The Cultural Impact of UK Film: Questions and Evidence

A report of the seminar held at Birkbeck College 27 November 2009

Prepared by Jim Barratt on behalf of:

UK Film Council
Birkbeck College
Royal Holloway, University of London

Contents

Introduction

In 2008 the UK Film Council commissioned a consortium of Narval Media, Birkbeck College and Media Consulting Group to undertake a study of the cultural impact of UK film in the period 1946 to 2006, a project undertaken jointly with the British Film Institute.

The final report, *Stories we tell ourselves: the cultural impact of UK film 1946-2006*, was published by the UK Film Council in June 2009[1], and in the following November the research was presented to academic, policy and commercial researchers at a seminar hosted by the UK Film Council, Birkbeck College and Royal Holloway, University of London.

These seminar notes summarise the day's proceedings, capturing the chief points of discussion about how the UK Film Council and the wider research community can best build on the research going forward.[2]

The notes are divided into three sections that follow the main contours of the seminar programme (see page 24). Section one begins with the welcome address delivered by Carol Comley and David Steele's scene-setting introduction, before moving on to Ian Christie's presentation of the research team's methodology and principal findings.

The second section reports the two panel discussions that straddled the lunch break, chaired by John Hill and Sara Selwood with contributions from Roy Boyne, Christine Geraghty, Máire Messenger Davies and Richard Howells.

The final section summarises the answers delivered during a plenary report back following group discussion of three pre-prepared questions about the research.

---

[1] The main body of the report is available to download from the UK Film Council website (http://www.ukfilmcouncil.org.uk/media/pdf/f/i/CIReport_010709.pdf), along with the appendices (http://www.ukfilmcouncil.org.uk/media/pdf/n/b/CulturalImpactAppendices_260609.pdf).
[2] Four PowerPoint presentations were delivered at the seminar, and they are available from the UK Film Council web site: http://www.ukfilmcouncil.org.uk/culturalimpactseminar09.

Section one: Welcome, introduction and report findings

> *'We really want to know what you think.'*
> **Carol Comley, Head of Strategic Development, UK Film Council**

Carol Comley welcomed delegates by noting the seminar was one of a series addressed to researchers and policy makers, in the UK and Europe, intended to

- Disseminate the research findings;
- Stimulate discussion of the methodology;
- Gather suggestions for future research initiatives.

At a time when public funding for film in the UK is facing cut backs, Carol said the event provided a timely opportunity to contribute to the UK Film Council's strategic planning, particularly in light of the UK Film Council Board's proposal to increase research funding, as feedback from the event would help to inform the choice of future research.

> *'We want to collect something from the day that's concrete, which we can take forward into either what we do as the UK Film Council or what you do as an academic and policy community.'*
> **David Steele, Head of Research & Statistics, UK Film Council**

David Steele introduced the main programme with a look at how the research came into being, and the factors that led to its commissioning.[3]

Although the fieldwork and data collection were conducted in 2008, the study had a longer gestation period during which time the focus shifted from measuring the *monetary value* of film culture to examining cultural *impact*.

In the period 2003 to 2005, the UK Film Council researched the economic impact of UK film and considered whether a similar approach could be taken to produce a valuation of film culture.

The Research and Statistics Unit looked at various methodologies, including hedonic pricing and contingent valuation, and consulted with various authorities including DCMS, the Imperial College team involved in assessing the value of the Olympics, and academic David Throsby. The UK Film Council, in collaboration with Royal Holloway, University of London hosted an event on the subject, but ultimately, 'we weren't convinced enough to go down that particular road', due to concerns about methodological shortcomings and the expense of such approaches.

At the time the research specification was being drawn up it was decided to shift focus to look at cultural impact:

> '[Measuring] impact makes the study wider and potentially more interesting than just diving into a valuation exercise.'

---

[3] David's slideshow presentation is available to download from the UK Film Council web site: http://www.ukfilmcouncil.org.uk/media/powerpoint/8/s/DS_Cultural_Impact_Background_27_Nov_09.ppt

> *'We have introduced a longer time span for thinking about British cinema […] and a wider spectrum of indicators for the assessment of British cinema's impact than are traditionally used.'*
> **Ian Christie, Professor of Film and Media History, Birkbeck College**

Ian Christie began his summary of the methodology and principal findings by explaining that the research in a sense continues the work begun by the AHRC Centre for British Film and Television Studies.[4]

Also by way of background, Ian noted that the idea of studying 'impact' may be tarnished by association with plans by Higher Education funding bodies to replace the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) with the Research Excellence Framework (REF), which will require university departments to demonstrate the intended impact of their academic research.[5] In view of the controversial nature of these proposals, academic researchers may be deterred from addressing the subject of 'impact' in future research.

Nonetheless, the research team is clear that studying cultural impact is worthwhile :

> 'We, the study team, do feel that measurable cultural impact is significant and […] can help to place film within the parameters of the contemporary world, amongst the world of clicks, of page views etc.'

Turning to the report findings, Ian expressed the team's hope that the study will provide a platform for future research on the relationship between films and audiences, help to modernise the prevailing view of UK films and introduce a wider set of measures into the study of British film than has been employed within academic research to date.

In order to conduct the research, the team had to operationalise three concepts: impact, culture and Britishness.

Impact
The study team identified a range of impact measures across three axes, based on work originally conducted by the Public Broadcasting Service in the USA and cited by the BBC in its specification of Public Value:

- **Original impact** (e.g. initial release history, admissions, festival appearances);
- **Extended impact** (e.g. awards, DVD reissues, restoration, best lists "canonisation");
- **Wider impact** (e.g. citation in other media, evidence of esteem, evidence of impact on behaviour and society, IMDb rating, YouTube clips).

Culture
In addition to operationalising 'impact', the team had to define what it meant by culture and was influenced by the work of Raymond Williams, Pierre Bourdieu and Clifford Geertz.

---

[4] Ian's slideshow presentations is available to download from the UK Film Council web site: http://www.ukfilmcouncil.org.uk/media/powerpoint/7/d/CI_Report_Presentation_Ian_Christie_27_Nov.ppt
[5] See HEFCE's web site for details of the REF: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Research/ref/. MeCCSA, the subject association for the field of media, communication and cultural studies, submitted a response to HEFCE's REF consultation: http://www.meccsa.org.uk/papers/responses/response-to-hefce-consultation-on-the-ref

Geertz's concept of culture as 'stories we tell ourselves about ourselves' became central to the research:

> 'We needed an approach to culture that didn't immediately run aground on the issues of class and education, which are so central in Bourdieu […] The best solution seemed to be to turn to anthropology, so we borrowed Clifford Geertz's more dynamic concept of the ensemble of stories that societies tell each other, from his book *The Interpretation of Cultures*.'

Britishness
The final definitional point to decide was what constitutes a British film. This was challenging, not least because much of British cinema is 'the unknown cinema', to use Alan Lovell's description.[6] The level of knowledge about British cinema remains 'patchy and thin': the national filmography is incomplete, knowledge of individual films and their box office performance is inconsistent and many historical titles remain inaccessible to contemporary audiences.

> In consequence, 'we have a problem in depth and extent of our knowledge of British Cinema.'

To address this, the team compiled a searchable database of around 5,000 British fiction films made between 1946 and 2006 (post World War II), using available sources including Denis Gifford's *The British Film Catalogue* (the post-war period was chosen because the information is more complete).

> 'We have produced the skeleton of a resource, which I think will be of value in future, and I very much hope […] it will be carried forward.'

An added complication is that the concept of British national identity is itself open to debate:

> 'British cinema is a notoriously slippery category […] and this slipperiness actually mirrors the problem of British identity itself […] It is clear that Britishness is an essentially contested or unstable concept.'

In the face of these challenges, and due to time limitations, the team took a pragmatic decision about what constitutes a British film.

Inspired by Bordwell, Staiger and Thompson's approach to the study of classical Hollywood cinema[7], the team drew two samples from the film database and analysed them using a range of variables of interest within public policy discussions about 'British values'.

The two samples comprised a random sample of 200 films drawn from the database and an intuitive selection of 200 films felt to be significant and of lasting value by professional observers.

The team also ran a 'closer analysis' of 30 culturally significant case study films using the three dimensions of impact described above, to see 'how these three types of impact might play out.'

---

[6] Lovell, A, **The British Cinema: the Unknown Cinema**, BFI, 1969.
[7] Bordwell, D; Staiger, J and Thompson, K; 1985: **The Classical Hollywood Cinema: Film Style and Mode of Production to 1960**, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ian said that although the findings of this close analysis may not reveal any particularly new insights, they do serve to illustrate how the life of films, and therefore the scope of their potential impact, has been extended in recent years, 'which very much relates to the digital era':

> 'It is important to point out that the once quite short lifespan of most films has been extended quite extraordinarily [...] The extent to which we're still surrounded by films from the last 50 or 70 years is a very material fact and will undoubtedly change attitudes towards the history of British cinema.'

Ian also explained that 'wider impact' was examined from the perspectives of:
- Instances of censorship and notoriety;
- Quotations in other media;
- Zeitgeist moments.

In addition to charting UK films' original, extended and wider impact, the report has chapters on the effects of UK films on national and regional identity, on our understanding of ethnic identity and diversity, and on international audiences' perceptions of the UK.

In this latter regard, the study points to a difference between how international audiences perceive British films made on a low budget and the big budget inward investment features, like the Harry Potter franchise, which are judged in the same terms as other US studio releases:

> 'We found there is a disjunction between what is recognised a clearly British, which is quite a narrow conception of Britishness and tends to be low budget, authorial film in one of the recognised British genres; and the big budget inward investment productions which are technically British and may have many British components, but once dubbed and marketed by a studio are widely perceived as studio pictures and not really British at all.'

Ian described how the study ends with a look at the role of film policy, and of 'changing government attitudes to the British film industry.' The research team hopes the report will make clear to readers who may be unaware of earlier periods of public policy that market interventions have enabled and sustained the British film industry since the 1920s.

In terms of omissions, the research team is aware the study does not take account of audience perspectives, and Ian suggested this is an avenue the UK Film Council could pursue in future:

> 'There are generational and ideological issues that are crying out to be explored by [empirical audience research]: let's hope the UK Film Council is minded to fund such research in the future.'

Ian closed by offering three other items on his future research wishlist:
- A comprehensive national filmography;
- Further research to explore empirically film cycles with 'complex meanings' (e.g. Ealing comedies and other 'clusters'), asking audiences about what these films mean to them, and taking a similar approach to the work of John Sedgwick and Martin Barker *et al*;[8]

---

[8] Sedgwick, J (2000): **Popular Filmgoing in 1930s Britain: A Choice of Pleasures**, Exeter, University of Exeter Press.

- Study new film viewing patterns and how these are affecting spectatorship in the digital age.

Questions and answers

Sylvia Harvey (Professor of Broadcasting Policy, University of Lincoln) suggested it might be useful to 'follow the money', and distinguish between knowledge that comes from academic research and that which issues from a public policy context. 'Different sorts of knowledge are motivated by different sources of funding'. This piece of research straddles both, which makes it interesting.

Samm Haillay (Producer *Better Things*, part-time lecturer Teesside University) asked whether research should measure the impact of *UK cultural film* rather than concentrate on measuring the cultural impact of UK film.

In reply, **Ian Christie** stated that a number of cultural films appear in the research, but that the team sought to balance cultural and mainstream films in the samples because the distinction has been inhibiting in previous research. What constitutes a cultural film is open to debate and may change over time.

David Graham (Attentional) said he was interested in the difference between the more subversive attitude of the intuitive sample of UK films and the more affirmative values of the random sample. He wondered whether this reflects different audiences for these films: one which is more open to change and the other which wants to be entertained and its values affirmed.

Responding, **Ian Christie** agreed it was tempting to read the evidence in this way. The intuitive sample may have been valued precisely because the films are more challenging and provocative. But Ian noted that most of the films from both samples are seen by a wide range of people who may value them in different ways. The quantitative analyses have thrown up some broad features of British cinema, which may be useful for forming hypotheses, but the reality is more complex and requires more sophisticated methods.

Barker, M; Arthurs, J and Harindranath, R; (2001): **The Crash Controversy: Censorship Campaigns and Film Reception**, London, Wallflower Press.

Morning panel

'It seems to me that this move towards the analysis of cultural impact is a valuable one to which we as an academic community can contribute.'
John Hill, Professor of Media, Royal Holloway, University of London

John Hill, Chair of the morning panel, explained in his introduction why he welcomed the opportunity to discuss the research with representatives of the wider academic research community. Noting that the UK Film Council has tended in the past to seek academic input from outside film and cultural studies, John indicated his wish to encourage 'a *rapprochement*' between film/cultural studies and film policy makers.

Previous policy-related research, John suggested, had tended to focus on the economic or social impact of film, so the move towards studying cultural impact brought such research closer to the traditional concerns of film and cultural studies..

Picking up on Sylvia Harvey's point in the earlier Q&A, John agreed there are two discourses informing thinking around cultural impact:
- On the one hand, the UK Film Council champions the UK film industry to secure ongoing public support, and it relies on appropriate evidence to make its case;
- In academia, examining the influence of British films (e.g. in relation to the construction of ethnic and national identities) is long established even if film scholars have not previously used the term 'cultural impact'.

John summed up his introduction by reiterating the seminar's aims:
- To help the UK Film Council devise future research questions and methodologies;
- To encourage colleagues to embrace the cultural impact agenda without being confined to any particular line of enquiry or approach, 'to be active participants in thinking about the cultural impact of UK film and how it might be identified and studied.'

'I set myself the task of asking whether or not thinking about cultural impact and UK film is what the business school and policy people might call a 'wicked problem' […] It did seem to me that what was being done in the UK Film Council report wasn't a classic wicked problem, but it did link to a wicked problem. I thought that what the report was saying […] was that UK film has in fact had a significant impact on large numbers of people. It has helped substantially to change cultural mindsets of various kinds. And this institutional performance has been significant.'
Roy Boyne, Professor in the School of Applied Social Sciences, Durham University.

The first speaker, Roy Boyne, began by describing the study of cultural impact as akin to a 'wicked problem'.[9]

A wicked problem is one 'whose solutions require large groups of individuals to change their mindsets and behaviours'. Wicked problems share a number of characteristics, including the lack of any definitive formulation of the problem. Importantly, solutions to wicked problems are not true or false but they can be good or bad, and there are no proper tests of the adequacy of solutions. On a positive note, although they may be unsolvable, 'thinking about wicked problems may make connections where previously none existed.'

Roy then elaborated a series of questions and thoughts that struck him on reading the study:

- Were the impacts described in the report unintended? The answer to this is 'really rather complex'.
- Is UK film an agency in and of itself? 'Can one talk intelligently about UK film and its impacts? Does that discourse create UK film as an agency?'.
- Measuring change over time is crucial, and similarities and differences between generations need to be taken into account: 'The issue of generations is supremely important when thinking about cultural impact in a directed and concerned-for-the-future sort of way.'
- Is the report intended to make an advocacy case for public support for film? Is the report 'the beginning of something, or the end of something?' A central message of the report is that UK film has made a significant contribution to UK culture (what Roy termed 'institutional performance'). In this regard the report is a 'political intervention' that makes 'a significant contribution' to the advocacy case.
- However, there is no test of the evidence to support this case. The report, instead, provides evidence of outcomes and 'markers of cultural change'.
- As such the report does not satisfy the test of 'regularity' (e.g. 'that every time you do this set of things, the same thing will follow'), which is one criterion of 'causal adequacy'. It does, however, satisfy the other criterion of 'adjacency' or 'succession'. The report implies that if you do more of the same in future, the same beneficial change will follow. But the report makes very few references to negative impacts. 'There was no sustained consideration of impacts other than those that were positive.'

Turning to the wider context of impact assessment in the arts and cultural sector, Roy shared a list of outcomes of cultural interventions that were popular in 1997 when New Labour came to power (including items such as 'increase in individual employability', 'reduction in youth crime and alienation', 'recognition of environmental responsibilities' etc.). It is now widely accepted that cultural investment cannot always guarantee these instrumental outcomes in any predictable, dependable way.

Looking to possible approaches to research going forward, Roy recommended that, if impact-led research becomes necessary, it might begin by:
- Formulating, debating and testing impact hypotheses regarding output over a limited past period of between three and five years;

---

[9] Roy's slideshow presentation is available to download from the UK Film Council web site: http://www.ukfilmcouncil.org.uk/media/powerpoint/6/n/Roy_Boyne_CI_Presentation_Nov09_final.ppt

- Thereafter modelling future impact over a period of, say, three years, not so much to test a particular model, but more to see the impact of its existence over the period.

As more public agencies, he advised, are required to 'make a contract with the world to do something within a specific time frame,' a level of preparation might become invaluable.

''I'm really encouraged to see that the UK Film Council, at the end of the report, does call for change and possibilities within the mainstream educational system, and I'm sure we would be pleased to work with that. But an acknowledgment of education and its impact as a thread through the report would be a very good place to start.'
Christine Geraghty, Professor of Film & Television Studies, University of Glasgow.

Christine Geraghty began her presentation by welcoming the report for broadening the measures of UK film impact beyond 'box office figures and economic measures'.

In thinking about the purpose served by the study, Christine assumed the report exists for people who need to be convinced of the case for supporting UK film with public money. She also noted that it 'involves a particular rhetoric and a particular paradigm, […] around the creative industries or cultural policy'. In this context Christine questioned whether the wording in the Foreword was strictly true- 'do we really all feel good about UK film success?', and she is interested in to whom the 'we' in the Foreword refers.

Turning to main body of the report, Christine commented on three aspects of the methodology:

- She questioned the assumption that impact can ever be 'a single item':

  'It is important to note that impact, of course, can never be a single item. It is unrealistic and wrong to assume that a single film can have an impact that can be directly related to it. And sometimes that did seem to happen in the report, with *Bend it Like Beckham* being responsible for the development of women's football in India.'

  Social change results instead from a confluence of factors within a specific context, and this should be reflected in any impact study.

- The passage of time is a crucial factor when measuring cultural impact, especially with reference to the report's concepts of zeitgeist moments and cumulative impact, and this temporal aspect could be further developed. For example, there is a real difference in the content and aesthetics of films made in 1946 and 2006.

  The impact of individual films can also vary over time, and there are 'peaks of attention' within a film's lifetime from the moment of release to its extended life on other platforms, through remakes, sequels etc.

  Television's role in positioning British cinema and making it accessible has also changed over this period, and 'would repay further study'. In the past, for example, TV scheduling played a part in popularising certain films and cycles (e.g. Ealing comedies).

- The use of a variety of indicators of wider impact is 'very interesting', but 'different impact measures relate to different audiences' e.g. regular users of IMDb are different to other audience groups. Use of such measures therefore 'needs to be treated with some subtlety'.

Christine then outlined three broader points about the report:

- 'The report is organised around the national, […] however that's defined', but this may be 'over-determined' because the study was commissioned within a public policy context where such a paradigm is relevant. In deference to this paradigm, the report is 'politically safe' by being inclusive.

  Christine linked this point to a remark made in Ian Christie's presentation that studies of impact 'focus on what is obvious'; this is because a great deal of work has already been done on British cinema and national identity.

  Christine went on to argue there is an over-emphasis on certain types of films from the nations/regions and involving the representation of ethnic minorities.

  In terms of the nations and regions, the report deploys 'unsafe terminology' around Britishness. For example, Gordon Brown's definition of British values, quoted in the report, may be read as a version of Englishness.

  Christine acknowledged the section on ethnicity does offer a useful summary, but this is an area where impact goes beyond British films (and beyond Channel 4's support for British film). The impact on ethnic identity is related to much wider debates and social changes that were occurring at the time these films were released.

  In response to these challenges, Christine wondered whether the database could be analysed in another way to avoid such difficulties and still make the case for cultural impact. For example, an alternative analysis could proceed from the list of themes and variations that are characteristic of British films, to explore them in greater depth (page 18 of the report): 'It might have been useful to use that map more.'

  Gender is largely neglected, in contrast to the report's preoccupation with national, regional and ethnic identity. The list of 30 case study titles (on page 25) is 'very male oriented', and alternatives reflecting more female preoccupations could have been included (e.g. *The Red Shoes*):

  'If the examples on the list had been different it would have worked differently, I think. Ideas about the position of women have changed dramatically since the Second World War, at least as much as national identity. Did cinema reflect on that? Did it have an impact on that? Or did it actually impede that?'.

- The report downplays aesthetic changes in British films over the period:

  'The report does refer to particular aesthetic features, but what would happen if further work looked at impact as it played through some aesthetic criteria?'

For example, the impact of social realism may play differently in different periods.

It may also be helpful to examine 'the fantastic and the melodramatic' in British film, to shed new light on the relationship between UK and US filmmaking traditions. In another suggestion, Christine noted that performance is recognised in the report only in terms of awards, but performance may have impact in other ways. 'What would happen if the [30] films listed were reworked to use performance as a key indicator, or at least as an organising principle?'

The 'production circumstances' of films are also neglected in the report, and should carry equal weight alongside the section on public policy e.g. links with visual arts, television industry etc.

'I just think there are different ways of cutting what is actually an enormously exciting resource if it's made available.'

- Christine's third general point is not exclusive to this report, but reflected on an attitude 'typical of how public funders pay attention to education'. Despite calling for greater involvement of media education in the national curriculum (a call supported by Christine), the report fails to do justice to the role of education in promoting knowledge and understanding of British film, and teachers are not acknowledged as gatekeepers or enablers in this regard, nor their impact on 'generations of learners':

'I think there is a lack of attention paid to education and the role of educators in how British cinema makes an impact.'

Q&A

Steve Chibnall (Professor of British Cinema, De Montfort University) picked up on the issue of 'negative impact' and links to national and regional identity. He gave the example of *Get Carter* and observed that film can become a focus of resistance to the zeitgeist, and as such 'impact' could be deeply reactionary.

Christine Geraghty agreed that resistance is not always progressive, and many films of the 1950s offered 'a space of resistance' to modernisation in the wider society.

Alan Lovell (independent researcher) questioned the specification of British values favoured by the present government:

'I'm doubtful of the value of discussing British cinema in relation to questions of social identity and national identity, social attitudes and values. It seems to me to be part of a long tradition of a rather utilitarian approach to cinema in British culture. But if we are going to discuss it in those terms, can we agree that Gordon Brown's and Margaret Hodge's definitions are unsatisfactory in that they could apply to a number of societies, not only Britain.'

Mark Reid (Head of Education, British Film Institute) supported Christine Geraghty's call for a greater emphasis on media education. He is particularly interested in measuring cultural impact within education settings. Mark also noted the report emphasises instrumental value, with less attention paid to the intrinsic value of 'children experiencing a wide range of films'. He would like to see the development of metrics covering initiatives like FILM CLUB screenings to see if they are changing

children's viewing preferences. Other initiatives, like ScreenOnline and BFI Education DVDs and classroom resources, may also have impact on children's knowledge and understanding of British film but it is going unmeasured.

Charlotte Brunsdon (Professor of Film, Warwick University) welcomed the UK Film Council's involvement in cultural research, but echoed Ian Christie's point that 'impact has become an extremely loaded, [...] difficult and [is] about to become a truly repellent word for many people within the education system' as a result of the REF proposals.

Charlotte cautioned against seeing impact only in terms of change: 'Things can have impact and keep things carrying on and being the same.'

She also advised the UK Film Council not to forget the 'huge body' of research that exists in relation to television, especially audience research looking at different generations. Charlotte would like to see additional longitudinal and 'horizontal' ('cross-media') research that looks at the complexity of media usage and consumption in people's lives.

Sarah Street (Professor of Film, Bristol University) picked up on Roy Boyne's point about the role of research in cultural investment and the next steps to follow the study. She asked, 'what is the potential for somehow doing something with British film? […] This is historically a very tricky question […] What might a cinema so enabled look like?'

Welcoming the study, **Robin MacPherson** (Professor of Screen Media, Edinburgh Napier University) declared his interest in the public policy uses of the research, and how best to demonstrate social and cultural value to balance against economic impact:

> 'The policy implications of measuring cultural impact are […] politically pressing because the hidden question behind looking at the impact of film is measuring the impact of film policy […] because [public funding interventions] are going to come under scrutiny […] And one of the methodological questions that has yet been to be addressed is looking to tease out whether or not film policy interventions have the consequences which they intend. […] The challenge is that if we don't have an adequate sense of what the cultural impacts are, of film and future film policy, we're left with the creative industries policy framework and only economic impact will be measured and used to justify policy. So there is a positive imperative to have measures of social and cultural value that have some empirical underpinning in order to make the kinds of policy argument [..] that would be required to justify policy interventions that have cultural as opposed to economic objectives. So I welcome this report- we need to be ahead of the game.'

David Graham returned to Christine Geraghty's point about Britishness in the report. He agreed that Britishness is 'over defined' and needs to include a European element:

> 'We are, after all, European now, and a large part of our film economy is determined by European legislation, a large part of our film output are co-productions. [...] I get the feeling this definition is a bit retrograde and we need to be a bit more nuanced in the way we define our nationality.'

Richard Miller (Available Light Advisory) welcomed the study's historical view, but suggested that a more strategic perspective would also have been useful. For

example, the insights in Table 5.1 (Impact measures and ratings for the case study films, p.25) are 'crying out to be taken forward in a strategic way'.

In addition to cultural impact, Richard recommended looking at the impact of UK film on other areas of public policy like health, education, community development etc. which might leverage additional money to support film: 'I'd be interested to see a study that asks what are the impacts that will open larger pocketbooks and help to create more funding for film in difficult times.'

He also noted that the impact of UK film is a subset of the impact of film in general, and wondered whether it is worth seeing if work has been done elsewhere examining the impact of other national cinemas in their home countries, e.g. in Canada and Australia, by way of comparison with the UK.

Sylvia Harvey reminded delegates there have been a number of different Secretaries of State for Culture since 2000 and there is a tendency for policy emphases to reflect the views of the current post-holder. If a Conservative Government is elected in 2010, 'the big irony is [...]that the heritage/cultural case may be a stronger card to play in defending public intervention in film than the economic case.'

Holly Aylett (London Metropolitan University) also welcomed the study but was 'uneasy' about the notion of 'frontiers' and Britishness it puts forward, because 'Britain has hugely porous walls'. She would like to see this research as only one part of the 'story of cultural impact and value of UK film', and would favour a more concerted study of the role played by distribution in the cultural impact of UK films.

Afternoon panel

> *'The politics of cultural impact are really crucial because ultimately it's got to be about advocacy. However, I do think that the report, and the discussion this morning, opens up a whole debate about how it might be possible to use evidence of cultural impact in a way that the UK Film Council, the British Film Institute and the sector more generally can do more than contribute to a better financial settlement in the future. So one of the questions I would ask [...] is: if you can find out what [cultural impact] is, what are you going to do about it?'*
> **Sara Selwood, Editor, Cultural Trends.**

Sara Selwood, Chair of the second panel discussion, began by setting out some background to the study of cultural impact in the UK with a look at DCMS's changing approach since 1997, when DCMS inherited a 'failure to measure the effects of culture in any way, shape or form'.

This was remedied in 2003 with the development of the logic of 'cultural value' (championed by Demos, in a series of papers), and in 2004 Tessa Jowell, Secretary of State, published a paper that helped to challenge the measurement of instrumental outcomes.

Other recent developments include Sir Brian McMaster's review of excellence in the arts for DCMS, which favours decision-making based on judgement over measurement and led to thinking about peer review methodology (which may be too expensive to implement in every circumstance).[10]

---

[10] See DCMS web site for details:
http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/publications/3577.aspx

Sara suggested the study should be read within the context of the 'politics of cultural impact'. She noted that demonstrating cultural impact is essentially about advocacy, but the report may nonetheless have other uses.

> *'Why didn't you just go and ask the people? […] My instinct is just to go out with a big pile of questionnaires […] and ask some people what they think many of these things are: what the impact of particular films are, what the zeitgeist moment from their childhood was? So, where is the audience in all of this?'*
> **Máire Messenger Davies, Professor of Media Studies and Director of the Media Studies Research Institute, University of Ulster.**

The afternoon panel's first speaker, Máire Messenger Davies, set out to discuss the 'how' of measuring cultural impact, with particular reference to researching audiences.[11]

> 'The 'how' is always a really, really big question […] It's a problematic issue when it comes to conducting research.'

Máire addressed four main issues in her review of the study's approach:

'Some general points about methodology'
- Máire raised the question of research validity, and asked how representative the random sample of 200 films is.
- She also questioned use of an 'intuitive sample' based on professional judgement, as intuition is an amorphous concept. Furthermore, Máire detected a contradiction in use of the term 'intuition', which is better applied to the judgements of those without specialist knowledge.
- Citing David Deacon's article 'Why Counting Counts', in which the author challenges the use of quantitative terms in cultural studies research papers,[12] Máire identified other problems in the report's terminology. Words like 'generally', 'lasting', 'predominantly', 'majority', 'high' etc. lack necessary precision:
  'Quantitative terms are being used to create a kind of value, and we don't do this […] If quantitative terms are going to be used, we have to be very precise.'
- Máire pointed out that as cumulative impact is about change over time it can only properly be measured using longitudinal methodology: 'You can't really claim cumulative impact unless you're taking measurements over a long period of time, and it has to be the same measurements, the same questions and the same audience sample.'

'How do we understand the meaning of Britishness?'
- Máire talked about the deep impression *The Red Shoes* made on her, and she wondered about its Britishness in view of its production history and 'very European sensibility'.
- Other dimensions of Britishness could be examined, like hybridity ('We are a nation of borrowers'), excess, technical experimentation and the imprint of the 'crazy space' of British children's television. 'Harry Potter is stuffed with

---

[11] Máire's slideshow presentation can be downloaded from the UK Film Council web site: http://www.ukfilmcouncil.org.uk/media/powerpoint/5/q/Maire_Messenger_Davies_CI_Seminar_27_Nov_09.ppt

[12] Deacon's article appears in Pickering, M (ed) (2008): **Research Methods for Cultural Studies**, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

references to children's culture […] it is a treasure chest of references in terms of this crazy space aspect of children's culture.'

'How do we consult the audience?'
- Máire wondered why the research team did not conduct any audience research, and recommended this approach in future.
- By way of example, Máire referred to two pieces of 'large scale audience research' conducted in New York and West Yorkshire, looking at the concept of audience taste.[13] It is perfectly possible, she suggested, to conduct cost effective audience research using questionnaires:
'To do a one shot piece of survey research with audiences in cinemas or theatres is perfectly doable so long as you have access […] Access can be a problem for academics. But it isn't a problem for the BFI or the UK Film Council, I'd have thought.'

'How do we make the most of existing resources and research that's already been done?'
- Máire reiterated previous points made about the relevance of television research to the study of cultural impact, and the role of education in promoting UK film culture ('There's tonnes of stuff in the BFI archive about cultural impact, in terms of, for instance, how schools' curricula have changed'). She also recommended the use of students as research subjects as they can reveal aspects of generational change.

Máire ended her presentation by screening a television advertisement for Hovis bread entitled 'Britishness'. 'What interests me is that it has this subversive element [of British culture] and it is a very good example of what the Brits do well.'

> *'There's a great deal I admire about this report […] But at the same time […] this is a report that seems to want to talk about value, but feels constrained for political reasons to talk about impact. It wants to be interpretive, but feels politically constrained to be instrumental.'*
> **Richard Howells, Reader in Cultural and Creative Industries, King's College, University of London.**

'You might expect me to be a cheerleader for the cultural and creative industries', began Richard Howells. 'But I want to stand up and proudly say the wrong thing, because I'm particularly interested in what Sara [Selwood] phrased rather well as the politics of cultural impact. So rather than being a cheerleader this afternoon, I'm probably going to end up as a provocateur.'

As a self-proclaimed 'Geertz fan', Richard welcomed the study's view of British film as an 'assemblage of texts', of 'stories we tell ourselves about ourselves'. But he noted that Geertz was only interested in taking an 'interpretive, hermeneutic, cultural anthropological stance' towards culture, and did not examine 'impact'. Geertz, Richard said, looked instead at the 'generation of meaning'.

---

[13] See: Messenger Davies, M. & Pearson, R. E. (2003): 'Stardom and Distinction: Patrick Stewart as an Agent of Cultural Mobility: A Study of Theatre and Film Audiences in New York City' in Barker, M. & Austin, T. (eds): **Contemporary Hollywood Stardom,** London, Arnold, pp 167-186. and
Pearson R. E. & Messenger Davies, M. (2005): 'Class Acts?: Public And Private Values And The Cultural Habits Of Theatre-goers', in Livingstone, S. (ed) **Audiences And Publics: When Cultural Engagement Matters For The Public Sphere**, Bristol, Intellect Books, pp 139-161.

Pursuing this theme, Richard expressed his reservations about the AHRC report on the economic impact of arts and humanities research[14] and supported what he described as 'an undercurrent, or hopefully a backlash, against instrumentalism'.

Richard favoured examination of cultural value over cultural impact, and he saw little merit in 'gaming' the issue by trying to reach an accommodation with the instrumental agenda:

> 'In our heart of hearts […] we're not asking the wrong question [...] we're actually *answering* the wrong question. I think that academics, intellectuals, filmmakers need to take the initiative and reframe the debate for ourselves, and not have the debate framed for us by outsiders. And that the right question should be the debate not about impact but the debate about value.'

Q&A

Referring to Máire Messenger Davies's presentation, **Robin MacPherson** questioned the relationship between quantitative and qualitative evidence, and how best to control for audience size when comparing the intuitive and random samples. He asked whether a film seen by 2,000 people can have the same impact as a film seen by two million people.

In reply, **Ian Christie** agreed this is an important consideration. He said in addressing the matter, the research team brought together different 'modes of analysis' to pose questions, create hypotheses and then develop new methodologies.

Ian went on to acknowledge there are some things that are simply unknowable about impact, e.g. the number of people that have seen a film. Box office data are 'deeply suspect', and data for other platforms are hard to come by. This limits the scope for quantitative analyses.

Bertrand Moullier (Narval Media) added that the methods need to combine quantitative and qualitative approaches to look at change over time, while recognising there are limits to the use of audience numbers across platforms.

On the issue of what might be unknowable, **Máire Messenger Davies** said that research design should focus on the achievable: 'When you come up against […] an issue that appears undoable, the answer is don't do it! Research is the doable, research is about what can reasonably be addressed in ways that are practical and intellectually valid.'

Picking up Ian Christie's earlier point, Máire recommended conducting a 'controlled study' involving a sample of films with reliable box office data:

> 'You can control for different factors and that is what research does. I mean research is always leaving things out, so within the parameters you've chosen for your research design, […] you'd say this we can establish. And I think that's true of all research, and […] statistics allow you to do those controls.'

---

[14] The report ('Leading the World: The Economic Impact of Arts and Humanities Research') can be downloaded from the AHRC web site: http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/About/Policy/Documents/leadingtheworld.pdf

Noting that Geertz cautioned against using quantitative methods, **Richard Howells** accepted that academics should be free to choose their approach, and should seek to triangulate evidence derived from different methods.

Sylvia Harvey reflected on Richard Howells's presentation, arguing that although honesty and integrity are fundamental to academia, there are some dangers in 'not gaming' when academics work alongside policymakers.

David Graham spoke of the value of quantitative research, which starts 'where there is a very basic question' to answer. He observed that during the day nobody had asked the most basic question: why do people go to see films?

> 'With public money being spent on film, what are our citizens getting out of this experience? We haven't really got anywhere near that question, or indeed any answer to the question in this report […] Let's get out there now and start some very simple research […] and ask some very basic questions that will tell us why the people of this country go to see films, what they get out of them, and whether there are any differentiating factors that relate to the culture closest to them.'

John Hill responded by suggesting that asking audiences about a specific film would only yield evidence of immediate impact; he therefore posed the question of how you might design audience research that would measure the cumulative impact of past British films.

Returning to Ian's comment about the paucity of box office data, **Steve Chibnall** noted that the reputation of *The Red Shoes* was founded partly upon the fact it inspired people to take up ballet. In that sense box office figures are not always relevant as an indicator of impact.

Section three: Group discussion and report back

The final part of the seminar involved the audience working in small groups to consider the following questions:

1. Is the UK Film Council asking the right questions?

2. If the UK Film Council pursues the project of finding evidence for the cultural impact of UK film, what would be the most useful piece of research to do next?

3. Are there other research initiatives on the cultural impact of UK film that might be pursued by the academic community and is there a basis for networking and/or collaboration?

A representative from each group was then asked to report their conclusions, and their responses are summarised below:

Group 1
- The UK Film Council is not asking the wrong question, just not enough of the right questions.
- It is necessary to move beyond impact and explore questions of value e.g. benefits like engagement, entertainment etc.
- Future study should look at influences on filmmakers, because filmmakers are audiences themselves.
- Audience research is the most useful next step, but should be less ambitious in terms of time-scale, a very narrow, tightly focussed study of audience perspective is needed. This should be concerned with biographical details of research subjects and probably best explored through qualitative methods, like focus groups and interviews.
- The UK Film Council should consider using publicly-funded films as case studies for detailed audience research.
- The group welcomed the idea of a national filmography, and recommended an online project (a 'wiki filmography') open to anyone to develop and update listings thereby capitalising on amateur and professional research input.
- The academic community should continue to explore the cultural history dimension (writing about and debating the cultural history of British cinema), and develop new ways of doing that within a framework thinking about impact, influence and value.

Group 2
- This group looked at the issue in reverse: audiences are potential filmmakers and therefore it is important that familiarisation with British film culture is part of the national curriculum.
- Future research should ask audiences what matters to them and explore the circulation of 'cultural memes'.
- Research should not be confined to reception studies. It is also important to look at producers' cultural influences along with examination of the cultural assumptions of gatekeepers and power structures within film policy.
- The digitisation of the back catalogue presents 'considerable opportunities for heritage development', providing additional lines of enquiry.
- It would be interesting to study the impacts and value of those films that have been commercially unsuccessful but that have a substantial cultural footprint (e.g. work of Bill Douglas work).

Group 3
- The group agreed the study was an interesting starting point, but 'to continue in this vein would be too difficult. There's too much history in it.' The sixty year period spanned by the report has witnessed too many changes, and future research should confine itself to the post-2000 period.
- 'We felt it was important when looking at cultural impact for the UK Film Council to develop some hypotheses about impact and then test them with audiences'.
- The division between notions of high culture and the broader understanding of anthropology that anything can be cultural can be a distraction. There is a need to formulate 'a middle ground definition of culture' that will enable researchers to generate testable hypotheses.
- The UK Film Council could examine publicly-funded films that have not had substantial releases, by showing them to audiences to find out why they might have failed. 'Was the reason for their failure in cinemas something to do with distribution or was it actually something intrinsic to the films themselves?'
- The best way forward is for the UK Film Council to fund small-scale studies with the academic community, to enable the UK Film Council to benefit from academic independence of mind so the research does not appear to be self-serving.

Group 4
- The UK Film Council should 'formulate its own wicked question': 'How do we want to change the mindset and behaviour of a wide range of individuals in the UK in relation to film?'
- Impact is not always one way: 'What value do audiences create out of UK film?'
- It is imperative to study the cultural impact of film on children's experience. Research should start with what children make of film in their own right.
- With the growth of new media platforms it is important to track 'film engagement online'.

Group 5
- 'Academics should do something that does not duplicate what commercial operations are doing, drawing on the strengths of academic work.'
- Care needs to be taken to expand the notion of film to encompass all viewing platforms.
- On the matter of education, the group supported the idea of encouraging children to think about film as part of their wider cultural experience through the school curriculum, and they also favoured the use of students as 'research fodder'.

Group 6
- The group welcomed the report but recognised the 'inevitable limitations of its framework'. Additional parameters are needed if it is to be used for instrumental purposes, like 'social cohesion, inter-cultural dialogue, diversity of expression and the role that film plays in that.'
- This led to a discussion of distribution and exhibition, and 'the need to develop ways of measuring both in relation to cross media platforms and the post-2000 environment that we're all part of.'
- Future research should extend beyond the boundaries of Britain, given that most films people watch are not British.

- In the short term, there is a need for more qualitative audience research to complement the report.
- Longer term, the UK Film Council should consider a longitudinal approach, perhaps like the '7 Up' documentary series. This could be achieved by creating a framework to research different types of audience over time, examining different contexts and the influence of wider social, political and economic factors.

<u>Group 7</u>
- The group discussed the problem of Britishness and of reading films only from this national perspective. Greater attention should be given to indicators of esteem and popularity, because viewing habits are motivated by issues other than nationality.
- They recommended using SWOT analysis to help identify problems to tackle though research.
- The reduction of public funding for film is the elephant in the room, and the report's deployment in this context is critical.
- The report highlights policy institutions' lack of awareness of much relevant academic work: 'A lot of the debates that come up in the report are, of course, extremely familiar to many of us here.'
- Future research should gather evidence of the proliferation of distribution platforms and how that affects the film viewing experience.
- The group also recommended a 'focussed study' of the cultural value of films made in the last five years, allowing a much greater level of detail for individual titles.
- Finally, the group thought it was important to take into account comparative research that was conducted in the past and in other countries.

In summing up the day, **David Steele** reflected on the 'strong steer' from participants on the need to conduct audience research. He noted that audience research was not chosen at the time the research was commissioned because the UK Film Council wanted first to 'do the groundwork' by reviewing existing literature and clarifying the research issues.

David also referred to his own informal consultations about the impact of UK films, in which he had observed a tendency for people to put films into three categories, which he had also noticed in the discussions today:

1. 'Films that had impact on me at a particular moment in my life' (e.g. *Educating Rita*).
2. 'Films that were particularly good but mainly conveyed some sort of timeless message (e.g. *Dangerous Liaisons*)'
3. 'Films that were not only good, and affected me, but had a influence on the broader culture' (e.g. *My Beautiful Launderette).*

John Hill concluded with a proposal to establish a network of academics interested in studying and debating cultural impact and cultural value.

The final word was left to **Ian Christie**, who referred to the Mass Observation diaries of 1943, which provide 'a rich, one off resource about film preferences'. He suggested there may be scope for a new Mass Observation-style study in order to better understand 'the spectator of 2010', to build a picture of 'new models of spectatorship in the digital age'. This could also benefit from a comparative, European dimension:

'There is interest in many parts of Europe in posing these questions […] Not only to look at what we all have in common, but also at the relationships we have across frontiers in Europe. As somebody sensibly said this morning, British film policy has been European for a long time, perforce. It's an illusion to think it can be British alone. It ain't and it can't be!'

Programme

The Cultural Impact of UK Film: Questions and Evidence

Venue: Room B04, Birkbeck College, University of London, Torrington Square, London.
Date: Friday 27 November 2009, 10:30am - 4:15pm

10:00-10:30	Arrival and coffee
10:30	Welcome:
	Carol Comley (Head of Strategic Development, UK Film Council)
10:35	Introduction:
	David Steele (Head of Research & Statistics, UK Film Council)
10:45	Presentation of report findings:
	Ian Christie (Professor of Film and Media History, Birkbeck College)
11:15	Questions and comments
11:30	Tea and coffee break
11:45	Morning Panel
	Chair:
	John Hill, Professor of Media, Royal Holloway, University of London
	Speakers:
	Roy Boyne, Professor in the School of Applied Social Sciences, Durham University.
	Christine Geraghty, Professor of Film and Television Studies, University of Glasgow.
1:00	Lunch
2:00	Afternoon Panel
	Chair:
	Sara Selwood, Editor, *Cultural Trends*.
	Speakers:
	Máire Messenger Davies, Professor of Media Studies and Director of the Media Studies Research Institute, University of Ulster.
	Richard Howells, Reader in Cultural and Creative Industries, King's College, University of London.
3:15	Group discussion of questions:
	• *Is the UK Film Council asking the right questions?*
	• *If the UK Film Council pursues the project of finding evidence for the cultural impact of UK film, what would be the most useful piece of research to do next?*
	• *Are there other research initiatives on the cultural impact of UK film that might be pursued by the academic community and is there a basis for networking and/or collaboration?*
3.45	Plenary – report back responses to questions and concluding discussion
4:15pm	Finish

Speakers biographies

Roy Boyne

Roy Boyne is Professor of Sociology at Durham University, where he heads the recently formed *Economy and Society Research Group* in the School of Applied Social Sciences. He has published books on French philosophy, the sociology of art and cinema, and cultures of risk. He is a member of the executive editorial board of *Theory, Culture and Society*, and a board member of the recent journal, *Creative Industries.* He was guest-editor for the 2007 edition, devoted to cinema, of *Symbolism: a Journal of Critical Aesthetics*. He was Vice-Chair of the Board of Culture North East (until its demise in April 2009). He is writing a book for Sage on regional and international cultural strategy, based in part on research he did whilst visiting professor at the University of Strasbourg in 2007. As part of the research into questions of cultural strategy, he has become especially interested in the idea of 'impact', with particular reference to evaluation methodology, and to indirect impacts and externalities.

Ian Christie

Ian Christie is a film historian, curator, broadcaster and consultant. He has written and edited books on Powell and Pressburger, Russian cinema, Scorsese, and Gilliam, and worked on many film-related exhibitions. Between 2003-05, he was director of the AHRC Centre for British Film and Television Studies; and in 2006 he was Slade Professor of Fine Art at Cambridge University, with a series of lectures entitled 'The Cinema Has Not Yet Been Invented'. A Fellow of the British Academy, he is Professor of Film and Media History at Birkbeck College, director of the London Screen Study Collection and vice-president of Europa Cinemas, of which he was a co-founder. Current work includes research on the early motion picture industry in Britain, the place of film in the digital era and the history of production design, which is the subject of his latest book, *The Art of Film: John Box and Production Design*. www.ianchristie.org

Christine Geraghty

Christine Geraghty is Professor of Film and Television Studies at the University of Glasgow, having previously worked at Goldsmiths College, University of London. She has written extensively on film and television with a particular emphasis on fiction and form. She is the author of *British Cinema in the Fifties: Gender, Genre and the 'New Look'* (Routledge, 2000) and of a study of *My Beautiful Laundrette* for I B Taurus in 2005. Her book *Now a Major Motion Picture: Film Adaptations of Literature and Drama* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2008) takes a fresh look at the vexed question of fidelity in adaptations and she recently published an essay on *Atonement* (Wright, 2007) in the journal *Adaptations*.

John Hill

John Hill is Professor of Media at Royal Holloway, University of London. He is the author or co-editor of a number of books on film and television including *Sex, Class and Realism: British Cinema 1956-63* (1986), *The Oxford Guide to Film Studies* (1998), *British Cinema in the 1980s* (1999) and *Cinema and Northern Ireland* (2006). John has also served as a Governor of the BFI and a Director of the UK Film Council.

Richard Howells

Richard Howells is a cultural sociologist who combines an international background in the humanities (Visual Studies at Harvard) and the social sciences (Social and Political Sciences at Cambridge). In 2004 he was Distinguished Visiting Professor at the Center for the Arts in Society at Carnegie Mellon University in the USA, with whom he continues to collaborate. He is now Reader in Cultural and Creative Industries and Director of the Centre for Cultural, Media and Creative Industries Research at King's College, London. Richard specializes in visual and popular culture, combining theory and practice to explore case studies as seemingly diverse as the myth of the Titanic and the humour of Ali G. He is currently working on the ontology of the celebrity photographic image, the relationship between Navajo theology and design, and the life and work of Louis Aimé Augustin Le Prince—who succeeded in making moving pictures several years before the accepted inventors of cinema. Finally, he is researching Ernst Bloch and a critical theory of art, literature, popular culture and Utopia. His work is united by asking the big questions about culture-–what is it? Why do we have it? And what does it tell us about ourselves? Publications include *The Myth of the Titanic* (1999), *Visual Culture* (2003, Chinese edition 2007) and *Using Visual Evidence* (2009), co edited with Robert Matson of the University of Pittsburgh. He has recently written a policy essay, commissioned by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, arguing for the value of arts and humanities research to society. This is now due for publication in Jonathan Bate (ed.) *The Public Value of the Humanities* (Bloomsbury, 2010). In addition to being a speaker at international conferences, Richard Howells is a regular contributor to radio and television programmes on cultural, creative and media issues.

Máire Messenger Davies

Máire Messenger Davies is Professor of Media Studies, and Director of the Centre for Media Research at the University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland. A former journalist, she has a PhD in Psychology and a BA in English Literature. She has worked in universities and conducted 'cultural impact' research on both sides of the Atlantic. Rather to her surprise, she has become a specialist in quantitative audience studies, and is the author (with Nick Mosdell of Cardiff University) of *Making people count: practical research methods for media and cultural studies* (2006), Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. A specialist on research with children and young people, her latest book is *Children, media and culture*, (2010, forthcoming) Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw Hill, http://www.openup.co.uk/children_media

Sara Selwood

Sara Selwood is an independent cultural analyst, Visiting Professor in the Department of Cultural Policy and Management, City University and Honorary Professor, Institute of Archaeology, UCL.

Much of her work focuses on cultural policy and the publicly-funded cultural sector. She has written extensively on the relationship between the expectations of policy, its implementation, funding and the publics' experience of cultural provision – particularly in relation to museums and galleries.

Her books include *The Benefits of Public Art* (1995) and the compendium, *The UK Cultural Sector: Profile and Policy Issues* (2001), which still remains the most comprehensive overview available on the sector. She edits *Cultural Trends*, a journal which combines statistical evidence on the cultural sector with commentary and interpretation (www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/09548963.asp). She recently completed a major review of Renaissance in the Regions, a £300m government programme of investment in England's regional museums.

She has a background in fine art, aesthetics, history and theory of art, and previously worked as an art historian and a curator of contemporary visual art. Her former posts include Head of the Cultural Programme at the independent think-tank, the Policy Studies Institute, and Quintin Hogg Research Fellow, University of Westminster. Sara is a Trustee of the National Portrait Gallery, a member of the Mayor of London's Cultural Strategy Group and Chair of its nascent London Cultural Reference Group.

List of attendees

Note: Not every person on this list made it to the seminar on the day, but all registered their interest in hearing the results and continuing to take part in the discussion of the issues.

Name	Position
Alan Lovell	Independent Researcher
Alicia Blum-Ross	Doctoral Candidate (Oxford) writing on youth filmmaking
Andrew Spicer	Reader in Cultural History, University of the West of England
Bertrand Moullier	Narval Media
Bruce Hanlin	Media & Journalism, University of Huddersfield
Carol Comley	Head of Strategic Development, UK Film Council
Charlotte Brunsdon,	Professor of Film, Warwick University
Chris Elliott	Subject Leader in Film and Video, Department of Arts, Media and English, London South Bank University
Christine Geraghty	Professor of Film and Television Studies, University of Glasgow
Claire Monk	Senior Lecturer in Film Studies, De Montfort University
Claudio Nazareno	PhD Researcher, School of Arts Centre for Research in Film and Audiovisual Cultures (CRFAC), Roehampton Univeristy
David Graham	Attentional
David Steele	Head of Research and Statistics Unit, UK Film Council
Des O'Rawe	Queen's University, Belfast
Dorota Ostrowska	Lecturer in Film and Modern Media, Department of History of Art and Screen Media, Birkbeck
Fred Davies	Associate Lecturer, The Open University in London
Gabriele Popp	Documentation Manager, British Film Institute
Garry Whannel	Professor of Media Cultures, University of Bedfordshire

Heather Stewart	Cultural Programme Director UK-wide, British Film Institute
Holly Aylett	Global Policy Institute
Holly Giesman	PhD student, Film and TV Studies, Roehampton
Ian Christie	Professor of Film and Media History, Birkbeck, University of London
Jane Sillars	Stirling University
Jason Lee	Head of Film and Media Studies, University of Derby
JC Chrissey	Research student, Royal Holloway
Jeremy Bubb	Roehampton University London
Jill Nelmes	University of East London
Jim Barratt	Consultant (Event Rapporteur)
John Adams	Professor, University of Bristol
John Hill	Professor, Head of Research, Department of Media Arts, Royal Holloway.
Jonathan L. Powell	Head of Dept, Royal Holloway
Jonathan Olsberg	Olsberg SPI
Jonathan Simon	Consultant
Julian Petley	Prof, School of Arts, Brunel University
Justin Smith	Principal Lecturer in Film Studies, School of Creative Arts, Film & Media, University of Portsmouth
Kate Oakley	Visiting Professor, Department of Cultural Policy and Management, City University
Katherine Burton	Publisher, Sociocultural Studies, Routledge/Taylor & Francis
Libbie McQuillan	Olsberg SPI
Lizzie Thynne	Senior Lecturer in Media and Film Studies, University of Sussex
Maire Messenger-Davies	Professor of Media Studies and Director of the Media Studies Research Institute, University of Ulster
Marie Dugo	Vassar College London Media Studies Program at FIE
Mark Reid	Head of Education, BFI
Mary Irwin	Institute of Education, London
Maud Mansfield	Policy Consultant
Michael Klontzas	Senior Lecturer, School of Music, Humanities and Media, University of Huddersfield
Min J. Lee	Independent Researcher
Natalie Foster	Senior Editor, Media and Cultural Studies, Routledge.
Naznin Hirji	Consultant
Olivia Noble	DCMS Evidence and Analysis Unit
Paul Kerr	London Metropolitan
Paul McDonald	Associate Dean (Research), Professor of Film and TV, University of Portsmouth
Paul Richardson	Senior Executive, Monitoring Unit, UK Film Council
Peter Bloore	Senior Lecturer in Creativity, University of East Anglia
Pippa Cross	Film producer; UK Film Council Board Member
Ricardo Domizio	Course Director, Film Studies, London South Bank University
Richard Howells	Reader in Cultural and Creative Industries, King's College, University of London
Richard Miller	Consultant, Available Light Advisory
Richard Naylor	Burns Owen Partnership
Richard Paterson	Head of Knowledge, BFI

Robert Murphy	Professor, De Montfort University
Robin MacPherson	Professor, Edinburgh Napier University
Roy Boyne	Professor in the School of Applied Social Sciences, Durham University
Samm Haillay	Producer "Better Things" and part-time lecturer, Teesside University
Sara Selwood	Cultural Policy consultant
Sarah Leon	Student
Sarah Street	Professor of Film, Bristol University
Sarita Malik	Sociology/Communications, School of Social Sciences, Brunel University
Sean Perkins	Senior Research Executive, UK Film Council
Silvia Angrisani	Media Consulting Group
Stephen Lacey	Professor, Cardiff School of Creative and Cultural Industries/Ysgol Diwydiannau Creadigol a Diwylliannol Caerdydd, University of Glamorgan/Prifysgol Morgannwg
Steve Chibnall	Professor of British Cinema, De Montfort University, Leicester
Susan Rogers	Programme Director, MA in Feature Film Screenwriting, Royal Holloway.
Sylvia Harvey	Professor of Broadcasting Policy, Lincoln
Tom Nicholls	Senior Lecturer in Media Theory, School of Media, University of Lincoln
Victoria Lowe	Lecturer in Drama & Screen Studies, University of Manchester
Vincent Porter	University of Westminster

(end)