News, Reviews, Clues, Interviews and Other Ancillary Materials -- A Critique and Research Proposal

Martin Barker, University of Wales, Aberystwyth, Wales

> Director John Lassiter and his computer artists and scientists spent four years designing everything you see, every character, house and car, down to each of the 1.2 million leaves on the trees in Andy's neighbourhood. In fact the more you know about how it was made, you'll never be able to watch Toy Story the same way again. (Narrator's commentary, documentary accompanying the DVD Special Collector's Edition of *Toy Story*, 2001)

Movie-makers and publicists have long known something which film researchers and analysts have not yet much considered. This performative act from the *Toy Story* documentary -- trying to ensure that something occurs by dint of announcing it -- is a prime example of a phenomenon still too much ignored.

There has been a steady, and much to be welcomed, move in recent years away from a primarily text-interpretative approach to films. Although the move is far from complete, there are a number of clear signs that it is taking place. The acknowledgement of a need for situated understanding of how films are produced, and that attempts to determine a "meaning" to films without regard to their time and mode of production are unsustainable, is one sign. The slow though hesitant development of audience studies is another. A third, which this essay is interested in, is the partial acknowledgement of the importance of (what have been variously called) secondary, ancillary or satellite texts which shape in advance the conditions under which interpretations of films are formed.

In a 1989 essay, Barbara Klinger identified and considered very thoughtfully a number of the problems emerging from text-centred notions of film (Klinger, 1989). Taking off from a discussion of forms of uninhibited behaviour (calling out, repeating lines of dialogue, etc) which draw attention to the collective nature of cinema-going, she developed an argument that such behaviours should not be seen as abnormal (however irritating they might be on occasion!). Rather, they signal audiences' moments of departure from engrossment in the film/text, into a variety of intertextual frames. Klinger proposed calling these "digressions". Her argument is important and has been influential. But calling them "digressions", I want to argue, raises a number of difficulties.

First, it suggests that, were it not for the digressions, audiences would be in thrall to the "text". It might be the case, of course, that our cinematic culture is empirically so rich in occasions for digression that no actual enthralled audience could ever be found. But even so, the idea of enthralment lurks behind "digressions", and this background analytic construct can still distract us from exploring in the opposite direction -- that these acknowledgements of context may not take us away from the film, or lead to "fragmentation" of the text, as Klinger argues. Rather than "momentary guided exits from the text", which suggests that

digressions are like momentary lapses in concentration, I will argue that we should think of such things as materials which guide and help construct the manner we attend to, and indeed often concentrate on, the films we watch. But the implications of this concentration are very different from those implied by "textual enthralment" (Klinger, 1989: 14).

The difference is important. A film has what we might call a relative ontological priority over those materials which accompany, surround, and discursively address it. The film constitutes the ground of their existence. But in return, their relation to it is to function by proposing reasons and strategies for preparing to go and see it -- or for reflecting subsequently on the nature of the experience obtained.

Klinger elaborated her initial proposal in her study of Douglas Sirk's changing reputation (Klinger, 1996). She explores the way the reputation of his films changed over time across "subversive, adult, trash, classic, camp, and vehicles of gender definition" (Klinger, 1996: xv). The insights from this research are enormously valuable. However, when theorising the significance of this, Klinger takes a step which troubles me. Rightly noting that we mustn't assume that reviews are able to dictate responses -- that would just be text-determinism at another level -- she turns instead to Robert Allen and Douglas Gomery's suggestion that perhaps reviews may tell us what to think about, rather than what to think. This use of a very general principle from the Uses and Gratifications tradition worryingly forecloses research on the concrete consequences of modes of reviewing practice. And perhaps the motive for this foreclosure comes from the resistance within American reception research to the European tradition of audience research.

Addressing related problems, Thomas Austin has recently offered a wide-ranging and judicious survey of the current state of thinking about the relations between textual analysis, audience research and what he calls "satellite" texts (Austin, 2002). In laying the ground for his own argument, Austin defends the project of audience research against the criticisms which have flowed from American reception theory. Critics such as Janet Staiger and Cynthia Erb have argued that audience research holds to a chimera of unmediated access to "pure" responses. Austin's reply to this is important, and one that I would want to accept and extend:

> Any and all forms of evidence -- whether textual or ethnographic, contemporary or retrospective -- are a mediation of the moment of film reception, an experience that can only ever be retrieved through the operations of language. There is thus no 'pure' and pre-discursive source of evidence beyond the 'stumbling blocks' of mediation, representation and distortion. Yet this is what Staiger's rejection of audience research implies. Moreover, the need for qualitative audience research is highlighted by the restricted nature of Staiger's own contextual investigations, which omit empirical details of everyday cinemagoing, and can ultimately only hypothesise about possible audience responses. (Austin, 2002: 26)

However Austin does not particularly pursue the implications of this for Staiger's own, increasingly influential, strategies of use of satellite materials. Two books of Staiger's have explored film reviews in elaborating her wider argument that film meaning derives primarily from contexts of reception, rather than textual formation (Staiger, 1992; Staiger, 2000). This approach has provided the basis for a growing range of other works, for instance Cynthia Erb's book on the history of King Kong in the movies and, albeit in much less structured

fashion, some essays in Loshitzky's edited collection on *Schindler's List* (Erb, 1998; Loshitzky, 1997).

The address to reviews is certainly valuable, especially in as much as it challenges the unstated assumption in much film analysis that the presumed audience is some kind of end-point, experiencing films as things-in-themselves, and on the brunt end of their assembled symbolic force. Seeing reviews rather as indicators of reception processes at the very least reminds us that film viewing often takes place for quite specific purposes -- and to be a writer of reviews is to be one particular *kind* of audience.

But there is a problem in the sheer privileging of reviews over other kinds of ancillary materials, a privileging which associates with the greater attention this leads to, towards "serious" over popular films. It is troublesome because, of course, it is popular cinema which is most seriously engrossed in the phenomenon of publicity, gossip, and other ancillary materials. I was reminded of this issue when re-watching recently a television interview with the *Guardian* film critic Derek Malcolm, who commented:

> What the film companies, the major companies want, is coverage from other than critics, show-business correspondents, interviews with the stars, scandal about the stars, anything that is going to get them in the papers, on the radio on the television. The last thing they really mind about is a pompous critic saying it really isn't very good. Nowadays if it's a really big film, it's not the reviews that they really require, it's the public. And that's rather different, because most of the public doesn't read reviews. (Malcolm, 1998)

Malcolm alerts us to dimensions that do not fit easily within Staiger's approach: that for many films, it isn't so much the *kind* of talk that matters as the *amount*. For this and other reasons, then, Staiger and others' exclusive focus on serious, broadsheet reviews may be missing the mark. It also reminds us that talk around films is very importantly a way of generating expectations of pleasures -- or of course, in the other direction, fears of disappointment, or even of discomfort and dislike.

Publicity campaigns have a distinctive rhythm. They flow from leaks and teasers, advance information, website presentations, through poster campaigns, advertorials, television advertising, into -- as release finally approaches -- publication of *Making Of* books, released interviews with stars, director, and others Electronic Press Kits, and the final flood and push to persuade people to give the movie a try. The significance of this can be lost if we attend only or primarily to reviews. Reviews need to be considered for their place in the flow of talk around a film; for the extent to which they speak only to their target community, or alternatively how far their argument flows beyond into an interdiscursive terrain where wider debates about a film's status may take place. I propose that we need to set reviews within the field of marketing and publicity materials, Press Kits and EPKs, contractually-required interviews and photo opportunities, and so on -- which together, I will argue, constitute more or less patterned discursive preparations for the act of viewing. Or to put it more crudely, we need to study how all the circulating prior information, talk, images and debates generate and shape expectations which will influence how we watch a movie. My concern therefore is with how we might study these ancillary materials in their anticipatory and thus prefigurative capacity.

Blockbuster Lessons

Another relevant corpus of work, found in studies of the "New Hollywood", has drawn attention to the studios' increasing dependence after 1975 on the Blockbuster "event" movie. The success of such movies depends heavily upon a launch weekend to establish their "legs" at the cinema. And that launch weekend is built on the back of deluges of publicity. Thomas Schatz among others has demonstrated the need for the marketers, as part of this, to establish clear singular defining concepts for each such film -- the "High Concept" of Don Simpson fame (Schatz, 1993; Fleming, 1998). By drawing attention to the significance of tie-ins, licensing agreements and merchandising, these works remind us of the extent to which films are not self-contained "texts". They are likely to be encountered, for their audiences, through more than one channel -- and there is no reason in principle to suppose that, for all audiences, the film is the most important component in the package (see Appendix One).

But work of this kind tends to estimate campaigns by their expense -- hence the interest in stating, as quite a few authors do, the rising proportion of budgets which is devoted to marketing and publicity. There has been much less attention to how such campaigns work. As a result, these accounts mainly deal only sketchily with the careers of publicity for particular films. The exceptions are, interestingly, where there have been serious conflicts and often failures. There has for instance been some interest in the rise of websites such as Harry Knowles' *aint-it-cool-news*, and the manoeuvres of the studios (from threats of legal action, through trying to incorporate Knowles, finally arriving at a relative accommodation -- Knowles, 2002), and even with a few movies (*The Blair Witch Project* being the most famous -- Telotte, 2001) building the major parts of their publicity campaign through such dialogues) as they tried to come to terms with them (see Appendix Two). But interest in these phenomena remains primarily anecdotal.

In her recent overview of debates around cinema and modernity, Gill Branston raises some of the issues I am trying to explore. She writes: "Distribution and exhibition do not simply 'deliver' a commodity unaffected by their delivery routes, especially the previewing and the exhibition practices needed to ensure money back on global blockbusters." (Branston, 2000: 76) Discussing the extent to which audiences can be considered free agents in choosing what they will watch, and how they will watch them, she considers the ways in which film releases are aided by supportive but "tied" paraphernalia such as studio clips and copyright-free photos. This, she suggests, encourages the tendencies for the Press to participate in the marketing game and to assume a mask of mock-positivity -- a mask which removes any need to consider whether audiences are satisfied or disappointed. Branston stops at the point of recognising that these tendencies encourage a "knowingness", which she chooses to call "postmodern". To my eye, this is too loose. While pointing to the phenomenon, this unwieldy generalisation hardly encourages investigation of the concrete processes involved in particular cases.

These bits and pieces aside, there is little in the way of systematic study of ancillary texts. Audience studies, which seem anyway to be in retreat at present, have hardly addressed issues of prior expectations. The nearest thing to this might be the small group of studies, of which Annette Kuhn's study is perhaps the best example, of historical audiences' interests in stars (Kuhn, 1999). Austin has some very interesting things to say about "satellite texts"; one of his emphases is on the steps taken by production companies to respond to and manage problematic discourses around their films, thus usefully emphasising the process of these over time (Austin, 2002). But it is hard to find more than these.

I suggest that this is a serious gap. Even a slight examination of our own cinema-going practices tells us that significant prefigurative processes are regularly at work. I challenge anyone reading this to say that they have not encountered situations where they have been a) irritated when a review "gives away the plot" of a film, or b) spent time in a film waiting for a moment to occur which has featured in the trailer, or c) come out of a film thinking "that was better than/ wasn't as bad as I had expected", or d) chosen a movie to see in particular company, or chosen company to see a particular movie, because of expectations, or e) any of a string of variants on these very ordinary ways in which responses to a film have been affected by foreknowledge and expectations. These are the epiphenomenal expressions of a set of processes which we have hardly begun to recognise, let alone research. They are important because they constitute the most systematic challenge to textualist approaches to film. If no real audience could ever approximate to the naïve audience presumed by interpretative approaches, does it not become a hollow exercise to search for "meanings" which could never attach to anyone?

This lack of attention is surprising, given the rise in interest in performativeness. To emphasise the performative in human behaviour is to draw attention to the ways in which people in all situations (including therefore the situation of being audiences) play roles, and manage their self-presentation, in light of learned rules. That these rules will usually be experienced as normal and obvious is precisely the point: only a slightly distanced manner of investigation will bring them into view. Consider, then, Jonathan Rosenbaum's recent assault on the "normality" of ways of talking about cinema. In the course of polemicising against repeated assertions of the "decline of cinema", blamed on studios' "giving the audience what they want", he points to the way so many publications now routinely list the top-ten box office grossers (see Appendix Three). Why do they do this, he asks? Aren't they in effect positing to audiences that the interesting thing to be asked about a movie is "How big (an event) is it?". What Rosenbaum is pointing to is an interesting case of what we might call indirect performative speech. Performative utterances were first analysed by the philosopher J. L. Austin, who drew attention to sentences whose delivery is itself a necessary condition for the completion of the situation of which they are part. So "I now pronounce you man and wife" performs the act of marriage, provided other circumstances have been properly attended to and provided that the speaker is invested with the appropriate authority. Austin's focus on this special group of first-person sentences has subsequently been extended by others to identify performative aspects of a vast amount of talk and writing. So "Someone has left the door open" is, according to context, in fact a request that the nearest person now close it -- as well as, perhaps, offering a mild denunciation of an (un-named) person's failure. And so on. But then, think the prefigurative force of "Everyone should see this movie" or "This is one sick, degraded film which no one in their right mind would choose to watch..."

Prefigurative talk about films seems to me to have strongly performative aspects. They may turn out to be indirect, in the sense that the behaviours they constitute and advance will not be directly connected to the informational content of the speech. But that may precisely be the gain. Perhaps unusually, it should enable us to move beyond general statements about performativity to defining how, and under what circumstances, concrete responses are in fact elicited.

Prefigurative Materials

What kinds of materials are involved here? The range is wide, and can never be closed, since new variants are constantly appearing. There is, first, a raft of materials produced by the film

producers, distributors and marketers. These include Campaign Books, Press Books (and associated Production Stills), Electronic Press Kits, Press Releases, Teasers, Posters, Trailers, contractually-required Interviews, leaks, free give-aways, prizes of items from the set, and so on. There is a parallel body of materials produced by organisations acting in concert with a film's makers: books, programmes on "The Making Of ..." the film, educational documentaries, merchandisers, licence holders, product placers and those with tie-in agreements in various modes circulate images, especially logos, from a film.

There has been useful research, both industry-based and academic, on the "added value" which brand names and logos contribute to goods, but so far as I know, none of this has been specifically connected with films (McLaughlin, 1996: 101-30). Several authors, for example, have noted the fact that *Jurassic Park* managed to display its own logo and indeed merchandising within the film's diegesis. None of them take the argument beyond this point, to ask how this presence, once noted by viewers, might affect processes of viewing. To have histories of some of the makers of these would in itself constitute a significant contribution to our knowledge of these processes. Unless I have missed them, we await even the beginnings of a history of, for instance, Boxtree Books who (along with one or two other publishers) have produced many of the "Making Of ..." books in the UK; and *Film Education* which, until recently, produced a regular flow of documentaries broadcast late night by the BBC for teachers to use in the classroom (timed to coincide with the release of the films themselves, thus constituting themselves as a strange part of the publicity process (see Appendix Four).

Another area awaiting significant attention is the world of parallel releases. Many contemporary releases now span not just film and video, but (as in the case of *Judge Dredd*) an official comic book adaptation, a newspaper comic-strip version, a novelisation along with an audio book of that novelisation, and several small booklets telling the "story of the movie" through the eyes of a secondary character. While there has been recognition of the importance of these narrative extensions for fans of, for instance, *Star Wars* or *Star Trek*, I do not know of any work on the way the original may be viewed differently as a result of contact with these parallels, extensions, reframings, back-histories and the like. Rather, the emphasis of fan studies has been on the *fans' own* seizures and appropriations of the original "text" (Jenkins, 1992). Again, at back of this, is a model suggesting that *but for* audiences' "activity" or "resistance" an unsullied text might influence them (see Appendix Five).

Useful work has, however, been done on the history, form and function of some of these kinds of ancillary materials. A few industry insiders have told the story of film marketing in very useful ways (Earnest, 1983; Lukk, 1997). Press Books have been given some serious attention by researchers (Miller, 1994). There has been a deal of attention to the role of advertising in relation to films (DeBauche, 1985; Haralovich, 1985). And there has been growing attention to the relations between films and consumerism, especially with regard to women's consumption (Gaines, 1989; Eckert, 1992; Desser and Jowett, 2000). There are studies of publicity photographs, a few of which explore the relationship between these and their source film (Wolfe, 1991). Again, I would want to stress the importance of situating all these diachronically. The release of *Hannibal* (2001) provides an interesting case in point. After an early spate of publicity which emphasised the links with the earlier *Silence of the Lambs* (1991), a shift in marketing strategy took place, perhaps in response to an awareness that the later film was likely to lose out in the comparison. Instead distributors emphasised the presence of a bizarre romance in *Hannibal* -- and this was condensed into its release date: Valentine's Day. This practice (of course best known from the earlier timed release on July

4th of *Independence Day*) was then backed by a series of practised puns, such as "He's a man after your heart..."

Alongside these "sponsored" materials, there is a range of other materials with different degrees of dependence on a film's makers or distributors. Magazines with a specialist interest in particular genres of films will frequently be granted access to additional photographs, interviews, and information on those aspects of a film which will particularly interest their readers -- thereby helping to ensure that the film will get substantial coverage (Pierson, 1999). This indicates a degree of mutual dependence, although film companies know that this does not automatically lead to praise. Alongside these, Press screenings with their associated packages of "goodies" to journalists work around a pecking order -- the more important media and individuals will be assured a seat, while regional and local journalists will often have to depend, at least at first, on what they can learn from those first to the table (see Appendix Six). This may actually give the more powerful journalists a position from which they can be more critical, if they wish, since they are unlikely to be barred from future Press Screenings. But journalists do more than review -- films are often sufficiently culturally salient to produce other kinds of coverage. Gossip, exposés, background stories, and of course intended or unintended celebrity information and images are significant parts of the meanings by which films can be framed. *Eyes Wide Shut* (1998) is a good recent instance of this. Two kinds of uncontrolled story circulated around the film: first, the repercussions of Stanley Kubrick's death in the run-up to the film's release; second, gossip about the relations between the on-screen and off-screen marriage and sex lives of Tom Cruise and Nicole Kidman.

Besides all these, some journalists sometimes deal more broadly, discussing the significance of films. The products of this kind of writing shade into debates and controversies around films -- where into the fray come a whole array of moral entrepreneurial organisations, educational bodies, political parties and spokespeople. The spirals of discourse these generate will also from time to time bring on board "experts" who will provide evidence and argument to participants. In this vein also must be considered the decisions, Press Releases and other materials produced by classification and censorship bodies, and the ways these are also then mediated by others.

Another array of materials to be attended to will be those which trade on the appearance of a film to promote themselves -- but in the process will almost certainly contaminate their original. *Hannibal* again provides a telling example. Spoofing the official poster quite closely and running close to it, Pepperami ran adverts for their product making playful reference to its "cannibalistic" tendencies. Meanwhile, Channel 4 ran a series of three documentaries on cannibalism, publicised as "the real life Hannibals". And -- perhaps coincidentally, but nonetheless allowing for the watchful to generate another "leak" from film to world -- Channel 4's popular archaeological series *The Time Team* (March 2001) ran a special edition on the discovery of the first strong evidence of cannibalism in British history. We need to ask in what ways these parallel materials may impact on the manner in which audiences manage their expectations of a film (see Appendix Seven).

However, prior to investigating the audiences, we need perhaps to take into account how strategically chosen many of these materials will have been. An illustration: a recent newspaper article examined the extraordinary range of release tie-ins for Disney's *Monsters, Inc.* (Hodgkinson, 2002). Interestingly, Hodgkinson missed what is to me the most interesting feature of these materials: the altogether absence of one kind -- product placements. Although

in the UK everything from breakfast cereals to power generating companies sought to link their names with this film, none was visible within the film itself. It is possible to think of several reasons why this might be the case. Absence of national-specific products allows for cross-national publicity. But it also puts a buffer zone around the film, against the criticisms of both the anti-globalisation Left, and the anti-gay Right -- this is "pure film", simply a fun experience. But the implications for subsequent viewing may be considerable (see Appendix Eight).

Most recently, but already of great importance, are internet-based information flows about films. Every significant contemporary film (but especially those targeting relatively youthful audiences) has a website associated with its name, from which images can be acquired. Many of these offer links to other unofficial (fan) sites. They will also often offer merchandise, games, images; they will offer teasers, sometimes answer questions. Their virtue from makers' and distributors' perspective is that they are relatively unmediated -- the websites do not depend on journalists to provide onward transmission of indexical information and images. Their risks also lie in this -- they can too easily be raided, pirated, and parodied. Again, we need to know much more about the processes of publicity-management revealed by these.

This is not a complete list -- as I say, I do not believe that there can be such a thing. But it does perhaps indicate the range. The task of studying this potential array without falling either into simple descriptiveness or into analytical chaos is clearly a tough one. I aim to outline a series of stages by means of which this may be done. I draw here on the experiences of an ESRC-funded study (Award No. R000222194) of the reception in Britain of David Cronenberg's *Crash* in 1996-7 to put forward a series of proposals for what would be involved in a study of that collection of secondary texts that includes production news, reviews, interviews with directors and actors, teasers, trailers, posters, and other publicity materials, debates, controversies, moral and classificatory interventions, etc. (Barker et al., 2001). This would in fact only be the first stage of what I conceive as a three-stage mode of enquiry (although to some extent the three stages may be separately undertaken).

The first stage is a study of the life of the ancillary materials, and the ways in which they constitute a discursive framework around a film, a kind of mental scaffolding giving it particular kinds of "support" (it can of course be hostile, hence the quote marks) and providing the means by which people may "climb inside" it. Of course, it is unlikely that anyone other than researchers like myself will ever encounter much more than a small proportion of the actually-produced array. This does not make the independent study of the materials any less relevant. As my case-study hopefully demonstrates, a proper study of the materials will reveal the extent to which they are patterned, drawing on the same sources, and using the same range of concepts, questions, and judgements. This then constitutes a determinate discursive terrain (see Appendix Nine). It can also hopefully draw attention to points of abrasion and conflict, and how sometimes producers and distributors will seek to allay or overcome these (Austin, 2002: 11-42).

The second stage, then, would be a study of how different audiences encounter, make use of, or are persuaded by that framework -- with what expectations (fears, hopes, curiosity, or etc.) they decide upon and prepare for their viewing. This essay doesn't attempt to do this job, but nonetheless I note three things which I believe are necessary to developing this into a research strategy. First, there is good reason to think that this is far more than just mental preparation. Prior expectations are likely to affect people's choice of cinema, or perhaps of

video (or now DVD), the company they choose to go with, and so on. We don't need the extreme (albeit still salient) example of audiences dressing up for *The Rocky Horror Show* to see the range of behaviours that can be affected; the identification of some films as "date movies" clearly can, under the right circumstances, affect preparations in a host of ways (see Appendix Ten). Second, there is also good reason to think that, while it is certain that there will be wide varieties in the amounts and kinds that different people encounter, it will nonetheless be socially and culturally patterned. Talk about film works through networks, both formal and informal (see Appendix Eleven). Film distributors know this, and try very hard to make use of them, working to generate 'scuttlebutt', that is, film-related talk among key target groups. Third, there is good reason to think that prefigurative materials will have different degrees of salience for different groups and individuals. There are obvious lessons to be learnt from the rising number of studies of fans, which make clear the exceptional degree of attention such people pay both to their chosen media materials and to all accompanying commentaries. There is a quite different source for thinking about this issue from American communication research, where critics reviewing the concept of agenda-setting have pointed to the neglect of this aspect of the issue (Edelstein, 1993).

There is an issue here about the meaning of "prefigurative". An objection could easily be raised that not all ancillary materials are encountered prior to watching a film. A recent experience would confirm this. I observed (and joined with) people, at a recent screening of *Mulholland Drive* (2001), in choosing not to look at the *Guardian*'s published clues for solving the meaning of David Lynch's film before they/I saw it. But two points are important here. First, of course, for those who knew that there were such clues before they watched, the act of postponement indicates a viewing strategy for the film premised on incipient pleasure in seeing how far they can get on their own. This indicates something of the complexity in the notion of prefiguration. But to me even more important is that the objection may still depend on a particular notion of the "text" of the film. It presumes that an encounter with a film ends as the credits roll. This is the boundary of the film, therefore it is the boundary of the meaning-making function of the film. Everything that follows is of a different order. I am arguing against precisely this view. The process of sense-formation after completion of viewing should not be distinguished in this way. Therefore, to read reviews, or clues, or anything else after the close of the film is still prefigurative in as much as it contributes to the understanding that people develop, and the way in which a film thereby contributes to their sense of self and sense of the world that they derive and carry forward into their lives.

The third stage would study how the actual encounter with the film leads to fulfilment of expectations, or disappointment, or surprise, or frustration. As I have argued, audiences' encounters with films do not begin and end with opening titles and closing credits. Encounters begin as the first layers of knowledge and interest are sedimented in; and they "close" with the processes, after viewing, in which people review, discuss, argue, and settle -- into a relatively stable form -- the meaning and significance of the filmic experience. To date, we know very little about what happens when patterned prior expectations finally get to meet the film to which they relate. This did, in fact, become one of our central questions in my research with Kate Brooks into the responses to *Judge Dredd*, where for each of the six orientations we identified we were able to paint a portrait of the kinds of attention given to anticipatory materials, and to say what happened when those with highly formed expectations actually encountered the film (Barker and Brooks, 1998).

In our study of *Crash*, we attempted to link all three stages, with different degrees of emphasis, and (I suspect) success. The study of ancillary materials was one strand of our

research, which also included an international comparison of public reception, and an audience study based on a special screening of the film. In this essay, I aim to draw out certain principles which became evident to me in our research process. In proffering here a model of how materials around any film might be studied, I have chosen to follow the method of Rick Altman, whose recent exceptional book on genre compiles a series of propositions as it unfolds its analysis (Altman, 1999).

I am not presenting *Crash* as some typical case. In fact it is, I believe, helpful precisely because it is not at all typical. A film which sought to present itself as, essentially, a committed, art-house embodiment of a dystopian story, *Crash* became besieged by hostile commentary. Our focus of attention was therefore primarily around the controversy, and the carriers of that -- national and local newspapers. But it is the way the debate unfolded over time, and the way in which those arguing over it had to make their premises explicit, that brings into unusually clear view a set of prefigurative processes. That they were prefigurative, became spectacularly clear to us when we researched audience responses to the film, even some months after its original release.

Learning from Crash

The British controversy over Crash effectively lasted a year. It began on 6 June 1996, when Alexander Walker published a review from the Cannes Festival. A subeditor at the London *Evening Standard* headlined this "A Movie Beyond The Bounds of Depravity" (Walker, 1996). The response was not immediate. But in November, coinciding with a screening of the film as part of the London Film Festival, the *Daily Mail* launched a campaign to prevent the film being classified or, in the event that it was, to persuade local authorities to use their residual powers to ban the film from their areas. At the same time, the *Mail* was seeking a revision of the British Board of Film Classification (BBFC) and perhaps of the Obscene Publications Act. The campaign which followed included approaches to every local authority in the country to attempt to get them to ban *Crash* from their area of jurisdiction. MPs were contacted, and questions asked in Parliament. Conservative-controlled Westminster City Council did ban *Crash* from its area, with the effect that the film could not have a normal launch and Press screening (among the others who banned it for a time were also two Labour-controlled local authorities). At the height of its campaign, *Mail* journalists door-stepped all the BBFC's examiners, and ran articles about their private lives. It even called for a boycott of Sony products in Britain. Under rising pressure, the BBFC under James Ferman sought expert opinion on an unusual scale, calling in first a psychologist, Paul Britton, to advice on the film's handling of sex and the disabled. This rebounded when Britton objected to the BBFC's selective use of his findings. The BBFC also sought Queen's Counsel's opinion on whether the film could be accused of "obscenity". Delaying its judgement for whatever reason, the pronouncement that the film would be released uncut as an "18" coincided with the launch of the 1997 General Election campaign. The *Mail* accused Ferman of smuggling the film out under cover (although the fact that, as I show below, the Press coverage peaked at this point suggests that if this was the BBFC's strategy, it was not a wholly successful one).

The scale and intensity of the campaign and the controversy was remarkable. As Cronenberg himself commented, Britain was virtually alone (see Appendix Twelve) in these broad attacks (albeit the denunciation of the film by Ted Turner, then owner of its U.S. distribution company, had some impact in America). Released eventually in June 1997 at a limited array of cinemas, *Crash* performed badly (considerably worse than in any other European country). There seems little doubt that this was in large part due to the controversy. People were simply

scared off. Mounting a screening some months later, we met residues even then of people's nervousness at seeing it. An examination of the nature of the circulating ancillary materials explained not only why, but in what ways, this avoidance-reaction was generated.

The materials we studied were entirely taken from print publications (see Appendix Thirteen). They are therefore significantly incomplete -- although there is good reason to think that the main controversy found its form in print, rather than on radio or television, for instance. The pattern of press and magazine attention is interesting in itself:

CRASH COVERAGE *

	All	Daily Mail/Evening Standard
June 1996	1	1
July 1996	0	0
August 1996	1	0
September	0	0
October 1996	1	0
November 1996	69	16 (7 = DM) **
December 1996	15	4 (3 = DM)
January 1997	16	4 (4 = DM)
February 1997	5	0
March 1997	105	19 (14 = DM)
April 1997	22	2 (2 = DM)
May 1997	49	7 (6 = DM)
June 1997	84	3 (3 = DM)
July 1997	19	0
August 1997	9	1 (1 = DM)
September 1997	2	0
October 1997	2	0
November 1997	1	0

* These figures are arrived at by counting any day in which *Crash* is known to have featured in any way in a newspaper. It does not therefore take account of either the scale or position of coverage, nor does it take account of there being several articles in the same day. On both scores, it understates the scale of the *Mail*'s involvement, since on several occasions it ran front page banner headlines, with several accompanying articles and/or editorials inside.

** The high proportion of reports in the *Evening Standard* in this period relates, of course, to the debates engendered by the inclusion of *Crash* in the London Film Festival in November 1996.

At the height of its campaign, the *Mail* was contributing up to 25% of our sample of materials. Yet it also dropped the campaign sooner than other publications, seeming to lose interest in the issue once it became obvious that it had failed in its attempt to get *Crash*

banned at a national level or barred at local levels. From this, I would posit a first methodological principle:

Proposition 1: It is necessary to examine the "volume" of ancillary materials, this being a combination of both frequency and distribution of materials, and their discursive intensity.

This is of course only a first step. What we discovered was the importance, next, of exploring the ways in which, and the extent to which, these materials reveal discursive interrelations. In other contexts, this would seem very normal -- we are well used to seeing the same publicity photograph, or still, or quotation, used repeatedly across a range of publications. Where journalists routinely use Press Kits and the like, the result can be repeated appearances of virtually identical materials. But in the case of *Crash* a quite different dynamic was at work. Here, the framework of the *Mail* came largely to dominate and determine talk around the film.

For all the furore it provoked, Alexander Walker's review was judiciously written. It made no claims about potential copycating, it did not douche its readers with adjectival horror. And in two vital respects, Walker's critique of *Crash* differed from the *Mail*'s uptake of his dislike. First, he retained a sense that this was a film and therefore had to be understood as such, rather than equated with a piece of soiled litter or smelly effluent. The signs of this run throughout the review, but emerge at one small but significant moment, where his condemnation is at its greatest, "*Crash* contains some of the most perverted acts and theories of sexual deviance I have ever seen propagated in mainline cinema". "…acts *and theories*…" that small extra, which comes from Walker's recognition that films operate in complex ways, disappeared from all re-quotations of this line by the *Mail*. Second, Walker was clearly overwhelmed by *Crash*, describing its "sensory overload", which he suggests may parallel the very sickness of its central characters who need to up the antes of sex in order to reach fulfilment, and may even parallel the lives of jaded viewers who delight in a film like this. This is not the *Mail*'s, or its reviewer Christopher Tookey's, perception of *Crash* at all. Tookey wrote instead that the film is "boring" -- but that the acts it shows (note: no reference to theories) are so appalling as to endanger young ill-formed audiences (Tookey, 1997). As a *Mail* editorial put it: "All the psycho-babble in the world cannot refute the simple fact: The film is sick. It should not be shown." (Anon, 1996a)

This agenda for condemnation became the touchstone for very many other responses: even a large number of those who would reject the *Mail*'s conclusions still accepted the logic from which they began. If the film was as they said, then it might deserve the treatment they demanded. But (according to some) it was too "boring" to have that much influence. Or it was too "cold" to affect people in the way the *Mail* asserted. But at the back of these expressions is an implicit acceptance that if people don't find it "boring", or do find it arousing, the *Mail*'s position will be that much harder to resist. Thinking about this leads me to:

Proposition 2: It is necessary to explore the direction that debates around a film take over time, and the ways in which and the extent to which a common discursive frame emerges, and who "owns" this frame.

One of the most striking features of this particular controversy was the very direct way in which critics and defenders all turned to "figures" of the audience to sustain their argument.

In the case of the *Mail* and those who ran with them, this was at first a figure of a young deviant male -- as in this editorial from the *Western Daily Press*:

> Ram-raiding and reckless driving by youngsters for the fun of it are already endemic throughout the country, with a particular West country favourite being a game of chicken in which the drivers of stolen cars signal they are going in one direction before going in the other. When it is a fact that scenes of violence or depravity from other films have produced real-life copycats it is not being sensational to suggest this one's lethally reckless driving for sexual thrills, fetishism, voyeurism and sadomasochism could prove the latest game for some lunatic West thrill-seekers. (Anon, 1996b)

But this extremity of response was unusual -- it was hard to sustain in face of the recognition by many journalists that Cronenberg films are pretty specialist fare -- unlikely viewing for young working class males. Indeed, it made easier the defence that the film was too "cool", "distant" to allow for such young men to "identify" with the characters. Or as the BBFC itself put it: "Rather than sympathising or identifying with the attitudes of tastes of the characters in the film, the average viewer would in the end be repelled by them, and would reject the values and sexual proclivities displayed." (BBFC, 1997) That notion of an "average viewer" provides a rhetorical line of defence -- to which in due course Christopher Tookey would fairly directly respond:

> I've never argued that normal people will see *Crash* and be inspired to engineer pile-ups on the M25. *Crash* is a landmark in pornography because it will encourage those who have a sadistic sexual bent (or discover that they have one as a result of seeing this film) to feel that they are not alone, that attractive people feel the same way and that no significant harm will come to others as a result of sado-masochistic acts. (Tookey, 1997)

And to the use of "coolness" as a line of defence, Walker himself responded in some heat:

> The word 'cool' has been the one most often bandied about by the defenders of David Cronenberg's film about a coven of degenerates who top up their fagged-out libidos with the thrill of car crashes. It's one of those words suggesting the users have freed themselves from most inhibitions -- especially the elitist one of making moral judgements about other people. (Walker, 1997)

What I am pointing to is a paradox: this is a public debate whose very intemperateness actually reveals how much the people fighting over *Crash* share the terms in which it must be debated. If the film is "hot", as the *Mail* claimed, then it might be dangerous. If "cool", then perhaps not -- unless we can take the extra step and condemn, as part of a wider intellectual campaign, the very idea of speaking in terms of "cool". And a new "figure" begins to emerge -- the figure of a corrupt middle-class intellectual, who is betraying his/ her own culture. *Crash* marks how far such people have sunk into amorality. Two propositions emerge from this:

Proposition 3: It is necessary to examine the implicit forms of film analysis within the debate. How is "meaning" and "significance" found with a film that is being debated?

The notion of implicit film analyses is important here. It is consciously intended to question any notion that what academics do with film is categorically different from what other kinds of viewers do as a result of their viewing. As I have written elsewhere: "everyone analyses films" (Barker, 2001: 1). But it is important also to see the ways in which, in making analyses, people call upon wider and sometimes more authoritative, bodies of information and ideas. This, in the case of the *Crash* debate, happened particular with relation to theories of filmic influence:

Proposition 4: It is necessary to explore the role of "figures" of the audience within the debate, and explore the relations among the asserted figures. What bases of evidence or argument underpin the claims, and how do these articulate with the informal film analyses?

The latter has its own dynamic. This tendency to produce "figures" of the audience should take us further. These are neither fully formed nor consistent, but they play a key role in allowing arguments to move from particular experiences of liking and disliking, to judgements on its wider significance. The BBFC and the *Mail* struggled for ownership of one "authoritative" figure, Dr Paul Britton. Originally employed by the BBFC to report on whether there might be a syndrome connected to finding disabled people sexually arousing, he became an object of attack by the *Mail* when the BBFC quoted him in their defence. But Britton was a wild card, and "changed sides" -- at which point the *Mail* lauded him where they had previously condemned him. And Westminster Council, one of the local authorities most willing to sing to the *Mail*'s tune, cited Britton directly as their authority:

> The Sub-Committee is concerned that immature persons and the physiologically vulnerable who do not have firm moral views would well be adversely affected by the film and we are especially concerned that those who have a predisposition to anti-social behaviour will be encouraged in their beliefs. A view which is supported by the views of Dr Paul Britton. (Westminster City Council Licensing Subcommittee, 1997)

We can see a process exemplified here, which points up the necessity of:

Proposition 5: It is necessary to see what claims to authority are acknowledged in debates around a film, and where and how far these are challenged.

Britton was important because he invoked a wider, pseudo-scientific set of concepts and claims, which carry a strong imprimatur within British (and even more so American) thinking about films -- that semi-behaviourist psychological account which sees the media operating on ill-formed, incomplete beings:

> Young people, and those whose moral and philosophical systems have not yet matured, or who are particularly impressionable, are much more likely to be influenced by the moral vacuum associated with the sexuality shown by the main characters. This is significant because sexually inexperienced people may look to the main characters as role models. (Britton, 1997)

It is this wider, and much longer-lasting frame, which perhaps allowed the more casual, "obvious"-because-sedimented claims which appeared in, for example, some local newspapers -- as in the following account of one local council's debate on *Crash*: "Addressing the film's content, Councillor Barkworth said: 'Violent and perverted screen

images can influence very susceptible people'." (Anon, 1996c) In one sentence, this newspaper report -- which did not particularly agree with Barkworth's position -- nonetheless introduces into the debate a mode of film analysis (the "film's content": crude content analysis of images then measured along a single moral dimension), and a theory of filmic influence (visuality is particularly powerful, and attacks those with "weak dispositions").

The very presence of this "obviousness" ought to alert us, as analysts, to terms, concepts and categories which are pervasive precisely because of their taken-for-granted status. Concepts will range from identifying expected pleasures, measures of performances, kinds and categories of audience, genres of film -- their direction, strengths, etc., narrative forms and demands. These may be particularly hard to perceive, precisely because they will seem terribly "obvious". This is the point which Richard Dyer has noted so well in relation to the category "entertainment" (Dyer, 2002). To mention some others which play significant roles in the interplay between generators of prefigurative materials and audiences: the concept of "hype" -- another curiously performative concept, since often telling potential audiences that there is a lot of it around a film is part of the very process of "hyping"; the concept of an "event movie" -- where much the same occurs. More specialised or localised would be any of the following: the idea of a "slacker" movie; the idea of a "cheesy movie"; the idea of "bad" movies; the relatively long-lasting concept of the "chick-flick" versus the momentary "strange things happen in small towns genre" (as used by Jonathan Ross on *Film 2002*, March 2002); and so on. Concepts and categories such as these are important precisely because they combine implicit descriptions of a film with predictions and promises of likely experiences. With *Crash*, for instance, we found that for some, perhaps many, viewers, one informal operative genre was the "ordinary sex and violence movie" (which *Crash* might or might not be). Unpacked, this proves to be very complicated. In one phrase, people acknowledge the force of a long tradition of "branding" films as gratuitous exploitation. The resultant category might in fact be empty, but it constantly *seeks* exemplars. But by calling it "ordinary", people distanced themselves from a categorisation, and diminished its call on themselves.

We can see in this the beginnings of another important research precept, if we generalise this away from the particularities of the *Crash* controversy:

Proposition 6: It is necessary to explore ancillary materials for the presence within them of concepts which situate a film among other film practices, with direct attention to the predictions and promises implicit in them for which interpretive groups may gain definite kinds of experience and reward from the film.

I am not developing this proposition here: only to note that in our study of the *Crash* controversy, we utilised a comparison between responses in the UK, and in France and America, and found three quite different national contexts of reception, whose discursive frameworks authorised different kinds and ranges of audience responses. It is of course important to emphasise that just because, within the British frame of reference, it was hard to understand how a person could legitimately enjoy *Crash* at simultaneously thoughtful ("cool") and sensuous ("hot") levels, that does not mean that some people didn't manage to do this, even without borrowing on frames of reference from elsewhere. This is precisely one of my grounds of criticism of the boundary reception research places around itself. The potential is there for well-managed audience research to open up how specific audiences live out their prefigured encounters with films.

The above six propositions are only first stages in what would be a completely adequate process of investigating ancillary materials for their prefigurative functions. I mention without any real elaboration three more which seem essential to me:

Proposition 7: It is necessary to explore ancillary materials for the presence within them of concepts which situate a film among other film and non-film practices. I am thinking here of the ways in which films are often measured against wider leisure criteria. This would connect with what Richard Dyer has begun to analyse so thoughtfully in his discussion of the functions of the category "entertainment".

Proposition 8: It is necessary to explore ancillary materials with a view to being able to ask whose priorities are represented, and whose are marginalised or excluded. The ambition of such a process would be to step beyond the overt discursive categories to discover, at least symptomatically whose interests are at stake in debates and decisions around a film (my example above of the "ordinary sex and violence movie" points in this direction).

Proposition 9: It is necessary to explore the processes which shape and lead to the production of the different kinds of publicly circulating materials. In the case of *Crash*, we sought to do this by interviewing journalists and others who had played key roles in the controversy. We wanted to discover the particular (for instance, editorial) decisions and wider routines which had led to them writing as they did. In other non-controversial cases, it would be necessary to explore relations among the various individuals, groups and organisations (who funds those *Making Of* books for instance? What limits are put on what they are able to tell? What are the frameworks which shape their content?) The questions here are potentially endless -- but it is to me a frustrating fact that we have so far attempted to answer so few of them.

What I have been laying out here are the first steps into a research programme for investigating and analysing ancillary prefigurative materials. And it really is only a beginning. Even in the case of *Crash* I believe we were able to go further than this, to ask, for instance: is it possible to detect the outlines of a "national filmic culture", that is, a broad discursive framework which sets the boundaries of what films in general are allowed to do and to be? Is it possible to depict the ways in which the public debates impact on practices of film consumption at the points where people choose to do this "privately" -- that is, not for the sake of deciding which side they are on in the public debate, but for personal pleasure or for participation in a primarily filmic culture? Is it possible to explore the relations between different sectors of intellectual life around films and cinemas, and examine the extent of their separation or interdependence -- for instance, to make sense of the curious silence, in the case of *Crash*, of almost the entire film academy (Barker, 2002).

The task which Reception Theory has so far declined to undertake, and which I wish to put back on the agenda, is precisely the task of considering how ancillary materials such as reviews prefigure. Simply, we know very little, except from personal experience plus anecdotes, about the ways in which, ultimately, our encounters with these masses of materials generates particular curiosities, hopes, fears, expectations, predictions of disappointment. Of course part of the problem is that they are rarely if ever encountered as "masses". For a start, actual situated individuals only ever encounter a sample of such materials. And among the ones they encounter, different materials will have variable salience for them -- the poster passed in the street whilst driving is probably going to signify less than the preview in the magazine specially bought, or the titillating gossip in a person's daily newspaper, or (of

course) the conversations with friends and relatives who themselves have encountered and made selections among ancillary materials.

It seems to me, however, that these are semi-separable tasks, each requiring us to sharpen our research tools. I am here only taking the argument to a further point. In strong opposition to those who want still to separate "textual" investigation from other kinds of filmic enquiry, I am proposing that we explore the processes whereby promises of filmic experience are generated by both publicists and public critics -- in order precisely that we can then proceed to research how groups and individuals proceed on the basis of those promises, encountering and responding to particular films, and in the course of responding producing their own film analyses, and the associated pleasures and uses of films for whose viewing they have been thoroughly prepared.

It isn't my intention to suggest that research is only worthwhile if it asks all these questions at once. Far from it. We need more research on each of the fragments and stages of this entire process -- and the great strength of Reception Research has been its examination of some particular components. But it is an argument for a different over-arching conceptual and methodological framework which can link the analysis of ancillary materials with a renewed emphasis on how actual, live viewers use them as part of their film-watching.

Appendices

Appendix One: Some years ago, a student of mine explored the ways young girls used the various available versions of *My Little Pony* -- the toys, the comics, and the television programme. It became evident that the programmes were used by some girls as opportunities for, and prompts to, grooming their "dolls". It seems that the television programmes especially provided them with assurance that these were more than just toys. But the most important activity (and one which was supported by their mothers) was the grooming.

Appendix Two: See also the small give-away booklet on *Blair Witch*, which came with *The Times* one weekend (Potten and Cowan, 2000). The emergence of this genre of publication is worthy of study in itself, and would itself be very much part of the field I am proposing. It is not enough simply to say that as viewers we have increased (opportunities for) being knowing audiences. These publications significantly alter, for those who encounter and read them, the very possibilities of being a certain kind of audience (Chin and Gray, 2002). The recent essay by J. P. Telotte on the marketing of *The Blair Witch Project* (1999) deals in the same coinage as this essay (Telotte, 2001). Telotte recounts the intersection of textual and marketing strategies which sought to provoke the question: could this have been real?

Appendix Three: As Rosenbaum argues:

> Against the claims of our cultural commissars that they're only giving the
> public 'what they want', let's consider why newspapers, magazines, and
> entertainment news on television list the ten top-grossing movies every week.
> It's a fashion supposedly dictated by public interest, yet for roughly the first
> eight decades of this century there was little evidence that such interest
> existed, even in embryo... Why, after all, should anyone care how much
> money a particular picture makes? Wouldn't we find it peculiar if newspapers
> routinely listed the ten top-selling soft drinks or fast-food outlets or cars every

week, complete with a rundown on the gross figures taken in by each product? (Rosenbaum, 2000: 15)

Appendix Four: Kate Brooks and I came across a curious publication issued to teachers by *Film Education* for *Judge Dredd* which offered guidance on how to teach the film in the classroom. One recommended exercise began: "You are going to deconstruct the figure of Judge Dredd ..." A viewing strategy prompted directly by this would indeed be a strange one, but that is hardly likely to have been the intention.

Appendix Five: A small but interesting exception is an essay by Peter Lehman, examining the implications of the radio versions of classic Hollywood movies (Lehman, 1998). Between 1947-57 movie releases were accompanied, or followed, by radio broadcasts introduced with the statement "Tonight your Director is..." Lehman examines the paradoxes contained within the claim that, for instance, the Director of the radio version of *Stagecoach* was John Ford -- when he didn't direct the radio version, and when indeed that version significantly conflicts with his screen version. The tensions in the experienced sense of an "author" could be extended, I sense, to the broad field of ancillary materials.

Appendix Six: One unpublished part of our research into the *Crash* controversy is our investigation of the journalists involved. Among the things to emerge there was journalists' clear awareness of this pecking order -- that provincial journalists, for instance, will not get into the Press screenings for major releases and will have to pick up on others' scraps.

Appendix Seven: In a remarkable, but insufficiently appreciated, piece of research, Tom Gunning has drawn attention to the co-presence with a whole series of major Hollywood 1930s releases of parodic versions under the title of the Dogsville Comedies. For example *All Quiet on the Western Front* was accompanied by *All Quiet on the Dogsville Front* -- a semi-serious spoof matching shot for shot with parts of the film, only substituting dogs for humans. Sometimes even accompanying a film at its main screenings, these comedies surely must have created a flux of unpredictable responses to the features they had mocked so strangely (Doherty, 1999).

Appendix Eight: An undergraduate student at UWA, Gareth Lowrie, interviewed young Disney audiences for his final year dissertation. He found fascinating evidence that for children as young as 8 there were felt to be "proper" and "improper" ways of relating to Disney merchandise. One boy talked of needing to see a film first, before he would know how not to "disrespect" the figures he had acquired. There were striking complexities in the relations they disclosed between merchandise and films.

Appendix Nine: There is an important assumption in this concept of a "discursive terrain", but one which I believe can by and large be tested. This is that a boundary can reasonably be drawn around a discursive arena, within which it is possible then to explore the extent of interdependence. With *Crash* we did indeed treat British debates as a bounded entity -- although at specific points (which we were thus able to identify) we could see that outside influences "bled" in. Alexander Walker's original review was penned from Cannes -- but clearly with a British audience in mind. Lesley Dick's *Sight and Sound* review was written from America -- but addressed to the British context. Occasional interviews in British magazines were arranged with Cronenberg while he was in Canada. However, as I believe we show, these "external" events were processed in, and made subject to the "laws" of the UK debate (Barker et al., 2001).

Appendix Ten: For reasons I do not pretend to understand, this year has been the year of the undergraduate dissertation by female students on the pleasures of horror films. Among a fascinating range of materials produced, through focus groups and other devices, was the shared recognition by groups of women that while they love watching many kinds of horror movie, they have real problems watching them with their boy-friends -- just in case they give way to the 'girlie' response of jumping or screaming. It would do real harm to their self-image if they found themselves grabbing hold of boyfriend's hand, for security. In such details are the real grounds of preparation for response to be found.

Appendix Eleven: Recently I was researching audiences for *Being John Malkovich* (1999). One of my prompt-questions was to ask people how they would describe *Being John Malcovich* if they were telling a friend about it. Although I had intended this purely as a way of garnering people's accounts of the most salient aspects of the film, many people responded by saying that of course they wouldn't want to spoil it for a friend, so they would only tell them that it was good, worth seeing, and unusual -- and some even worried about doing this! Practices of advising friends about films are clearly well embedded into lived cultures.

Appendix Twelve: This is not quite correct. I have since learnt from a colleague Ernest Mathijs that Norway, also, underwent a considerable controversy over *Crash*. It would be interesting to compare the process and terms of the two.

Appendix Thirteen: It is not possible to be certain that we obtained every published piece about *Crash* across our period, even if we discount problems such as that it is not easy in all cases to determine whether publications should count as UK-based. We drew from a number of sources, crucially from the BBFC's own cuttings, kindly made available to us by Mike Bor, then Principal Examiner.

References

Altman, Rick (1999) *Film / Genre*, London: BFI.

Anon (1996a) Editorial in *The Daily Mail*, (9 November), p. 6.

Anon (1996b) Editorial in *The Western Daily Press*, (23 November), p. 6.

Anon (1996c) Crash Control in *The Scunthorpe Evening Telegraph*, (12 November), p. 3.

Austin, Thomas (2002) *Hollywood, Hype and Audiences: Selling and Watching Popular Film in the 1990s*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Barker, Martin and Kate Brooks (1998) *Knowing Audiences: Judge Dredd, Its Friends, Fans and Foes*, Luton: University of Luton Press.

Barker, Martin with Thomas Austin (2000) *From Antz to Titanic: Reinventing Film Analysis*, London: Pluto Press.

Barker, Martin, Jane Arthurs and Ramaswami Harindranath (2001) *The Crash Controversy: Censorship Campaigns and Film Reception*, London: Wallflower Press.

Barker, Martin (2002) Crashing Out in *Screen*, 43 (1), pp. 74-8.

BBFC (1997) *Crash* Press Release, (18 March).

Branston, Gill (2000) *Cinema and Cultural Modernity*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Britton, Dr Paul (1997) quoted in Distortion! in *The Mail on Sunday*, (23 March), p. 19.

Chin, Bertha and Jonathon Gray (2002) One Ring to Rule Them All: Pre-viewers and Pre-texts of the *Lord of the Rings* Films, *Intensities*, 2. Available at: www.cult-media.com [Accessed 11 December 2002]

DeBauche, Leslie Midloff (1985), Advertising and the Movies, 1908-1915, *Film Reader*, 6, pp. 115-24.

Desser, David and Garth S. Jowett (eds.) (2000) *Hollywood Goes Shopping*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Doherty, Thomas (1999) This is Where We Came In: The Audible Screen and the Voluble Audience of Early Sound Cinema, in Melvyn Stokes and Richard Maltby (eds.), *American Movie Audiences: From the Turn of the Century to the Early Sound Era*, London: British Film Institute, pp. 143-63.

Dyer, Richard (2002) *Only Entertainment*, London: Routledge.

Earnest, Olen J. (1983) Star Wars: A Case Study of Motion Picture Marketing, *Current Research in Film*, 1, pp. 1-18.

Eckert, Charles (1991) The Carole Lombard in Macy's window, in Christine Gledhill (ed.), *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, London: Routledge, pp. 30-9.

Edelstein, Alex (1993) Thinking about the Criterion Variable in Agenda-Setting Research, *Journal of Communication*, 43, (Spring), pp. 85-99.

Erb, Cynthia (1998) *Tracking King Kong: A Hollywood Icon in World Culture*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Fleming, Charles (1998) *High Concept: Don Simpson and the Hollywood Culture of Excess*, London: Bloomsbury.

Gaines, Jane (1989) The Queen Christina Tie-ups: Convergence of Shop Window and Screen, *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, 11, pp. 35-60.

Haralovich, Mary Beth (1985) Film Advertising, the Film Industry, and the Pin-up: The Industry's Accommodation to the Social Forces of the 1940s, *Current Research in Film*, 1, pp. 127-64.

Hodgkinson, Will (2002) Monster Deal in *The Guardian*, (8 February), pp. 4-6.

Jenkins, Henry (1992) *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture*, London: Routledge.

Klinger, Barbara (1989) Digressions at the Cinema: Reception and Mass Culture, *Cinema Journal*, 28 (4), (Summer), pp. 3-18.

Klinger, Barbara (1996) *Melodrama and Meaning: History, Culture and the Films of Douglas Sirk*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Knowles, Harry, with Paul Cullum and Mark C. Erner (2002) *Ain't It Cool? Kicking Hollywood's Butt*, London: Boxtree/Macmillan.

Kuhn, Annette (1999) Memories of Cinemagoing in the 1930s, *Journal of Popular British Cinema*, 2, pp. 100-20.

Lehman, Peter (1998) "Tonight your Director is John Ford": The Strange Journey of Stagecoach from Screen to Radio, in Andrew Horton and Stuart Y. MacDougal (eds.), *Play It Again, Sam: Retakes on Remakes*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 295-309.

Loshitzky, Yosefa (ed.) (1997) *Spielberg's Holocaust: Critical Perspectives on Schindler's List*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lukk, Tiiu (1997) *Movie Marketing: Opening the Picture and Giving it Legs*, LA: Silman-James.

McLaughlin, Thomas (1996) *Street Smarts and Critical Theory: Listening to the Vernacular*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press

Malcolm, Derek (1998) Exploding the Blockbuster Interview, *Film Education*, BBC2, (March).

Miller, Mark S. (1994) Helping Exhibitors: Press Books at Warner Bros. in the late 1930s, *Film History*, 6 (2), pp. 188-96.

Pierson, Michele (1999) CGI Effects in Hollywood Science-Fiction Cinema 1989-95: The Wonder Years, *Screen*, 40 (2), pp. 177-92.

Potton, Ed and Amber Cowan (2000) *Into The Woods: The Definitive Story of The Blair Witch Project*, Suffolk: Screen Press Books.

Rosenbaum, Jonathan (2000) *Movie Wars: How Hollywood and the Media Conspire to Limit what Films We Can See*, Chicago: A Cappella Books.

Schatz, Thomas (1993) The New Hollywood, in Jim Collins, Hilary Radner and Ava Preacher Collins (eds.), *Film Theory Goes to the Movies*, New York: American Film Institute, pp. 8-39.

Staiger, Janet (1992) *Interpreting Films: Studies in the Historical Reception of American Cinema*, Princeton University Press.

Staiger, Janet (2000) *Perverse Spectators: the Practices of Film Reception*, N.Y.: New York University Press.

Telotte, J. P. (2001) The Blair Witch Project, *Film Quarterly*, 54 (3) (Spring), pp. 32-39.

Tookey, Chris (1997) Crash review in *The Daily Mail*, (6 June), p. 18.

Walker, Alexander (1997) Porn Goes into Overdrive in *The Evening Standard*, (5 June), p.17.

Walker, Alexander (1996) A Movie Beyond the Bounds of Depravity in *The Evening Standard*, (3 June), p. 16.

Westminster City Council Licensing Subcommittee (1997) Press Release, (January).

Wolfe, Charles (1991) The Return of Jimmy Stewart in Christine Gledhill (ed.), *Stardom: Industry of Desire*, London: Routledge, pp. 92-106.

Filmography

All Quiet on the Western Front, 1930. Dir. Lewis Milestone. Universal Pictures.

Being John Malcovich, 1999. Dir. Spike Jonze. Propaganda Films.

The Blair Witch Project, 1999. Dir. Daniel Mynck and Eduardo Sanchez II. Blair Witch Partners/ Haxan Entertainment.

Crash, 1996. Dir. David Cronenberg. Alliance Communications Corporation.

Eyes Wide Shut, 1999. Dir. Stanley Kubrick. Warner Bros.

Hannibal, 2001. Dir. Ridley Scott. Dino de Lauretis Productions.

Independence Day, 1996. Dir. Roland Emmerich. Twentieth Century Fox.

Judge Dredd, 1995. Dir. Danny Cannon. Cinergi Pictures Entertainment Inc.

Jurassic Park, 1993. Dir. Steven Spielberg. Universal Pictures/ Amblin Entertainment.

Monsters, Inc., 2001. Dir. Pete Docter and David Silverman. Pixar Animation Studios/ Walt Disney Pictures.

Mulholland Drive, 2001. Dir. David Lynch. Touchstone Television.

The Rocky Horror Picture Show, 1975. Dir. Jim Sharman. Twentieth Century Fox.

Schindler's List, 1993. Dir. Steven Spielberg. Universal Pictures.

Silence of the Lambs, 1991. Dir. Jonathon Demme. Orion Pictures Corporation.

Toy Story, 1995. Dir. John Lasseter. Pixar Animation Studios/ Walt Disney Pictures

Book critique writing is very important task and you need a lot of time and patience to succeed. You should first get an interesting book to based your work on and start writing a draft a once. Â A book critique involves the careful analysis of an author's work to produce a comprehensive evaluation that not only informs the reader of the merit and quality of a book but also of the author's ability to adequately relay and accomplish the purpose of the selection. There are several things to consider when constructing a book critique. Key issues to be mindful of are providing clear judgments with supportive evidences as well as properly analyzing an author's writing style and technique. Finding research proposal topics is a hard task, especially when you have no time. Here is a list of brilliant ideas for your proposal. Â If you have any questionnaires for your research proposal or any other documents related to your investigation, include them all in the appendices. Now that you know how to structure a research proposal, itâ€™s time to begin the work. What is the first thing to be done, then?