie, Sky Cinema, TCM, Box Office, Front Row, and Hallmark. Film Four and Disney channels are not included in this category. The main news channels were BBC News 24, Sky News, CNN, and ITN News, and the main sports channels were SkySports, Eurosport, Extreme Sport, and At the Races.

14 The high percentage of the main sample indicating that they heard of Ingmar Bergman – in our view improbable – suggests that many respondents might have confused Ingrid and Ingmar Bergman.

15 The occupations class classifications used here are a compressed version of the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification. For an explanation of this, see Rose et al (1999)

16 Crime has been assigned to the large employers and higher level managers and professionals on the basis of the suppressed decimal point which registered a higher level of preference than that shown here by the intermediate class. The same is true of other cases of the same kind in this table

17 The subjects included in the humanities and social sciences are the fine arts, English, foreign languages, history, general humanities, music, film and media, photography, economics, sociology, political social psychology, social policy, psychology, social science, geography, and media and communication. The science,
maths and engineering subjects included computing, technology, and design subjects, including electronics and architecture.

Our work in interpreting our data via multiple correspondence analysis is ongoing. Both this figure, and the later figure relating to the social space of television, represent an interim stage of this work and do not therefore constitute our definitive findings. It should also be noted that, in the interests of legibility, minor adjustments have been made to the positioning of these modalities in cases where two or more occupied closely co-adjacent or overlapping positions.

The link between critical and popular taste in relation to film is intriguing. John Hill points out in Bourdieu’s own study of taste, *Distinction* the problematic effect of this in debates about cultural capital and film. The film chosen by Bourdieu to represent popular box-office taste is Nicholas Ray’s *55 Days at Peking*, whilst the film proven to resonate with more refined tastes was *Divorce Italian Style*, directed by Pietro Germi. The latter is largely forgotten, whereas, Hill suggests, ‘there would be few ‘cinephiles’ today who would confidently rank a slight Italian comedy over Ray’s flawed epic.’ (Hill 2004:31).

These were Chris Archer in the borders region of Scotland, Ruth Jackson in Belfast, Stephanie Adams in Swansea, Surinder Guru in Birmingham, Karen Wells in London and David Wright in Nottingham. The household interviews were conducted by members of the research team, with the help of Chris Archer, Ruth Jackson, Stephanie Adams and Pippa Stevens.

In one case we were unable to re-interview the survey respondent but did interview her partner.

This proved difficult. The survey did not provide us with many examples of same sex partnership whom we could approach. To take account of this, three follow-up interviews were held with members of the lesbian and gay focus groups.

For practical purposes at this stage, this was a crude measure of educational qualifications, with ‘Low’ being No qualifications/GCSE or equivalent, ‘Medium’ being A-level/GNVQ or equivalent and ‘High’ being degree or above.

This is a pseudonym. In the household interviews, respondents were asked to pick their own pseudonyms. In the focus groups, participants have been allocated pseudonyms.

This is a possible explanation for the presence of ‘cartoons’ as a genre in the ‘Women’s cinema’ category.

Pseudonym for midlands-based ‘art cinema’

The survey was administered to adults of 18 or over. The youngest member of the household interview sample was 25.
Only one person, Hilda, a 33-year old shop worker and mother of two, chose a horror film as a favourite, the 2002 British werewolf film, *Dog Soldiers*.

A 2000 release starring James Spader and Angela Bassett, directed by Walter Hill.

Given the significance ascribed to ‘fandom’ in contemporary social and cultural theory and film scholarship it is interesting how rare this particular, specialist enthusiasm is in both stages of our qualitative research.

In the household interview phase respondents were asked to choose their own pseudonyms.

The interviews were conducted by Tony Bennett, Mike Savage, Elizabeth Silva and Alan Warde.

The sample for the household interview phase was determined by ethnicity of the survey respondent, rather than their partner.

This could be over-stated. This group was organised through a prominent midlands community centre which doubled as a mosque. Members of the group seemed particularly keen to come across as upstanding representatives of the community.

---

**APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX 1: TELEVISION AND FILM QUESTIONS FROM THE CCSE SURVEY**

Television
ASK ALL

Q86-  [Media] 34
Q90  CARD A2
Which of the things on this card do you have in your household?
PROMPT: Which others?
INCLUDE ONLY APPLIANCES IN WORKING ORDER
CODE ALL THAT APPLY
Multicoded (Maximum of 5 codes)
1 Video recorder or DVD player/recorder
2 Personal computer or laptop
3 Digital, satellite or cable TV
4 Mobile phone
5 Internet access
6 None of these

Q91  [TerChM]
CARD A3
On this card is a list of television channels. Which one of these do you
yourself watch most often?
IF SEVERAL, PROBE FOR THE ONE WATCHED MOST.
1 BBC1
2 BBC2
3 ITV
4 Channel 4/S4C
5 Channel 5
6 (Never watches any of these)
7 (Never watches TV)

IF ‘digital, satellite or cable TV’ at [Media]
Q92  [DigChMOp] 34
(Can I just check,) which if any, cable, satellite or digital channel do you
yourself watch most often?
RECORD THE NAME OF ONE CABLE, SATELLITE OR DIGITAL
CHANNEL VERBATIM.
IF SEVERAL, PROBE FOR THE ONE WATCHED MOST.
IF NEVER WATCHES CABLE, SATELLITE OR DIGITAL
CHANNEL, CODE 'NONE'
Open Question (Maximum of 120 characters)

Q93  [DigChMCo] 34 (NOT ON SCREEN)
dv
Range: 1 ... 97

ASK ALL

Q94  [TVHrsWkD]
(Can I just check,) on an ordinary weekday, how many hours of
television do you normally watch during the day and evening?
INTERVIEWER: ROUND UP TO NEAREST HOUR
IF DOES NOT WATCH TELEVISION ON WEEKDAYS, CODE 0
IF NEVER WATCHES TV, CODE 97
Range: 0 ... 97

IF NOT ‘never watches TV’ AT [TVHrsWkD]

Q95

[TVHrsWkE]
On an ordinary weekend day, how many hours of television do you normally watch during the day and evening?
INTERVIEWER: ROUND UP TO NEAREST HOUR
IF DOES NOT WATCH TELEVISION AT WEEKENDS, CODE 0
Range: 0 ... 24

Q96

[HowTV]
CARD A4
Which of the phrases on this card best describes how you most often watch TV?
1 By yourself
2 With your partner
3 With your children
4 With your partner and child(ren)
5 With other family/ household members
6 With friends
7 Other (WRITE IN)

Q98

[TypProgM]
CARD A5
On this card is a list of different types of television programmes. Which, if any, of these do you like the most?
1 News/ Current affairs
2 Comedy/ Sitcoms
3 Police/ detective
4 Quizzes/ game shows
5 Nature / History documentaries
6 Sport
7 Arts programmes
8 Films
9 Variety / chat shows
10 Drama
11 Reality TV e.g. Big Brother
12 Soap operas
13 Cookery/ Home decorations/ Gardening
14 (Other (WRITE IN))
15 (None of these)

IF TYPE OF PROGRAM GIVEN AT [TypProgM]

Q100

[TypProgS]
CARD A5 AGAIN
And which do you like second best?
1 News/ Current affairs
2 Comedy/ Sitcoms
3 Police/ detective
4 Quizzes/ game shows
5 Nature / History documentaries
6 Sport
7 Arts programmes
8 Films
9 Variety / chat shows
10 Drama
11 Reality TV e.g. Big Brother
12 Soap operas
13 Cookery/ Home decorations/ Gardening
14 (Other (WRITE IN))
15 (None of these)

IF NOT ‘never watches TV’ AT [TVHrsWkD]

Q102 [TypProgL]
CARD A5 AGAIN
And which do you like the least?
1 News/ Current affairs
2 Comedy/ Sitcoms
3 Police/ detective
4 Quizzes/ game shows
5 Nature / History documentaries
6 Sport
7 Arts programmes
8 Films
9 Variety / chat shows
10 Drama
11 Reality TV e.g. Big Brother
12 Soap operas
13 Cookery/ Home decorations/ Gardening
14 (Other (WRITE IN))
15 (None of these)

Q104- [TVProg]\textsuperscript{34}
Q106 CARD A6
Of the programmes listed on this card, which three do you like best?
PROBE: Which others? CODE UP TO THREE.
IF RESPONDENT DOESN'T LIKE THREE, CODE ONE OR TWO OR 'None of these'
Multicoded (Maximum of 3 codes)
1 Bad Girls
2 Big Brother
3 South Park
4 Spooks
5 Sex and the City
6 Midsomer Murders
7 The Simpsons
8  Absolutely Fabulous
9  Home and Away
10  Panorama
11  University Challenge
12  West Wing
13  A Touch of Frost
14  Two Pints of Lager and a Packet Of Crisps
15  Eastenders
16  Who Wants to be a Millionaire
17  Friends
18  Eurotrash
19  Six Feet Under
20  The Bill
21  Buffy the Vampire Slayer
22  Coronation Street
23  Perfect Match
24  (None of these)

Q107  [GrandNat]
CARD A7
I am going to read a list of televised events. Taking your answers from this card, please say for each one - if it happened to be on television - whether you would make a point of watching it, might watch it, or would probably not watch it.
If you don't know or have not heard of it please just say so.
...the Grand National?
FOR DON'T KNOW, USE Ctrl + K
1  Would make a point of watching
2  Might watch
3  Would probably not watch
4  Haven't heard of

Q108  [FootWC]
CARD A7 AGAIN
...the Football world cup?
FOR DON'T KNOW, USE Ctrl + K
1  Would make a point of watching
2  Might watch
3  Would probably not watch
4  Haven't heard of

Q109  [QueenCB]
CARD A7 AGAIN
...the Queen's Christmas broadcast?
FOR DON'T KNOW, USE Ctrl + K
1  Would make a point of watching
2  Might watch
3  Would probably not watch
4  Haven't heard of
Q110 [GenElec]
CARD A7 AGAIN
...General election night results programme?
FOR DON'T KNOW, USE Ctrl + K
1 Would make a point of watching
2 Might watch
3 Would probably not watch
4 Haven't heard of

Films

ASK ALL
Q111 [FilmM]
CARD A8
Thinking now of films, whether shown in the cinema or on television. On this card is a list of different types of films. Which, if any, of these do you like the most?
1 Action/ Adventure/ Thriller
2 Alternative/ art cinema
3 Bollywood
4 Cartoon
5 Comedy
6 Costume drama/ Literary adaptations
7 Crime
8 Documentary
9 Fantasy
10 Film noir
11 Horror
12 Musical
13 Romance
14 Science fiction
15 War
16 Westerns
17 (Other(WRITE IN))
18 (None of these)

IF TYPE OF FILM GIVEN AT [FilmM]
Q113 [FilmS]
CARD A8 AGAIN
And which do you like second best?
1 Action/ Adventure/ Thriller
2 Alternative/ art cinema
3 Bollywood
4 Cartoon
5 Comedy
6 Costume drama/ Literary adaptations
7 Crime
And which do you like the least?

1 Action/ Adventure/ Thriller
2 Alternative/art cinema
3 Bollywood
4 Cartoon
5 Comedy
6 Costume drama/ Literary adaptations
7 Crime
8 Documentary
9 Fantasy
10 Film noir
11 Horror
12 Musical
13 Romance
14 Science fiction
15 War
16 Westerns
17 (Other(WRITE IN))
18 (None of these)

I am going to read a list of current film directors. Taking your answers from this card, please say for each one whether you would make a point of watching a film directed by them, might watch it, or would probably not watch it. If you don't know or have not heard of any of them please just say so. ... Stephen Spielberg?

FOR DON'T KNOW: USE Ctrl+K

1 Would make a point of watching
2 Might watch
3 Would probably **not** watch
4 Haven't heard of

Q118 [Hitche]
CARD A9 AGAIN
... Alfred Hitchcock?
FOR DON'T KNOW: USE Ctrl+K
1 Would make a point of watching
2 Might watch
3 Would probably **not** watch
4 Haven't heard of

Q119 [Almodov]
CARD A9 AGAIN
... Pedro Almodovar?
FOR DON'T KNOW: USE Ctrl+K
1 Would make a point of watching
2 Might watch
3 Would probably **not** watch
4 Haven't heard of

Q120 [Bergman]
CARD A9 AGAIN
... Ingmar Bergman?
FOR DON'T KNOW: USE Ctrl+K
1 Would make a point of watching
2 Might watch
3 Would probably **not** watch
4 Haven't heard of

Q121 [Campion]
CARD A9 AGAIN
... Jane Campion?
FOR DON'T KNOW: USE Ctrl+K
1 Would make a point of watching
2 Might watch
3 Would probably **not** watch
4 Haven't heard of

Q122 [Rathnam]
CARD A9 AGAIN
... Mani Rathnam?
FOR DON'T KNOW: USE Ctrl+K
1 Would make a point of watching
2 Might watch
3 Would probably **not** watch
4 Haven't heard of
APPENDIX 2 TABLES ACCOMPANYING CHARTS

Table for Chart 1: Number of hours weekday TV viewing (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2 hours</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5 hours</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6+ hours</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 2: How most often watch television (column %).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By yourself</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your partner</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With your partner and</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child(ren)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With other family/household members</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 3: TV channel (terrestrial) watch most often (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BBC1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITV/NI:UTV</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 4/S4C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 4: Satellite/digital/cable channel watch most often (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has dig/cab/sat TV</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBC3/BBC Digital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artsworld/BBC4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/does not watch</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s channels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentaries</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas/ethnic channels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle/hobbies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular channels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movies (excl Film 4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music channels</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News channels</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Channels</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 5: Type TV programme like most (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News/current affairs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy/sitcoms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police/detective</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes/game shows</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature/history documentaries</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts programmes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety/chat shows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap operas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cookery/home/gard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table for Chart 6(a): Television programmes like best (column %) Soaps/reality TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Brother</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastenders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Away</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronation St</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 6(b): Television programmes like best (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad Girls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midsomer Murders</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Touch of Frost</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 6(c) Television programmes like best (column %) ‘Serious television’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panorama</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Challenge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 6(d) Television programmes like best (column %) New drama

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Wing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spooks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Feet Under</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 6(e) Television programmes like best (column %) New Comedy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main sample</th>
<th>Afro-Caribbean</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Show</td>
<td>Has not heard of</td>
<td>Like to watch</td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table for Chart 8: Weekday hours viewing by social class (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>0-2 hours</th>
<th>3-5 hours</th>
<th>6+ hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSEC1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
NSEC1: Large employers, higher level managers and professionals
NSEC2: Lower level professionals and managers
NSEC3: Intermediate occupations
NSEC4: Small employers and own-account workers
NSEC5: Lower supervisory higher level technical workers
NSEC6: Workers in semi-routine occupations
NSEC7: Workers in routine occupations
NSEC8: Never worked

Table for Chart 9(a): Channel preferences by education, (row %)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BBC1</th>
<th>BBC2</th>
<th>ITV1</th>
<th>Channel 4/SC4</th>
<th>Channel 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No quals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE/O Level</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Level, Higher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 9(b): occupational class (row %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BBC1</th>
<th>BBC2</th>
<th>ITV1</th>
<th>Channel 4/SC4</th>
<th>Channel 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSEC1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSEC7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
NSEC1: Large employers, higher level managers and professionals
NSEC2: Lower level professionals and managers
NSEC3: Intermediate occupations
NSEC4: Small employers and own-account workers
NSEC5: Lower supervisory higher level technical workers
NSEC6: Workers in semi-routine occupations
NSEC7: Workers in routine occupations
NSEC8: Never worked
Table for Chart 9(c): Channel preferences by age (row %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>BBC1</th>
<th>BBC2</th>
<th>ITV1</th>
<th>Channel 4/SC4</th>
<th>Channel 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 9(d): Channel preferences by gender (row %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>BBC1</th>
<th>BBC2</th>
<th>ITV1</th>
<th>Channel 4/SC4</th>
<th>Channel 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 9(e): Channel preferences by ethnicity (row %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>BBC1</th>
<th>BBC2</th>
<th>ITV1</th>
<th>Channel 4/SC4</th>
<th>Channel 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White English</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Celtic</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Origin</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table for Chart 10: Ethnic file/main sample – film (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ethnic file</th>
<th>Main sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream cinema</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table for Chart 11: Ethnic file/main sample – television (column %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic file</th>
<th>Main sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respectable tv</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older popular tv</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly women’s tv</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger popular tv</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 3 FOCUS GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCSE FG No.</th>
<th>Special Items</th>
<th>Group Members (m-f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rural service workers</td>
<td>Domestic Media/Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gay men</td>
<td>Sport/Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MC Retired</td>
<td>Reading/Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WC Retired</td>
<td>Domestic Media/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lesbians</td>
<td>Music/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Black Middle Class</td>
<td>Cinema/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Landowners and Managers</td>
<td>Reading/Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Skilled Manual Workers</td>
<td>Cinema/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Low paid women</td>
<td>Domestic Media/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pakistani MC</td>
<td>Reading/Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pakistani WC</td>
<td>Cinema/Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Music/Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18-30 Professionals/Students</td>
<td>Music/Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unskilled and Semi-skilled</td>
<td>Museums/Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Benefit Claimants</td>
<td>Music/Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Agricultural Workers</td>
<td>Domestic Media/Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Black Working Class</td>
<td>Domestic Media/Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Indian Middle Class</td>
<td>Sport/Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Indian Working Class</td>
<td>Domestic Media/Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Culture Industries</td>
<td>DM/Cinema/Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>Sport/Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>Domestic Media/Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Women Professionals</td>
<td>Music/Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Business Elites</td>
<td>Music/Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>Cinema/Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 4 THE ACHIEVED SAMPLE OF HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heterosexual 17</th>
<th>Lesbian &amp; Gay Households (2)</th>
<th>Lone Parents with children 5 2:3</th>
<th>Sole person (6) 2:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Ethnic’6 : ‘White’11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Capital</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With dependent children (below 16)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With NO dependent children (below 16)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland(5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales(4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caerphilly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>2:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorks. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands (5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester (3)</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX 5 FAVOURITE FILMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="#">A101R – X-Files; This respondent also chose X-Files as her favourite TV programme and book.</a></td>
<td><a href="#">A101P Italian Job dir. Peter Collinson 1969; ‘Where Eagles Dare’ dir. Brian Hutton 1968.</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# Footnotes

[A101R – X-Files; This respondent also chose X-Files as her favourite TV programme and book.](#)  
[A301P – Grease dir. Randal Kleiser 1978](#)  
[B101R – MoonRaker dir. Lewis Gilbert 1979.](#)  
[B301P – Along Came Polly dir. John Hamburg 2004](#)  
[B301R – Saving Private Ryan dir. Steven Spielberg](#)  
B401P – *Cheaper by the Dozen*; This was re-made recently starring Steve Martin. The respondent specifically refers to the original, erroneously identifying David Niven as the star. In fact it was Clifton Webb dir. Walter Lang 1950)


B402P – *Gladiator* dir. Ridley Scott 2000


B502P – *Top Gun* dir. Tony Scott 1986


B503 – *Pulp Fiction* dir Quentin Tarantino 1994

B503R – *Fanny and Alexander* dir. Ingmar Bergman 1982


B602P – *Schindler’s List* dir. Steven Spielberg 1993

B602R – *Singin’ in the Rain* dir Stanley Donen/Gene Kelly 1952; *Gilda* dir. Charles Vidor 1946

B603 – *Pulp Fiction* dir Quentin Tarantino 1994

E201 – *Christmas Carol* (the recent cartoon version, for her children); *Leaving Las Vegas* dir. Mike Figgis 1995

E301 – *Scarface* (presumably the 80s version) dir. Brian De Palma 1983

E301R – *Carousel* dir. Henry King 1956


F101R – *Carousel* dir. Henry King 1956

F302R – *Shirley Valentine* dir. Lewis Gilbert 1989

H202R – *Little Caesar* dir. Mervyn LeRoy 1930; *Scarface* (presumably, from the context of the talk, the Howard Hawks 1932 original)
Survey directors mentioned

Campion x 1 (D601R ‘The Piano’)
Bergman x1 (B503R ‘Fanny and Alexander’)

Other directors mentioned

Gilbert x2 (F302R ‘Shirley Valentine’, B101R ‘Moonraker’)
Darabont x2 (B402P ‘Shawshank Redemption, E301 ‘The Green Mile’)
Scorcese x2 (A302R, B402P – both ‘Goodfellers’) – both these respondents named the director themselves.
Ridley Scott x 3 (B402P ‘Gladiator’; B601P ‘Blade Runner’; D601P ‘Legend’)
Tony Scott x2 (B502R&P – both ‘Top Gun’)
Warchowski brothers (B501R&P – both ‘The Matrix’)
James Cameron x2 (B601P ‘Terminator 2’; A201P ‘Titanic’)
Brian De Palma x2 (E301R ‘Scarface’; A201 ‘Mission: Impossible’)

See, for a representative sample of this literature arising out of an earlier stage of this project, Bennett and Savage (2005).