

PICTURING SPANISH FILMGOERS: MOTIVES, BARRIERS AND FILM THEATRES

Manuel CUADRADO-GARCÍA

Marketing Department, Universitat de València, Spain
Manuel.Cuadrado@uv.es

Nela FILIMON

Corresponding author
Economics Department, Universitat de Girona, Spain
Nela.Filimon@udg.edu

Juan D. MONTORO-PONS

Applied Economics Department, Universitat de València, Spain
Juan.D.Montoro@uv.es

Abstract

Findings on European countries show non-uniform decreasing trends of film theatres' audiences, the decline being more severe in Spain. This research presents a multifaceted perspective of Spanish filmgoers focused on motives for and barriers to film theatres attendance. Two comprehensive scales (motives, barriers) are proposed. First, motives and barriers are optimally scaled with principal components analysis (PCA); and, second, we identify segments of filmgoers with latent class modelling (LC). PCA recommended a five-factor solution for motives (education, film popularity, film quality, social interaction, and mood) and a seven-factor solution for barriers (film offerings, venue's features, perception, preference and place, substitute activities, financial restrictions, recreation time disposability). LC analysis suggested three segments: mainstream filmgoers who watch films in multiplexes in shopping centers and in the center of the city; art-house filmgoers; and filmgoers who go to film theatres to watch films in original version. The socioeconomic and behavioral covariates complete the profile of the clusters, and the findings are consistent with the existing evidence on film audiences. Increasing cultural participation is the objective of many governments' cultural policies and a more comprehensive understanding of film audiences can contribute to this.

Keywords: filmgoers, motives, barriers, latent-class models, PCA

JEL classification: M310, Z11

1. Introduction

In a report for the EU, Paris (2014) has shown that the decrease in film theatres' audiences has reached its two lowest levels since the beginning of the century, the first in 2005 and the second in 2009, in spite of being a favorite way of spending spare time, especially among young people (De Bruyn and Cillessen, 2008). According to Paris (2014), this decreasing trend was not uniformly distributed, as some countries, such as Spain, have experienced a very severe decline in their cinema audiences (more than 46% in the period 2001-2013), while others have managed this trend more effectively. In Spain, this evolution was observed in the previous century too, with more than half of the film theaters being closed from the '60s to the early '90s (Cuadrado and Frasquet, 1999). This evidence invites the exploration of a deeper understanding of the filmgoers' behavior to help marketers and owners of film theatres design new marketing strategies meant to increase filmgoers' attendance.

From a consumer behavior perspective, motives are taken to be at the origin of the decision process which manifests itself in actions intended to satisfy needs (Crompton and McKay, 1997:425; see also Murray, 1964; Iso-Ahola, 1980). Jackson (1997) developed the 'constraints' paradigm, according to which the desire or need to participate is inherent in human condition, but individual choices are limited by constraints. Thus, "in order to fully understand leisure involvement we need to understand both facilitators and constraints, and how they work together to produce participation and non-participation and their accompanying experiences" (Raymore, 2002:38).

With respect to individuals' engagement with cultural activities, in general, and films, in particular, many studies have sought to explain the motives underlying filmgoers' behavior paying relatively less attention to the barriers. As a matter of fact, even motives have often been determined from a comparative analysis with the audiences of other media, such as television (Austin, 1986:117; Austin, 1983). Some authors have argued that the main reason why fewer studies have paid attention to the motives of cultural audiences (i.e., filmgoers) was that researchers (i.e., film reviewers) were interested in addressing a more general audience (Dyer, 1981). This could explain why "in the motion picture industry, the consumer is the great unknown" (Wierenga, 2006:674). In the case of films, audiences are particularly important because it is "through the existence of an audience that film acquires social and cultural importance" (Gripsrud and Lavik, 2008:455).

This research seeks to analyze the behavior of Spanish filmgoers, with a special focus on motives and barriers of attendance. With this research, we would like to contribute to the literature on cultural participation by providing a multifaceted characterization of filmgoers. The empirical analysis builds on data collected via a self-administered questionnaire to a sample of Spanish population, of 18 years of age and above, selected according to a non-probabilistic method, based on quotas of gender and age (INE, 2011). The methodological approach consists of two steps: first, motives and barriers are optimally scaled with principal components analysis (PCA) and, at a second stage, we employ exploratory latent class (LC) modelling, a method generally recommended for the study of hedonic products' consumption (Botet and Wedel, 1999), with the purpose of identifying specific patterns of film theatres' attendance. Thus, based on preferences for film theatres and their environmental characteristics, we identify three segments of filmgoers: one that prefers multiplexes in shopping centers and in the center of the city, a group for which going to the film theatres means leisure and entertainment; art-house filmgoers; and filmgoers that prefer multiplexes showing films in original version. Moreover, the method allows for considering additional restriction to segment the sample and we do so here by introducing an economic constraint (see also Swanson, Davis and Zhao, 2008). The key findings are intended to add to the literature on experiential goods consumption, such as films, for a better understanding of film audiences' behavior.

The article unfolds as follows: section 2 provides a brief review of the literature on filmgoers' consumption behavior, section 3 is dedicated to the methodology, section 4 presents the main results, and in section 5 we conclude.

2. A Consumer Behavior Perspective of Film Theatres' Audiences

The motives and barriers approach

While a significant bulk of the research on film audiences has focused on the type of films (i.e., 'mainstream' vs. 'art house' films), a particular stream of research has paid special attention to the motives underlying individuals' decisions to participate/not participate in leisure and cultural activities in general, film theatres attendance being one of them. In this line, Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky (2009) offer, for example, a comprehensive overview of the motives driving audiences for art versus commercial films. Several features of film consumption, consistent across various studies, were identified by these authors: 1) there is a higher frequency of attendance for art film audiences compared to those of commercial films (see also Faber, O'Guinn and Hardy, 1988); 2) socialization and/or entertainment are not the main motives for art filmgoers but the films per se (see also Vahemetsa, 1970; Austin, 1984); 3) art film audiences seem to be quite 'self-determined' (Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky, 2009:216), as their attendance behavior is less dependent on others' opinions or company (see also Faber, O'Guinn and Hardy, 1988); 4), commercial film audiences are more likely to watch films about which they know more, such as popular movies that are extensively advertised, while the audiences of art films go to film theatre to watch a film just because it is an art film (see also Chamberlin, 1960); 5) art film audiences appreciate the 'cultural value' transmitted by films (see also Vahemetsa, 1970,); 6), regarding venues' features, art film audiences were found to be less demanding than commercial film audiences with respect to location or facilities (i.e., sound, seats, parking, etc.), given their main interest in the quality

of the film (Adler, 1959; Austin, 1984); last, art filmgoers who prefer more drama and original version films, are also motivated to watch a director's work, and put more weight on reviewers' critiques than on advertising (see also Adler, 1984; Austin, 1984; Faber, O'Guinn and Hardy, 1988).

As for barriers, research on film theatres' attendance indicates the preference for other ways (digital TV, internet downloads, DVD discounts, etc.) of enjoying films (De Vany and Walls, 2007; Silver and McDonnell, 2007); the preference for film substitutes (videogames) or other viewing environment (mall entertainment) (Silver and McDonnell, 2007), or the existence of domestic constraints, such as lack of time, family obligations, etc. (Collins, Hand and Ryder, 2005). Hart, Kerrigan and Vom Lehn (2016), have analyzed film consumer's hedonic experience with an introspective (diary) research method and identified three dimensions of film consumer behavior that support existing evidence: film characteristics (artistic, commercial), viewing environment (home or film theatre) and situational environment (time, mood, companions, etc.). Their findings also confirm the importance of previous film experience on filmgoers "future sense making and film consumption experiences" (pp. 388).

Types of film theatre audiences

This stream of research distinguishes among various segments of filmgoers. Vahemetsa (1970) found, for example, four segments of art filmgoers: the 'cultural prestige type', for whom film is a specific cultural expression; the 'first cognitive type' (films are important information sources contributing to increasing life experiences); the 'second cognitive type' whose motive for art film attendance is to escape from reality; and the 'aesthetic type' who perceives art films as 'creative products'. Sedgwick and Pokorny (2012:329-330) worked with a historic micro-dataset (early 1940s) on 22 film theatres in Philadelphia, in the US, and identified three types of filmgoers: a non-selective segment, consuming films more as a generic commodity, but who go to the film theatre for various motives –film-viewing habits, the experience of viewing films in a movie theater rather than the film per se, or accompanying friends who want to see a specific film; the selective film consumers, whose preference for recommended films is directly related to their social status; and a small segment of filmgoers who based their choice on personal recommendations.

In Spain, Cuadrado and Frasset (1999) found three segments of filmgoers –social viewers, apathetic viewers and filmgoers– and, the benefits of going to film theatre to watch films, ranged from having a good time and feeling emotions to having fun. García-Álvarez, Filimon and López-Sintas (2007) focused on filmgoers' choices of films by country of origin –US, Spain and other countries– and identified three typologies of film theatres audiences: a majority of filmgoers with a clear preference for US films, especially families and younger individuals; an audience for Spanish films, integrated mainly by middle-age and middle-class filmgoers; and a social and intellectual elite that preferred European films. The dominant preference for US films was explained by the fact that these were perceived by audiences as synonymous of familiar and reliable entertainment, and in Spanish language; in contrast, these qualities were not all met by Spanish and European film productions. In a research closer to the approach presented here, Fernández-Blanco, Orea and Prieto-Rodríguez (2009) worked with a 1998 Spanish dataset containing self-rated valuations of both US and Spanish films. The authors applied LC models and identified two groups of filmgoers, differentiated by variables such as income, ticket price, education, and age, among others. Overall, their results advocate in favor of introducing socioeconomic indicators and self-rated preferences in the analysis, for a more complete identification of the hidden consumer preferences.

Socioeconomic context and film audiences

From a temporal perspective, the research evidence seems to indicate that there has been a change in the social context surrounding the experience of going to the film theatre to watch a movie (Tudor, 2013), with a significant change in the age profile of the filmgoers over the last twenty years (1993-2012): while young people (11-14 and 15-19 age segments, in particular, and to a lesser extent, the 20-24 year-old segment) go to the film theatre less frequently, those above 50 years of age have increased their consumption of films (Paris, 2014:12-13). Other

demographics, such as gender, point to a rather even trend of film theatre attendance for men and women (Sedgwick and Pokorny, 2012; Tudor, 2013); and, the inverse correlation between film theatre attendance and filmgoers' social status, education level and income, has also weakened over time (Tudor, 2013).

In UK, Chan and Goldthorpe (2007) analyzed visual arts and found evidence for gender effects only in the cases of theater, cinema and dance, with women exhibiting a more omnivorous pattern of consumption than men. Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky (2009) found that art filmgoers, compared to commercial filmgoers, were, on average, more educated (high cultural capital), more likely to be single, and men, although gender differences have proven to be an inconsistent feature across the research on film audiences and elitist cultural consumption. From a cross-country perspective, Governo and Teixeira (2014) explored the determinants of the consumer demand for art house films vs. mainstream film theatres offerings and found no significant relationship between social and cultural status indicators, (the relative demand for art films was usually associated with higher income and education levels of film consumers). While these findings are in line with the cultural omnivorousness setting (Peterson and Kern, 1996), other authors (see Katz-Gerro, 1999; López-Sintas and García-Álvarez, 2006, etc.) did find evidence supporting cultural stratification thesis (Bourdieu [36]).

Finally but not lastly, according to Morley (1992:157-158), cited in Meers (2001:140), "picture palaces" and "domestic context" are considered to be different film watching experiences inviting to take into account the 'context' (place) of film consumption (see also Hart, Kerrigan and Vom Lehn, 2016). Richins (1997) also argues that in the case of goods embedding meanings (i.e., experiential goods like films), context is particularly important for emotions. The place was found important also in the case of music consumption: Roose and Vander Stichele (2010), differentiated among music listening and attending behavior in Flanders, through activities or practices that embed a socially visible status marker (i.e., a concert hall) and others that do not (i.e., home), among others.

Overall, existing research indicates that it is necessary to look into the relationship between the film theatre audiences and the role of motives/barriers, and socioeconomic variables to gain a more complete understanding of filmgoers' decision-making behavior.

3. Methodology

Data and variables

The data were gathered with a personal survey based on a structured questionnaire using a quota sampling method that yielded information from 516 individuals of both genders, aged 18 or older in 2013. The questionnaire was divided in three parts: filmgoers' consumption habits, motives/barriers and sociodemographic variables. A comprehensive number of self-rated items registered the motives for (17 items) and the barriers to film theatre attendance (28 items) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Motives for and barriers to film theatres attendance

Variable	Range	Mean	Median	SD
Motives for film theatre attendance				
<i>I go to the film theatre ...</i>				
To feel emotions	1-5	3.17	3.0	1.177
To see a director's work	1-5	3.13	3.0	1.181
To achieve self-fulfilment	1-5	2.33	2.0	1.146
To reach educational development	1-5	2.71	3.0	1.130
To learn languages	1-5	2.13	2.0	1.207
To find out about other cultures	1-5	2.57	3.0	1.182
To watch my favourite actors films	1-5	3.21	3.0	1.158
To see successful box-office films	1-5	3.20	3.0	1.150
To see a film recommended by others	1-5	3.55	4.0	0.970
To watch prized films	1-5	3.01	3.0	1.168
To enjoy a film with good reviews	1-5	3.51	4.0	1.048
To see a film that has been intensively advertised	1-5	3.26	3.0	1.179
To socialize	1-5	3.14	3.0	1.294
To experience better sound and image quality	1-5	3.83	4.0	1.028
To relieve boredom	1-5	2.76	3.0	1.201
To share an experience	1-5	3.09	3.0	1.020
To look for relaxation	1-5	3.32	4.0	1.122
Barriers to film theatre attendance				
<i>I do not go (more often) to film theatre because:</i>				
Too many films to choose	1-5	2.28	2.0	1.014
I do not know what's on	1-5	2.49	2.0	1.116
Films are very similar	1-5	2.35	2.0	1.080
I'm not interested	1-5	2.29	2.0	1.147
It is difficult for me to understand films	1-5	1.75	1.0	0.907
Nobody to go with	1-5	1.77	1.0	0.933
Scarce information on what's on	1-5	2.17	2.0	0.949
Difficult to get tickets	1-5	1.85	2.0	0.941
They sell smelly food	1-5	1.92	2.0	1.080
People disturb by using their mobile phones	1-5	2.28	2.0	1.198
Timetables are inconvenient	1-5	2.31	2.0	1.132
Moviegoers make noise by eating food	1-5	2.23	2.0	1.137
I prefer watching movies in diff. media (TV, PC, etc.)	1-5	3.47	4.0	1.204
I prefer doing other act. (shopping, going out, etc.)	1-5	3.52	4.0	1.071
Watching movies at home is more comfortable	1-5	3.69	4.0	1.104
There are cheaper ways of watching films	1-5	3.64	4.0	1.226
I prefer social networking	1-5	2.00	2.0	1.127
I prefer videogames	1-5	1.76	1.0	1.096
It is not as pleasant as years ago	1-5	2.51	2.0	1.187
Current cinemas are not my type	1-5	2.34	2.0	1.186
Lack of time	1-5	3.08	3.0	1.315
I don't like the films that are on	1-5	2.70	3.0	1.093
Films are bad	1-5	2.30	2.0	1.069
I prefer other cultural events (concerts, theatre)	1-5	3.23	3.0	1.203
Cinema tickets are expensive	1-5	3.77	4.0	1.158
Not being able to go out (children, etc.)	1-5	2.49	2.0	1.382
Multiplexes are far away from home	1-5	2.46	2.0	1.164
1. Strongly disagree... 5. Strongly agree				

Socioeconomic and behavioral characteristics of cinemagoers

The survey comprised information on several representative indicators of individuals' positions in the social hierarchy: socioeconomic status and education level, all informative with respect to the respondents' social, economic and cultural capital endowments. The occupational status, at the time of the survey, was used as a proxy for the socioeconomic status, as the survey did not elicit information on income level. The categories were as follows: 1) employed, 2) unemployed, 3) retired, 4) student, 5) house work, and 6) others. Educational attainment, recorded with four levels, was used to operationalize the cultural capital: 1) primary school, 2) secondary school, 3) technical college, 4) university studies. A special five-point Likert scale question was meant to measure whether the interviewees had enough disposable income to enjoy leisure pursuits. For calculation purposes, the five levels of responses were reduced to three: disagree, neutral, agree. The profile of the respondents was completed with sociodemographic indicators (see Table 2).

Table 2. Main demographics

Variable	Proportion (%)	Variable	Proportion (%)
<i>Age</i>		<i>Gender</i>	
18-35	35.7	Male	49.6
36-50	32.0	Female	50.4
>50 years	32.4	<i>Occupational status</i>	
<i>Education level</i>		Employed	43.2
Primary school	7.8	Unemployed	10.1
Secondary school	32.7	Retired	11.2
Technical college	18.8	Student	27.9
University	40.6	House works	5.0
<i>Status</i>		Others	2.5
Single no children	26.6	<i>Nationality</i>	
Single with children	6.2	Spanish	84.7
With partner no children	22.9	Other	15.3
With partner and children	44.4	<i>I have enough free time to enjoy leisure activities</i>	
<i>Frequency of going to the film theatre</i>		Disagree	29.6
Less than once per year	8.2	Neutral	25.2
Once a year	26.3	Agree	45.2
Once every 3 months	33.3	<i>I have enough disposable income to enjoy leisure pursuits</i>	
Twice every 3 months	18.6	Disagree	30.2
Twice a month	11.0	Neutral	31.4
Once a week	2.6	Agree	38.4

The frequency of cinema attendance was organized in four levels: 1) once a year or less, 2) once or twice every three months, 3) twice a month, 4) once a week or more. A five-level Likert type question –strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree– asked the respondents to assess whether they had enough time to enjoy leisure activities (see Table 2).

Motives for cinema attendance

A set of 17 items (see Table 1) were dedicated to understanding the motives for cinema attendance. In order to determine the adequate number of components to retain in the analysis, we applied a principal components analysis (PCA). Basic assumptions on the suitability of the data for this type of analysis were checked with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olking (KMO) statistic, which should be greater than 0.600 (KMO=0.744) and the Bartlett's test, which was significant (Chi-squared=1382.486; df=136; p-value=0.000). The PCA procedure recommended a five-factor solution explaining 54.07% of the total variance (TVE). Table 3 shows the final five-factor solution (Varimax Procedure), consisting of 17 items selected based on eigenvalues, TVE, loadings and interpretability. Except for the 'mood' component, integrated by only two items –to relieve boredom and to look for relaxation– which returned high communalities (>0.500), the other components were determined by at least three items (see also Hager and Winkler, 2012, for similar reports of factors with only two items).

Table 3. Rotated factor structure of motives for film theatres attendance

Variable	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Communality (h^2)
Education (mean=2.57)						
To reach educational development	0.737					0.590
To learn languages	0.730					0.540
To find out about other cultures	0.698					0.553
To see a director's work	0.627					0.417
To achieve self-fulfillment	0.575					0.507
Film's popularity (mean=3.5)						
To see successful box-office films		0.735				0.573
To see a film that has been intensively advertised		0.702				0.639
To watch my favorite actors		0.600				0.442
To watch prized films		0.509				0.529
Film's quality (mean=3.63)						
To experience better sound and image			0.736			0.640
To see a film recommended by others			0.613			0.480
To enjoy a film with good reviews			0.642			0.559
Social interaction (mean=3.13)						
To share an experience				0.720		0.551
To socialize				0.690		0.510
To feel emotions				0.555		0.488
Mood (mean=3.25)						
To relieve boredom					0.711	0.557
To look for relaxation					0.692	0.617
Eigenvalues	3.417	1.488	2.012	1.179	1.097	
Total variance explained (%)	15.823	10.598	10.943	9.167	7.538	54.07
Cronbach-α*	0.730	0.62	0.532	0.441	0.311	

*see Hager and Winkler (2012) for similar levels of Cronbach- α for performing arts attendance

For each factor extracted, the items were summated, and in order to reduce the sparseness of the data, the five-level Likert scale was collapsed into two levels, taking as reference the mean of each subscale (1-disagree/below the average; 2-agree/above the average).

Barriers to cinema attendance

In a similar fashion, the barriers were registered on a five-point Likert scale by a set of 28 items (see Table 1). The PCA procedure converged to a final seven-factor solution (see Table 5 below), explaining 58.2% of the total variance and retaining 26 items out of 28, based on eigenvalues, the items' loadings, TVE and interpretability. The tests of the initial hypotheses (KMO=0.859 and Chi-squared=3091.634; d.f.=190; p-value=0.000) confirmed that a PCA analysis could return significant factor structures. After a first PCA iteration, indicating a suitable seven-factor solution (TVE=56.52%), two items (nobody to go with and multiplexes are far away from home) with very low loadings were eliminated, and the final solution is presented hereafter. A similar procedure, as the one in the previous section, was applied to rescale the items and to reduce the sparseness of the data.

Table 4. Rotated final seven-factors solution for film theatres attendance barriers

Variable	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Factor VI	Factor VII	Communality (h^2)
Film offerings (mean=2.19)								
Too many films to choose	0.565							0.435
I do not know what's on	0.494							0.475
It is not possible talking in cinemas	0.546							0.478
I'm not interested	0.619							0.540
It is difficult for me to understand films	0.682							0.514
Scarce information on what's on	0.541							0.519
Difficult to get tickets	0.703							0.588
Venue features (mean=2.27)								
They sell smelly food		0.592						0.535
People disturb by using mobile phones		0.757						0.640
Timetables are inconvenient		0.612						0.524
Moviegoers make noise by eating food		0.763						0.646
It is not as pleasant as years ago		0.634						0.683
Current cinemas are not my type		0.533						0.593
Perception (mean=2.45)								
I don't like films that are on			0.748					0.598
Films are very similar			0.651					0.573
Films are bad			0.733					0.598
Preference and place (mean=3.82)								
I prefer watching films in TV, PC, etc.				0.702				0.619
I prefer other cultural events				0.587				0.501
I prefer doing other act. (shopping, etc.)				0.637				0.615
Watching movies at home is more comfortable				0.745				0.664
Substitute act.(mean=2.05)								
I prefer social networking					0.760			0.627
I prefer videogames					0.751			0.627
Financial (mean=3.91)								
Cinema tickets are expensive						0.816		0.725
Cheaper ways of watching films						0.665		0.684
Recreation time (mean=3.01)								
Lack of time							0.789	0.678
Not being able to go out (children care)							0.692	0.613
Eigenvalues	5.763	2.424	1.914	1.479	1.336	1.234	1.143	
Total Variance Explained (%)	22.164	9.325	7.360	5.687	5.138	4.744	4.396	58.82
Cronbach-α*	0.792	0.799	0.682	0.654	0.579	0.588	0.418	

*see Hager and Winkler (2012) for similar levels of Cronbach- α for performing arts attendance

Type of film theaters and audiences

Film theatre attendance was recorded for four types of venues: a) multiplexes in shopping centers, b) multiplexes in city centers, c) film theaters, and d) multiplexes showing films in original version. Each respondent was asked to rank the four types from 1 to 4, according to the frequency of attendance. A paired samples t-test was conducted to evaluate whether the respondents scored differently on these variables. The results indicated that there was not a significant difference in the scores for multiplexes in shopping centers ($M=1.79$; $SD=0.932$) and multiplexes in city centers ($M=1.75$; $SD=0.728$) at the 0.05 level of significance ($t=0.564$; $df=447$; $p=0.573$). In this case, we would not reject the null hypothesis that the scores for these two variables are the same, and a new variable –multiplexes in shopping and city centers– was calculated using the mean scores of these two variables. Finally, in order to

control for the sparseness of the data, the frequency ranks were re-coded in two levels: most preferred and less preferred film theatres, respectively (see Table 5).

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for film theatres ratings

Variable	Range	Mean	Median	SD	1 st -most frequented	2 nd -less frequented
Multiplexes shopping and city centres	1-2	1.274	1.00	0.446	72.5%	27.5%
Art houses	1-2	1.840	2.00	0.366	15.9%	84.1%
Multiplexes original version	1-2	1.838	2.00	0.368	16.1%	83.9%

Data analysis and parameters of the model

We are interested here in exploring the unobserved data heterogeneity associated to filmgoers' patterns of attendance emerging from the type of film theaters usually chosen to watch a film. These patterns are next analyzed in association with filmgoers' motives for and barrier of attendance, and other variables such as, socioeconomic indicators, behavior (frequency of film theatre attendance), generational patterns (age), film preferences, etc., with the purpose of showing that they respond to socioeconomic and generational structures and this applies also to filmgoers' motives/barriers of attendance (for a previous version of this research, without PCA analysis for motives and barriers see Cuadrado et al., 2013). To do this, we employed the latent class (LC) method (Lazarsfeld and Henry, 1968) to test the consumer behavior model according to which, individuals consume patterns of products (Boter and Wedel, 1999). Intuitively, the LC method splits the sample in T clusters or latent classes and estimates, for each one, a set of parameters. In the LC model defined in the equation below (see Vermunt, 2010), Y stands for the whole set of indicators Y1, Y2, and Y3, corresponding to the three types of film theatres defined in Table 5, and Z, for the set of so-called active covariates (e.g., financial constraint) as they will condition the final number of clusters.

$$P(\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{y}|\mathbf{Z}) = \sum_{t=1}^T P(t|\mathbf{Z}) \prod_{k=1}^3 P(Y_k = y_k|t)$$

The model estimates, for each cluster, its size and the probabilities of the indicators (Y), conditioned to cluster membership. Once obtained the clusters and the parameters, each individual (observation) is assigned to a cluster only (Magidson and Vermunt, 2001) based on the calculated membership probabilities (see also Vermunt and Magidson, 2008).

Model selection

The parameters of the LC model are estimated by first fitting the null, or restricted, model (T=1), with one latent class and the unrestricted model (T=2) with two latent classes. A likelihood ratio test (L2) is performed, such that if the null model is rejected, the process continues by incrementing, each time, the number of latent classes by one. This process aims at finding the model that provides an adequate fit for the data and stops once we fail to reject a null model. Table 6 gives the statistics used to assess the goodness of fit of the LC model used in the analysis: the chi-squared likelihood-ratio statistic L2; the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the Consistent Akaike's Information Criterion (CAIC) are both based on L2 (see also Raftery, 1986; Fraley and Raftery, 1998). The L2 statistics indicate, for each model, the amount of unexplained association among the variables (hence, lower values are preferred). The data in Table 6 show that the addition of a latent class (from the model with one cluster to the model with two clusters) contributed to reduce the L2 statistic by 75.6%, while the contribution of the additional latent classes (the models with three to four classes) was much lower (22.5%; 1.2%). The p-value (>0.05), indicates that the model with three clusters provides an adequate fit for the data. Additional statistics (Dayton, 1998), such as BIC (which takes parsimony into account) and CAIC, also suggest that the model with three clusters would be a better fit for the data (the lower their values, the better).

Table 6. Goodness of fit statistics for the latent class model

LCA model	LL	Npar	L ²	BIC(L ²)	CAIC(L ²)	df	p-value	Class. Error
One-cluster	-637.686	3	520.8521	411.6205	393.6205	18	4.30E-99	0.000
Two-cluster	-440.7467	9	126.9735	54.1524	42.1524	12	2.50E-21	0.001
Three-cluster	-382.032	15	9.5443	-26.8663	-32.8663	6	0.15	0.001
Four-cluster	-378.9298	21	3.3398	3.3398	3.3398	0	.	0.024

4. Main Findings and Discussion

The parameters of the model

Table 7A presents the estimates of the parameters for the three-cluster model. The first row presents the proportion of how many individuals have been classified in each cluster, $P(t|Z)$ that is, the cluster's relative size, and the following rows indicate the probability of filmgoers' behavior (preference for a type of film theatre), given their classification in that cluster $P(Y_k|t)$ in percentages. If take, for example, a filmgoer classified in cluster 1, he or she has a probability of 99.97% of going very frequently to watch films in multiplexes in shopping and city centers, a probability of 99.96% of not going to multiplexes showing films in original version (OV) and a 32.78% probability of facing financial constraints on cultural and leisure activities. Thus, based on these conditional probabilities and mean values, we can characterize the probabilistic behavior of the Spanish filmgoers regarding the type of film theater preferred, constrained by the disposable income for cultural pursuits.

The parameters estimated suggest one big cluster (70.53% of the sample) of filmgoers that basically prefer multiplexes in shopping centers and in the center of the city (*mainstream filmgoers*). A second cluster (15.87% of the sample) stands for *art-house filmgoers*; according to Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky (2009:214), “[a]rt films are frequently selected to be shown at major film festivals and are often the winners of distinctive film awards. Many of these films are made in non-English speaking countries... In terms of the theatrical release of art films, they are screened primarily in art-house and repertoire theatres only”. The third cluster (13.6%) represents filmgoers that prefer to watch films in original version (*OV filmgoers*).

Table 7A: Probabilistic patterns of film theatres attendance (column profiles in %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Sample
Cluster Size, $P(t Z)$ (s.e.)	70.53 (0.0217)	15.87 (0.019)	13.6 (0.0179)	100
<i>Indicators of type of film theatre $P(Y_k t)$</i>				
<i>Multiplexes shopping and city centres</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	99.97 (0.001)	0.35 (0.0071)	3.71 (0.0256)	72.5
Less frequent (No)	0.03 (0.001)	99.65 (0.0071)	96.29 (0.0256)	27.5
<i>Art houses</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	0.02 (0.0008)	99.52 (0.009)	1.2 (0.0549)	15.9
Less frequent (No)	99.98 (0.0008)	0.48 (0.009)	98.8 (0.0549)	84.1
<i>Multiplexes original version</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	0.04 (0.0017)	13.75 (0.0575)	99.5 (0.0094)	16.1
Less frequent (No)	99.96 (0.0017)	86.25 (0.0575)	0.5 (0.0094)	83.9
<i>Financial constraint</i>				
<i>I have enough disposable income to enjoy leisure pursuits</i>				
Disagree	32.78	22.92	22.76	30.2
Neutral	35.73	33.42	25.87	31.4
Agree	31.49	43.66	51.37	38.4

An alternative, and easier, interpretation of filmgoers' profiles is based on whether the individuals classified in cluster t , $P(Y_k|t)$, are over- or underrepresented among individuals with that behavior (similar to a row profile table, see bold values in Table 7B). Thus, filmgoers in cluster 1 (70.53%) are overrepresented among those choosing the *very frequent* level (Yes) of attendance for multiplexes in shopping and city centers (*mainstream filmgoers*),

and for whom film theatres mean leisure and entertainment, and the *less frequent* level (No) of attendance for venues showing films in original version (*OV filmgoers*). Cluster 2 (15.87%) is overrepresented among individuals who prefer film theaters, an elitist segment of filmgoers for whom watching films at the movie theatre is an experience (*art-house filmgoers*); cluster 3 (13.6%) is overrepresented among filmgoers who have a clear preference for watching films in multiplexes showing them in original version (*OV filmgoers*).

**Table 7B: Probabilistic patterns of film theatres attendance
(row profiles in %)**

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Sample
<i>Cluster Size, P(t Z) (s.e.)</i>	70.53 (0.0217)	15.87 (0.0019)	13.6 (0.0179)	100
<i>Indicators of type of film theatre P(Y_k t)</i>				
<i>Multiplexes shopping and city centers</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	99.36	0.00	0.64	72.5
Less frequent (No)	0.00	54.69	45.31	27.5
<i>Art houses</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	0.00	99.05	0.95	15.9
Less frequent (No)	83.97	0.01	16.01	84.1
<i>Multiplexes original version</i>				
Most frequent (Yes)	0.09	13.81	86.10	16.1
Less frequent (No)	83.74	16.26	0.00	83.9
<i>Financial constraint</i>				
<i>I have enough disposable income to enjoy leisure pursuits</i>				
Disagree	77.44	12.19	10.37	30.2
Neutral	74.07	15.59	10.34	31.4
Agree	61.48	19.18	19.34	38.4

As already mentioned, the LC model estimated here also takes into consideration the income available for cultural pursuits (see i.e., Fernández-Blanco and Baños-Pino, 1997; Fernández-Blanco, Orea and Prieto-Rodríguez, 2009). The estimates show that while filmgoers in cluster 1 (mainstream filmgoers), who prefer multiplexes in shopping and city centers, are subject to financial constraints, those in the other two clusters (art-house and OV filmgoers) ‘agree’ with having enough income for cultural pursuits, as they are overrepresented in these indicators.

Motives for going to film theatres

According to the results presented in Table 8, for cluster 1 (mainstream filmgoers), films’ popularity (i.e., prizes, intensive advertising, favorite actors and successful box-office records) and mood (to relieve boredom and to relax) are the main drivers of cinema attendance. They do not seem to be influenced by films’ quality (good reviews, recommended by others, or better image and quality of the exhibition) or by educational purposes or socialization needs. All in all, on average, they seem to fit well in the profile of filmgoers who prefer commercial and popular films for entertainment. Cluster 2 (art-house filmgoers) exhibits a different motivational pattern: as expected, they are overrepresented in indicators related to motives of personal education achievements and social interaction (share emotions, experiences and socialize with filmgoers sharing common preferences for art films) (see Swanson, Davis and Zhao, 2008; Hager and Winkler, 2012); neither films’ quality nor popularity seem to be strong motives for choosing film theatres, as they seem to be a well-informed and rather specialized film audience and go mainly for the movies alone. Cluster 3 (OV filmgoers) exhibits a pattern similar to cluster 2, except for the fact that these filmgoers do take into account films’ quality (reviews, recommendations, better sound and image). It appears that film theatres allow them to benefit more from the impact of technical innovations on film releases. This result is consistent with the findings of Governo and Teixeira (2014) predicting, on average, a positive relationship between the countries’ level of technological development and the domestic demand for art films.

Table 8. Motives for film theatres attendance (row profiles, %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
<i>Cluster size</i>	70.53	15.87	13.6
<i>I go to the film theatre...</i>			
<i>Education (mean=2.57)</i>			
Agree (≥ 2.57)	66.16	16.53	17.31
Disagree (< 2.57)	75.41	15.14	9.45
<i>Film's quality (mean=3.63)</i>			
Agree	69.5	13.89	16.61
Disagree	72.12	18.96	8.92
<i>Film's popularity (mean=3.5)</i>			
Agree	70.75	15.82	13.42
Disagree	70.26	15.93	13.81
<i>Social interaction (mean=3.13)</i>			
Agree	65.68	18.47	15.85
Disagree	75.8	13.05	11.15
<i>Mood (mean=3.25)</i>			
Agree	76.25	11.70	12.04
Disagree	66.85	18.55	14.60

Barriers for attending film theatres

The results in Table 9 indicate that clusters 1 and 2 (mainstream and art-house filmgoers) are, on average, the most affected by the barriers analyzed. Thus, the mainstream segment is sensitive to factors such as: film offerings (too many films to choose, difficult to get tickets, etc.), perception about the films released (very similar or bad films), their preference for other cultural activities and places; for this audience, the distinction between home and film theatre 'contexts' is important (see Morley, 1992; Sedgwick and Pokorny, 2012); while financial resources act as a constraint (see Fernández-Blanco, Orea and Prieto-Rodríguez, 2009), they face no leisure time restrictions. Overall, these barriers seem to fit well with this profile of filmgoers, looking mainly for entertainment, and that exhibits features similar to the commercial films' audiences (see also Chuu, Chang and Zaichkowsky, 2009). Cluster 2 (art-house filmgoers) shares some of the barriers of cluster 1 (film offerings, perception, preference and place), but in contrast, they are not affected by financial restrictions. They do not face leisure time restrictions either, and as expected, are sensitive to film theatres' features (i.e., smelly food, mobile phone noise, nostalgia for former type of film theatres, etc.). In this respect, Tudor (2013) argues, for example, that an important part of social life in the past century was closely related to 'going to the movies' ritual, and the change in this social context surrounding the experience of going to the film theatre eventually affected attendance. Finally, cluster 3 (OV filmgoers) is affected by two barriers only, that is, leisure time restrictions and the preference for other substitute activities (social networking, videogames).

Table 9. Film theatres attendance barriers (row profiles, %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3
<i>Cluster size</i>	70.53	15.87	13.6
<i>I do not go (more often) to the film theatre because...</i>			
<i>Film offerings (mean=2.19)</i>			
Agree (≥ 2.19)	71.91	16.99	11.1
Disagree (< 2.19)	69.33	14.91	15.76
<i>Venue features (mean=2.27)</i>			
Agree	68.98	19.14	11.88
Disagree	71.83	13.13	15.04
<i>Perception (mean=2.45)</i>			
Agree	72.59	18.52	8.89
Disagree	69.01	13.93	17.06
<i>Preference and place (mean=3.82)</i>			
Agree	71.16	17.13	11.71
Disagree	69.08	13.53	17.39
<i>Substitute activities (mean=2.05)</i>			
Agree	67.37	16.96	15.67
Disagree	71.87	15.41	12.72
<i>Financial (mean=3.91)</i>			
Agree	72.94	15.65	11.41
Disagree	64.79	16.40	18.81
<i>Recreation time (mean=3.01)</i>			
Agree	65.83	15.81	18.37
Disagree	72.46	15.90	11.64

Socioeconomic and behavioral profile of cinemagoers in clusters

The estimates for the socioeconomic context presented in Table 10 indicate that individuals in cluster 1 (mainstream filmgoers) are, on average, more likely to be men below 50 years of age, some unemployed and with a low education level (primary and secondary school), and single with or without children; they are not affected by leisure time restrictions, as they are either unemployed or students (most of this group being foreigners residents in Spain at the moment of the interview); they are also very frequent filmgoers. Cluster 2 (art-house filmgoers.) is overrepresented among women, who are more likely to be unemployed or retired, but with a higher cultural level (technical and university studies) than the mainstream filmgoers, and some dedicated to housework, with a partner and children; in contrast to cluster 1, they are above fifty years of age and mainly Spanish. They do not go very often to the film theatre, also due to leisure time constraints. Cluster 3 (OV filmgoers) exhibits a different socioeconomic profile: mainly foreign women, above 50 years of age, highly educated (university studies), employed or with another occupational status, and with partner and no children. They are frequent filmgoers and have enough time for leisure pursuits (see also Fernández-Blanco et al., 2009, for the significant impact of socioeconomic indicators on film theatres' audiences). These findings are also in line with the cultural stratification framework (Bourdieu, 1979) confirming previous research evidence on cultural consumption (see López-Sintas and García-Álvarez, 2006).

Table 10: Socioeconomic and behavioral patterns of filmgoers (row profiles, %)

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Sample
<i>Cluster size</i>	70.53	15.87	13.6	100
<i>Education</i>				
Primary School	83.94	12.04	4.02	7.8
Secondary School	75.29	12.58	12.13	32.7
Technical college	69.68	18.66	11.66	18.9
University studies	65.13	17.48	17.39	40.6
<i>Personal status</i>				
Single no children	76.47	11.18	12.35	26.5
Single with children	80.70	7.42	11.88	6.2
Partner no children	64.74	15.50	19.76	22.9
Partner with children	68.76	20.24	11.00	44.4
<i>Occupational Status</i>				
Employed	68.89	13.67	17.45	43.2
Unemployed	73.73	25.47	0.80	10.1
Retired	66.57	20.06	13.37	11.2
Student	75.73	12.04	12.23	27.9
House works	57.79	31.24	10.96	5.0
Others	66.57	16.72	16.71	2.5
<i>Age</i>				
18-35 years	73.67	12.98	13.35	35.7
36-50 years	72.83	14.39	12.78	32.0
>50 years	64.01	21.15	14.83	32.4
<i>Citizenship</i>				
Spanish	70.48	17.04	12.47	84.7
Other	70.77	9.27	19.96	15.3
<i>Gender</i>				
Male	74.00	13.11	12.89	49.6
Female	67.18	18.54	14.29	50.4
<i>I have enough free time to enjoy leisure activities</i>				
D	67.1	18.7	14.21	29.6
N	75.36	14.73	9.91	25.2
A	69.94	14.65	15.41	45.2
<i>Frequency of film theatre attendance</i>				
Once a year or less	70.88	20.86	8.26	34.6
1-2 every 3 months	70.91	15.53	13.57	51.8
Twice a month	67.24	4.01	28.75	11.0
Once a week or more	72.64	8.65	18.71	2.6

5. Conclusions

This research explored the behavior of Spanish filmgoers in order to disentangle their tastes and habits, with a special interest in the motives and barriers of going to film theatres. The empirical results suggest three clusters of filmgoers with the following probabilistic patterns of behavior: a segment of mainstream filmgoers, for whom going to film theatres to watch a film means leisure and entertainment; a segment of art-house filmgoers, and a segment that enjoys watching films in their original version (OV filmgoers). The segmentation of the data set in three clusters was conditioned by filmgoers' financial constraints showing that they may affect filmgoers' behavior.

The PCA findings identify five groups of motives –educational purposes, film popularity, film quality, socialization and mood– and seven groups of barriers: film offerings, venue features, perception, preference and place, substitute activities, financial barriers and recreation time disposability. The socioeconomic and behavioral (frequency) indicators complete the profile of the filmgoers. These findings add to the existing research evidence in favor of using self-rated preferences and socioeconomic variables to determine (film) consumer groups. This paper illustrates the different filmgoers segments, and in doing so, illustrates the specific barriers and motivations for each of these groups. These insights can assist cultural policy makers and film theatres' managers in designing specific actions and market strategies to better meet the needs and preferences of each of these distinct segments. Finally but not lastly, these findings invite to expanding filmgoers' analysis to other national contexts, to allow for further cross-country comparisons.

Acknowledgements

Authors gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Finola Kerrigan and Andrea Rurale on a previous version of this research.

References

- Adler, K.P. (1959), "Art Films and Eggheads", *Studies in Public Communication*, Vol. 2 (Summer), pp.7-15.
- Austin, B.A. (1983), *The Film Audience: An International Bibliography of Research with Annotations and an Essay*, Scarecrow, Metuchen, NJ.
- Austin, B.A. (1984), "Portrait of an Art Film Audience", *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 74-87.
- Austin, B.A. (1986), "Motivations for Movie Attendance", *Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 115-126.
- Boter, J. and Wedel, M. (1999), "Segmentation of Hedonic Consumption: An Application of Latent Class Analysis to Consumer Transaction Databases", *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, Vol. 3 No. (3/4), pp. 295-311.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La Distinction. Critique Social du Jugement*, Les éditions de minuit, Paris.
- Chamberlin, P. (1960), "Allies, Not Enemies: Commercial Nontheatrical Experience on the West Coast", *Film Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 36-39.
- Chan, T.W. and Goldthorpe, J.H. (2007), "Social Stratification and Cultural Consumption: The Visual Arts in England", *Poetics*, Vol. 35, pp. 168-190.
- Chuu, S.L.H., Chang, J.C. and Zaichkowsky, J.L. (2009), "Exploring Art Film Audiences: A Marketing Analysis", *Journal of Promotion Management*, Vol. 15 No. 1-2, pp. 212-228.
- Collins, A., Hand, C. and Ryder, A. (2005), "The Lure of the Multiplex? The Interplay of Time, Distance, and Cinema Attendance", *Environment and Planning*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 483-501.
- Cuadrado, M. and Frassetto, M. (1999), "Segmentation of Cinema Audiences: An Exploratory Study Applied to Young Consumers", *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol. 23 No. 4, pp. 257-267.
- Cuadrado, M., Filimon, N., Kerrigan, F. and Rurale, A. (2013), "Exploring Cinema Attendance Facilitators and Constraints. A Marketing Research Approach", Paper presented at the 5th Workshop on Cultural Economics and Management, 24-25 October 2013, Cadiz, Spain.
- Daenekindt, S. and Roose, H. (2014), "Ways of Preferring: Distinction Through the 'What and the How' of Cultural Consumption", *Journal of Consumer Culture*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 25-45.
- Dayton, M.C. (1998), *Latent Class Scaling Analysis*, Sage University Paper Series on QASS, 07-126, Thousand Oaks, Sage Publishers, CA.
- De Bruyn, E.H. and Cillessen, A.H.N. (2008), "Leisure Activity Preferences and Perceived Popularity in Early Adolescence", *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 442-457.
- De Vany, A.S. and Walls, W.D. (2007), "Estimating the Effects of Movie Piracy on Box-office Revenue", *Review of Industrial Organisation*, Vol. 30, pp. 291-301.
- Dyer, R. (1981), "Entertainment and Utopia", in Altman, R. (Ed.), *Genre: The Musical*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, pp. 175-189.
- Faber, R.J., O'Guinn, T.C. and Hardy, A.P. (1988), "Art Films in the Suburbs: A Comparison of Popular and Art Film Audiences", in Austin, B.A. (Ed.), *Current Research in Film: Audiences, Economics and Law*, Vol. 4, Ablex, Norwood, NJ, pp. 45-53.
- Fernández-Blanco, V. and Baños-Pino, J.F. (1997), "Cinema Demand in Spain: A Cointegration Analysis", *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 57-75.
- Fernández-Blanco, V., Orea, L. and Prieto-Rodríguez, J. (2009), "Analysing Consumers' Heterogeneity and Self-reported Tastes: An Approach Consistent with the Consumer's Decision Making Process", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 622-633.
- Fraley, C. and Raftery, A. (1998), "How Many Clusters? Which Clustering Methods? Answers via Model-based Cluster Analysis", *Computer Journal*, Vol. 41, pp. 578-588.
- García-Álvarez, M.E., Filimon, N. and López-Sintas, J. (2007), "Reliable Entertainment: Spanish Consumers' Preferences Regarding a Film's Country of Origin", *International Journal of Non Profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 217-229.
- Governo, F. and Castro Teixeira, A.A. (2014), "Marketing and Technology Sophistication as Key Determinants of the Demand for 'Art House' Cinema Films: A Cross Country Analysis", *Téchne*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 15-25.
- Gripsrud, J. and Lavik, E. (2008), "Film audiences". In J. Donald and M. Renov (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Film Studies* (pp. 454-470). London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781849200400.n29

- Hager, M.A. and Winkler, M.K. (2012), "Motivational and Demographic Factors for Performing Arts Attendance across Place and Form", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 41 No. 3, pp. 474-496.
- Harry, H. (1986), "Motivation Research", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, Vol. 4 No. 5, pp. i-234.
- Hart, A., Kerrigan, F. and Vom Lehn, D. (2016), "Experiencing Film: Subjective Personal Introspection and Popular Film Consumption", *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 375-391.
- Hawkins, B.A., Peng, J Hsieh, C.M. and Eklund, S.J. (1999), "Leisure Constraints: A Replication and Extension of Construct Development", *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 179-192.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística/National Institute of Statistics (INE). (2011), *Survey on Population Demographics*, available at www.ine.es. (accessed 10 January 2011).
- Iso - Ahola, E. (1980), *Social Psychological Perspectives on Leisure and Recreation*. W. C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Jackson, E.L. (1997), "In the Eye of the Beholder: A Comment on Samdahl and Jekubovich (1997), 'A Critique of Leisure Constraints: Comparative Analyses and Understandings'", *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 458-468.
- Katz-Gerro, T. (1999), "Cultural and social stratification: Leisure activities, musical tastes, and social location", *Social Perspectives*, Vol. 42 No. 4, pp. 627-646.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. and Henry, N.W. (1968), *Latent Structure Analysis*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.
- López-Sintas, J. and García-Álvarez, M.E. (2006), "Patterns of Audio-Visual Consumption: The Reflection of Objective Divisions in Class Structure", *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 397-411.
- Magidson, J. and Vermunt, J.K. (2001), "Latent Class Factor and Cluster Models, Bi-plots, and Related Graphical Displays", *Sociological Methodology*, Vol. 31, pp. 223-264.
- Meers, P. (2001), "Is there an Audience in the House? New Perspectives on (European) Film Audiences", *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 138-144.
- Morley, D. (1992), *Television, Audiences and Cultural Studies*, Routledge, London. Murray, E.J. (1964), *Motivation and Emotion*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Paris, T. (2014), *New Approaches for Greater Diversity of Cinema in Europe? Analyses of Experiments Launched in the Context of the Preparatory Action1 "Circulation of European Films in the Digital Era" (European Parliament & European Commission)*, available at http://ec.europa.eu/culture/library/studies/cinema-diversity-report_en.pdf. (accessed 12 July 2015).
- Peterson, R.A. and Kern, R.M. (1996), "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61, pp. 900-907.
- Raftery, A.E. (1986), "Choosing Models for Cross-Classifications", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 51, pp. 145-146.
- Raymore, L.A. (2002), "Facilitators to Leisure", *Journal of Leisure Research*, Vol. 34, pp. 37-51.
- Richins, M.L. (1997), "Measuring Emotion in the Consumption Experience", *Journal of Consumer Research*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 127-146.
- Roose, H. and Vander Stichele, A. (2010), "Living Room vs. Concert Hall: Patterns of Music Consumption in Flanders", *Social Forces*, Vol. 89 No. 1, pp. 185-207.
- Sedgwick, J. and Pokorny, M. (2012), "Film Consumer Decision-Making: The Philadelphia Story, 1935-36", *Journal of Consumer Culture*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 323-346.
- Silver, J. and McDonnell, J. (2007), "Are Movie Theatres Doomed? Do Exhibitors See the Big Picture as Theatres Lose their Competitive Advantage?", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 50 No. 6, pp. 491-501.
- Swanson, S.R., Davis, C.J. and Zhao, Y. (2008), "Art for Art's Sake? An Examination of Motives for Arts Performance Attendance", *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 37, pp. 300-323.
- Tudor, A. (2013), *Image and Influence: Studies in the Sociology of Film*, Routledge Library Editions: Cinema, London.
- Vahemetsa, A. (1970), "A Typology of the Recipients of Artistic Film", *Society and Leisure*, Vol. 2, pp. 87-101.
- Vermunt, J.K. (2010), "Latent Class Modelling with Covariates: Two Improved Three-Step Approaches", *Political Analysis*, Vol. 18, pp. 450-469.
- Vermunt Jeroen K., and Jay Magidson. (2008), *LG-Syntax User's Guide: Manual for Latent GOLD 4.5 Syntax Module*. Belmont, MA: Statistical Innovations Inc.
- Wierenga, B. (2006), "Motion Pictures: Consumers, Channels, and Intuition. Invited Commentary", *Marketing Science*, Vol. 25 No. 6, pp. 674-677.