

Treveri Gennari, D and Sedgwick, J

Memories in context: the social and economic function of cinema in 1950s Rome

Treveri Gennari, D and Sedgwick, J (2015) Memories in context: the social and economic function of cinema in 1950s Rome. *Film History*, 27 (2). pp. 76-104.

doi: 10.2979/filmhistory.27.2.76

This version is available: <https://radar.brookes.ac.uk/radar/items/db37e076-6131-4049-97fe-db982f07bb7b/1/>

Available on RADAR: September 2016

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the post print version of the journal article. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Memories in Context: The Social and Economic Function of Cinema in 1950s Rome

ABSTRACT: During the 1950s, cinema in Italy blossomed, bringing film entertainment to Italians on an unprecedented scale. This study draws upon the testimony of 325 elderly Romans about their filmgoing experiences during this period. Their memories are set in the particular context of the film programs that they (and fellow filmgoers) selected—information that is derived from daily newspapers and supplemented with trade listings of the most popular films screened in Rome. In producing a bottom-up account of filmgoing, the paper contributes to the general debate about film culture in Italy in the postwar era.

KEYWORDS: Postwar Italian cinema, Roman audiences, oral history, film programming, film distribution, film tastes, filmgoing

During the 1950s, cinema in Italy blossomed, bringing film entertainment to Italians on an unprecedented scale while capturing approximately 70 percent of all entertainment revenues.¹ One authority notes that there was one cinema seat for every nine inhabitants—more than in Great Britain (1:12) and France (1:16).² Browning and Sorrell produce figures indicating that in 1950 Italians made fourteen visits on average annually to the cinema—ahead of both France (nine), and West Germany (eleven).³ By 1955 this figure had risen to seventeen visits per person (see table 1). *****INSERT TABLE 1 HERE*****

The postwar Americanization of Italy and Western Europe, in which films played such an important role, has been well documented.⁴ Certainly, Hollywood films were integral

to satiating the public's appetite for cinema, taking a leading share of the market. Particularly attractive to Italian audiences were big-budget Technicolor productions that had epic and historical dimensions. But, at the same time, audiences were also attracted to films made on much more modest budgets by indigenous producers that spoke to them in their own language and were filmed in black and white.⁵ Between them, Hollywood and Italian films dominated the market. However, the provision of film entertainment and the economic imperatives of the various agencies involved is only part of the story. The other part is the social aspect: the cinema as a venue where people met and shared experience, including, of course, the film featured on the program. As will become apparent in this article, this social function remains strongest in people's memories, irrespective of the degree of comfort and luxury associated with the venues they attended. One imagines that the social significance of going to the cinema was much more marked at that time when compared with today.

In her study of the economics of the postwar Italian cinema, Barbara Corsi argues that by the end of the 1950s—after a decade of sustained economic growth—audiences in Italy begin to diversify, moving away from the state of “homogeneous spectatorship” that she believes characterized the immediate postwar years.⁶ They did this by developing distinctive preferences in terms of both film and theater choices. Is this view of Italian cinemagoers consistent with the evidence? Using the oral histories of elderly Romans, now in their late seventies or early eighties, this research investigates the films they saw and the cinemas where they saw them during their active years of cinemagoing in the 1950s.⁷

In setting audience memories in context, this article adopts a multiple-methods form of investigation in which audiences are studied both from an experiential and numerical standpoint.⁸ Our findings provide a corrective to Corsi's depiction of the evolution of the character of Italian cinemagoers by revealing a fully developed exhibition sector in operation in Rome earlier than she suggested, in which first-, second-, and third-run cinemas were

carefully differentiated.⁹ The oral evidence gathered for this article suggests that each cinema run performed a distinctive role in the diffusion of movies, attracting different types of audiences and yielding a different type of experience: a market that was at the same time extensive, delineated between the center and the periphery, and deep—termed by a contemporary commentator as *mercato di profondità*.¹⁰

Combining an account of how this “system of provision” worked in Rome in the 1950s with the oral evidence presented by our survey participants is the main task of this article. In developing this bottom-up approach to film audience research, we intend to provide a more thorough understanding of audience behavior and experience. This article continues in four parts. The next part describes the sources of data and methods used, followed by an analysis of context that changes in scope from a macro to a micro account of film consumption and exhibition. A third section reports on the oral histories provided by the sample of elderly Romans questioned and interviewed in the study. A discussion then follows in which a number of concluding remarks are made.

THE TWO METHODS AND SOURCES OF DATA

Annette Kuhn has argued that “going to the pictures was the occasion for the earliest ventures into the world beyond the home. Close to home, almost an extension of home, and yet not home, ‘the picture’ is remembered as both daring and safe.”¹¹ For Kuhn there is a geography, anthropology, and sociology associated with cinemagoing. From an economic perspective, Douglass North refers to these types of factors as informal institutional arrangements, which differ from place to place and territory to territory, giving form to idiosyncratic practices and experiences.¹²

However, while idiosyncrasy is ever present in the particular, an underlying economic logic prevails, a logic that indeed pervades the history of the movie industry. Made possible

by countless coordinating decisions, the movie business is predicated on the principle of revenue maximization: faced with a set of fixed (sunk) costs, financiers, producers, distributors, and exhibitors are motivated to extract as much revenue as they possibly can from the films with which they are connected. For this to happen, distribution and exhibition must necessarily be sufficiently flexible to respond to audience demand for particular films once revealed, making popular films more readily available than less popular films. In organizing around this principle, the Italian industry during the postwar period was no different from any other center of movie production, distribution, exhibition, and consumption in the developed capitalist world.

At the apex of the revenue-maximizing process is the feature film, supported by a program of screen and nonscreen items that jointly serve the purpose of extending the entertainment consumed by audiences. Put differently, it is not the newsreel, the cartoon, the trailer, or the second feature on a double-bill program that draws audiences to a particular cinema on a particular day. If it were, box-office revenues would not vary between programs screened at the same cinema, featuring different top-of-the-bill films. This is not the case.¹³ Thus, screened at a cinema and seen by a paying audience, the feature film constitutes a geographical and temporal point at which industry supply arrangements interface with the lives and preferences of film audiences. It can be understood as a confluence where financial, production, exhibition, and consumption decisions come together, in effect constituting an imprint (the DNA) of the business as a whole. In conjunction with box-office data, the feature film serves as a unit of analysis, which when aggregated allows assessments to be made about the relative popularity of films and audience preferences. Of course, this aggregation can be applied to a locality, province, or territory, or, indeed, used to make comparisons between any of these.¹⁴

Our oral evidence was gleaned from a survey of 325 people who lived in Rome between the years 1945 and 1960. Interviews were held between September and December 2012, when 325 people aged sixty-five to ninety filled in a questionnaire (labelled LAR001 to LAR325) comprising a range of quantitative and qualitative questions.¹⁵ The recruitment process entailed selecting participants who attended centers for the elderly in the capital, as well as medical practices, holiday resorts, and residential homes. Demographic information collected included age, education level, family composition, religious and political beliefs, and leisure activities as well as details of residency and socioeconomic status. Cinemagoing decisions were investigated through questions about ticket prices and factors determining the selection of films, as well as preferences of days and types of cinemas. In an open-ended section, participants were also asked to write about their memories of cinemagoing, aided by prompts about favorite theaters, stars, and films as well as broader matters such as what cinema represented for them and those factors that influenced their decisions to attend particular cinemas and watch particular films. When participants in the survey were asked to identify one or more films that had made a strong impression on them, 177 named films that were released in Rome during the twelve years following the end of the Second World War, and most of them (108) remembered seeing these films during the seven years between 1950 and 1956, the period that has become the focus of this study. The interviews were supplemented by thirty-two video diaries available online (<http://italiancinemaaudiences.org>), the purpose of which was to get respondents to expand upon a number of issues that arose from the questionnaires.

The source of film program information is the daily listings found on page 6 of the Roman edition of the Communist Party daily newspaper *l'Unità*, the archive of which is online, backed up by the daily listings found in the evening paper *Momento Sera* and the daily *Il Tempo*.¹⁶ From this information, a dataset was created comprising the daily programs

of 130 Roman cinemas for twenty-eight days, January 2 through 29, 1954.¹⁷ This dataset provides an insight into how the market worked: how films filtered out from first-run to second- and third-run cinemas. Given the assumption that films that were popular were screened more frequently than films that were not, the program data captures implicitly the film choices audiences made and, hence, what their preferences were. In conjunction with the memories of the survey participants, it is possible to come to an understanding of how the cinemas in these different runs served audiences that are differentiated by locality, gender, and/or social class. The evidence also helps to identify patterns of audience behavior as well as the characteristics of film performance. First-run cinemas frequently held films over from one week to the next, while some third-run cinemas rarely held them over for more than a day, which indicates that at any one time, a distinction existed between films that served as attractions of the day and films that served as programmers, even though some of the latter, on release, had earlier been main attractions.¹⁸ Indeed, such was the depth of the diffusion process that one contemporary maintained that some 70 percent of film revenues came from non-first-run cinemas.¹⁹

To put both testimonial evidence and film program knowledge into context, data are drawn from two principal sources: SIAE (the Italian Society of Authors and Publishers)—a multipurpose society that administers copyright related to all kinds of intellectual works—published detailed annual statistics of cinemagoing in Italy in its organ *Annuario dello Spettacolo*, while the exhibitors' organization AGIS (Associazione Generale Italiana dello Spettacolo) produced a biweekly publication *Bollettino dello Spettacolo* listing (not always consistently) the aggregate box-office grosses derived from (mostly) first-run (*prima visione*) cinemas in the largest Italian cities.

THE CINEMA CONTEXT

By 1950 the film industry had taken a dominant position as a source of entertainment in the lives of the Italian people. As table 1 (column 4) shows, cinema captured approximately 70 percent of entertainment revenues during these years in what was a rapidly growing market; a combination of rising attendance and real admission prices led to nearly four-fold growth in the box office (measured in 1950 prices) between 1946 and 1955. Indeed, cinema attendance peaked in 1955, some ten years later than in Great Britain and the United States, although as Peter Miskell and Marina Nicoli show, inflation-adjusted revenues continued to hold up during the next fifteen years, even though attendance fell as a consequence of rising admission prices.²⁰ Italy was extremely well endowed with cinemas in the 1950s, with a very low ratio of population to cinemas when compared with other, similar national markets. This is even more the case when the Catholic provision of cinematic entertainment (known as parish cinema) is taken into account.²¹ By 1950, there was no shortage of cinemas or, for that matter, films for Italians to choose among. *****INSERT TABLE 2 HERE*****

Table 2 shows that between 1950 and 1956, Italians largely went to see Hollywood or Italian films; a similar situation prevailed before the formation of the Ente Nazionale Industria Cinematografia (ENIC) in 1939—a measure that brought film distribution under state control, effectively causing the Americans to leave the market.²² The volume of Italian output listed in table 2 suggests a developed industrial capacity to make films. This, coupled with the fact that for the first five years of the series Italian films generated a higher mean box office than their Hollywood counterparts, suggests an environment in which the genres, stars, and directors of postwar Italian cinema flourished. The dramatic decline in the fortune of Italian films shown in table 2 in 1955 and 1956 was a direct consequence of the much better performance in the market by Hollywood's top films, which was partly connected to the growing presence in the portfolios of the major studios of high-budget epic films presented in Cinemascope format.²³

*****INSERT TABLE 3 HERE*****

In keeping with the division of the country between an industrial and prosperous North and an agricultural and underdeveloped South, the statistics presented in table 3 confirm a North-South divide in cinemagoing practice. In the words of a contemporary commentator, “a higher concentration of more expensive cinemas can be found in the North of the country, which diminishes in the Centre and reaches its lowest in the South—evidence of the regional variation in income per inhabitant.”²⁴ However, one must be careful not to overemphasize this difference. Table 3 shows that while per capita expenditure on tickets indicates that cinemagoers in the southern cities spent significantly less annually than their northern compatriots, they also paid lower admission prices. Furthermore, statistics presented in the *Annuario dello Spettacolo* show that between 1952 and 1957 the growth in the number of cinemas was greater in the South than in the North, reducing the number of inhabitants per cinema in the three poorest provinces of Basilicata, Calabria, and Sicily from 9,585, 9,921, and 9,604 to 7,097, 7,851 and 6,697, respectively, compared to the national average of 5,253 in 1951 and 4,663 in 1957.²⁵ Thus, it would appear that filmgoing was an important social activity for all urban Italians, irrespective of where they lived. Moreover, the films that Italians were watching were by and large of recent vintage, with less than 10 percent of 1956 box-office revenue generated by films released in 1952 and before—an indicator that distributors followed the business practice of systematically removing from circulation films that had had wide circulation through the various runs in order to make room for films recently released.²⁶

From table 3 it is evident that Rome, with 250 permanent cinemas, was the largest urban market for films in Italy, boasting significantly more cinemas, ticket sales, and screening days than Milan.²⁷ Also, Romans went to the cinema on average more often than other Italian city populations—thirty-five times during 1956, compared to thirty-three in

Bologna, Milan, and Genoa. The city was also the center of the Italian film industry and home to production studios, film crews, distribution companies, and the multifarious services linked to cinema, such as casting, costume design, and dubbing. Not surprisingly, industry organizations such as ANICA (Associazione Nazionale Industrie Cinematografiche e Affini) and AGIS (Associazione Generale Italiana dello Spettacolo)—respectively the national associations of producers, and distributors and exhibitors—were also located in Rome, along with the editorial offices of the main film journals.²⁸

Cinemas in the major cities of Italy were divided into three tiers—termed *prima*, *seconda*, and *terza visione* (first, second and third run)—an economic arrangement that was formalized through the licensing arrangements of local authorities.²⁹ In this mode of operation, films were distributed in time and space from box-office rich (high price) cinemas located (usually) in city centers through various demarcated tiers of cinemas that charged lower admission prices and were generally less well accoutred.

*****INSERT TABLE 4 HERE*****

Annuario dello Spettacolo produced a number of tables detailing the distribution of ticket prices. In Italy in 1956, the mean cinema price was 147 lire.³⁰ Other than in Messina, table 3 shows that the mean price of cinema admission in the largest Italian cities was more than this, and in some cities markedly so. Table 4 reproduces aggregate ticket price information for twenty-eight cities (all with populations greater than 200,000) and for the Italian market as a whole, confirming that city dwellers paid more on average to go to the cinema: just below 60 percent of all Italian audiences paid 150 lire or less for admission, while 61 percent of inhabitants living in the big cities paid more. From table 4 it is clear that ticket prices varied considerably, with prices above 450 lire being the preserve of a tiny number of exclusive city cinemas. However, at the other end of the spectrum, it is interesting to note that in both the city and all Italian categories, most Italian cinemagoers paid in the

range of 101 to 150 lire. *****INSERT TABLE 5 HERE*****

We would expect first-run cinemas in Rome to be expensive in relation to other cinemas in Rome and, as shown in table 5, such is the case. Secondary evidence for this comes from the daily evening paper *Momento Sera*, which listed admission price ranges as well as location details and daily screening times. In Rome prices varied at the top end from 800 to 1000 lire charged by the cinema Barberini, to the 60 to 70 lire and 60 to 80 lire price ranges set respectively by the managements of the Lux and Centrale. In keeping with the model of how films were distributed through the various tiered submarkets, ticket prices show a strong negative correlation (-0.8) with the number of programs screened by cinemas on average each week, specifically, high prices with low turnover and low prices with high turnover. *****INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE*****

Table 5 presents a film programming profile of the cinemas of Rome, based upon the film programs of 130 cinemas listed daily in the Roman edition of the communist newspaper *l'Unità*. These were collected for twenty-eight screening days, from January 2 to 29, 1954. Of these cinemas, 114 had either complete records (or were missing one day) and are named in table 5. Between them they ran 1,539 film programs screening over eight hundred distinct features during the four weeks, always, it would seem, on single-bill programs.³¹ From table 5, it is apparent that different cinemas perform different roles. At the extremes, the very expensive Barberini and Capitol cinemas screened one film apiece for the duration: respectively *Pane, amore e fantasia* (1953) and *La Tunica* (The Robe, 1953), while three cinemas the Palazzo, Corallo, and ABC screened twenty-six films—more or less a separate film for every day of the week. The cinemas listed as having “up to one change” and “one to two changes” per week correspond with those listed as first-run (*prima visione*) cinemas in the newspapers *Il Tempo* and *Momento Sera*. The frequency distribution of film turnover is shown in figure 1. The velocity of film circulation is indeed astonishingly high, requiring a

highly effective industrial organization to schedule and then get the films to the cinemas.³² Of the 114 cinemas listed in table 5, seventy-five screened three or more films a week.

*****INSERT TABLE 6 HERE*****

Table 6 provides further evidence of the extensive nature of the system of distribution. It lists the twenty most frequently programmed films during the twenty-eight-day period, measured by the number of screening days. Clearly, at any point in time, films that have been newly released onto the market will coexist with films released earlier. Thus, in January 1954 three films were at the beginning of their circulation histories—*Pane, amore e fantasia* (1953), *Vacanze romane* (Roman Holiday, 1953), and *Storia di tre amori* (The Story of Three Loves, 1953). These films were screened at a small number of (first-run) cinemas on extended runs.³³ In contrast, nine of the twenty films listed were screened at twenty or more cinemas, having been released some months earlier. Clearly, this last group, while securing plentiful bookings, which can be assumed to indicate some measure of popularity among the audiences of the lower-order cinemas at which they played, only get a small number of days' bookings at each. Their day as main attractions had passed.

Table 6 should not be regarded as a popularity chart. For this it is possible to turn to the trade journal *Bollettino dello Spettacolo*, which published tables of box-office performance for many of the cities listed in table 2, drawn from first-run cinema sources.³⁴ Although the historical sequence of box-office records published for Rome is incomplete, the earnings of 115 films that premiered in Rome's first-run cinemas during the period leading up to and including January 1954 are published, and the top twenty can be found in table 7.

*****INSERT TABLE 7 HERE*****

Using this box-office information in conjunction with the online daily listings found in *l'Unità*, it has been possible to track the 115 films back to their release dates and discover the cinemas at which they were first screened. Table 7 shows that the top twenty ranking

films were premiered in one or more of twelve first-run cinemas found in the upper reaches of the listings in table 5. Of these films, *La Tunica* (The Robe) was the only film to premiere in a single cinema (Capitol). *Pane, amore e fantasia* opened at two cinemas, the Barberini and Metropolitan, *Vacanze romane* (Roman Holiday) opened at the Ariston and Fiamma, and *L'avventura di Peter Pan* (Peter Pan, 1953) and *I vitelloni* (1953) opened at the Capranica and Europa. Table 7 also shows that a number of the cinemas were used more frequently than others to screen the top twenty hit films, with the Capranica and Europa each aggregating one hundred days, the Barberini eighty days, the Metropolitan seventy-five days, and the Capitol seventy-three days. *****INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE*****

Another interesting aspect of table 7 is the diminishing rate at which film revenues decline with rank. Extending this observation to the 115 films listed in the *Bollettino dello Spettacolo*, figure 2 illustrates a pattern that conforms to a power rule, in which revenues decline precipitously at the top end of the spectrum but then flatten out along the range.³⁵ The pattern shown in figure 2 is similar to that found in studies of the North American, British, and Australian markets during the mid-1930s and the postwar North American market.³⁶

In keeping with table 2, tables 6 and 7 reveal that American and Italian productions shared the top end of the Roman market. Twelve Hollywood, seven Italian, and one French production appear in the top twenty. With the exception of *Roman Holiday* and *Wax Museum*, the films from Hollywood are period or costume pieces; all of them, other than *Roman Holiday*, can be regarded as big-budget spectacles. Only *Wax Museum* is set in contemporary America, and all of them are top-fifty US productions, with six of the films taking top-ten berths in the North American market.³⁷ This contrasts strongly with the Italian films listed, all of which have a contemporary setting, encompass tensions of everyday living, and are spoken in the vernacular. (Being shot on location in Rome, *Roman Holiday* has more in common

with these films.) None of the Italian films is listed as a top-ranking film in the United States, and most did not appear to get widespread release.

The strong showing of domestically produced genres and stars indicated in table 7 suggests that Italian films resonated deeply with Roman audiences, a finding that was confirmed in the survey, where the two most important deciding factors for going to the cinema were actors (174) and genre (155). It would appear that when established stars, such as Peppino De Filippo, Sophia Loren, Gina Lollobrigida, Anna Magnani, Amedeo Nazzari, Silvana Pampanini, Vittorio De Sica, Nino Taranto, and Totò appeared on the screen, domestic audiences were attracted in large numbers.³⁸

AUDIENCE MEMORIES OF THE CINEMA EXPERIENCE

The evidence presented in the previous section about the workings of cinema as a system of provision and the films that proved popular with Roman audiences was drawn from secondary sources. What about the voice of the cinemagoers themselves? What experiential and practical information can they impart to help us better understand the decision-making, expectations and pleasure that made up the everyday experience of going to the cinema? Our findings suggest a congruency between memory and function; of how cinema was remembered in conjunction with how it operated some fifty years earlier, with each set of evidence corroborating the other.

In 1954 most of our respondents were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. Many of them regularly attended the cinema, and convenience, time, opportunity, and location were important determining factors. When asked which day they went to the cinema, Sunday predominated (33 percent), followed by Saturday (14 percent). However, a significant proportion of participants (20 percent) recalled that they did not have a special day for attending and that they were just as likely to see films on weekdays. The selection of cinema venues shows those located in the neighborhoods in which the participants lived were

the most popular (mentioned by 36 percent of participants), compared to cinemas located in the city center (14 percent) and those in other neighborhoods (8 percent). When respondents were asked about which type of cinema they attended, this pattern is confirmed with only 23 percent maintaining they went to first-run cinemas, while 27 percent went to cinemas in the second run, 23 percent to the third run, and 27 percent to parish cinemas.³⁹

MEMORIES CONNTECTED TO THE CHOICE OF CINEMA

In a video diary, Giuseppina M. explains that her choice of cinema was determined by the interest she had in the film: if the film was attractive, she would go to the first run, while if she was not sure about its qualities, she would wait until it came around to the second run. For others, the first run meant watching films that had just come out (LAR036, LAR251), and one commented, “I knew the film was beautiful and had to watch it straight away” (LAR254). For Giuseppe V., “Third-run cinema was a ‘cinema popolare,’ with people from the area. It was not a category of cinema for poor people, but a habit. I mean that in the first run you would go occasionally when there was a very interesting film that you really wanted to see straight away.”

Multiple respondents recall the beauty of first-run theaters (LAR009, LAR042, LAR059, LAR076, LAR080, LAR089, LAR096, LAR136, LAR176), with big blue seats (LAR009), velvet chairs (LAR058), big and very red decor (LAR195), with a majestic entrance (LAR243, 266), oceanic, with an upper circle, which for one respondent was an environment that transcended reality (LAR029). These cinemas were clean and welcoming (LAR036), simple (LAR047), smoky (LAR046, LAR048, LAR054), elegant (LAR078, LAR111, LAR319), comfortable (LAR046, LAR133), with an open roof (LAR052, LAR057), a perfect sound system (LAR090, LAR196), a perfect view of the screen (LAR168), that was also well attended (*frequentato da bella gente*) (LAR133). Respondents

remembered velvet chairs (LAR 058) and armchairs (LAR105); one spoke of the Sala Umberto with seats and cushions so comfortable “that sometimes I used to go there to rest” (LAR159). Also mentioned was the layout of the cinemas, in the shape of a shell (LAR110), and also that they were clean and hygienic (LAR036, LAR186, LAR218, LAR214, LAR221, LAR305).

Described them as beautiful and big, second-run cinemas are likewise remembered with affection by some (LAR059, LAR069, LAR082, LAR084, LAR102, LAR127, LAR158, LAR162, LAR186, LAR218, LAR279, LAR298, LAR315, LAR323); patronized by elegant people (LAR068, LAR069, LAR111); comfortable and well attended (LAR133). One respondent (LAR028) made the following distinction: “The Rubino [third run] had wooden chairs, while the Reale [second run] was beautiful but you had to find a boyfriend who would take you there!”

In contrast, third-run cinemas are described as very simple and modest (LAR011, LAR152, LAR153) as well as uncomfortable with wooden chairs and a smoky atmosphere (LAR019, LAR048, LAR053, LAR054, LAR062, LAR070, LAR085, LAR087, LAR088, LAR110, LAR120, LAR129, LAR132, LAR135, LAR140, LAR146, LAR179, LAR192, LAR275). Some cinemas had a roof that could be opened on a hot evening, especially to get rid of the smoke (LAR057, LAR065, LAR098, LAR120, LAR139, LAR231, LAR299, LAR303). Indeed, Giuseppina M. names Il Massimo as a cinema where, during the intermission, the roof would open to expel the smoke.

MEMORIES CONNECTED TO THE LOCATIONS OF CINEMAS

Several interviewees confirm the wide range of cinemas available both in the center of the city and on the periphery. Angelo Z. remembers five theaters he could walk to in his own area, while Mirella F. mentions three, and Nandy P. simply states that there were many

cinemas in her neighborhood. Some neighborhood cinemas were considered the place to be seen on a Saturday night. Nandy P. describes it as a destination for the stroll (*lo struscio*), a practice normally associated with the main street where people gathered in their best clothes to spend time together as well as show off to each other. This level of familiarity with the locality represents a fundamental aspect in the cinema theater choice: looking at a local map, Giuseppina C. and Natalia M. explain that neighborhood cinemas served as a meeting place where everybody knew each other. There were “cinemas of your area, where people of your area would go, cinemas that no longer exist” (LAR100); one participant (LAR280) tells us that a particular cinema was just “a room very similar to one in a house,” another (LAR292) states that these cinemas were more like homes, while another (LAR296) draws parallels with her home, in that cinemas had the same wicker chairs as home, while another one describes them as big living rooms (LAR112).

In contrast to the legitimate theater, cinemas were busy and familiar venues, where people smoked (one participant LAR181 likened them to a gas chamber), ate (Giuliana DT., LAR016, LAR098, LAR110), and chatted (LAR030, LAR110), and venues where families and children would gather, offering many a sense of security and well-being (LAR134). For one participant they were places characterized by “lots of confusion and cheerfulness” (LAR146), corroborating Francesca Casetti and Mariagrazia Fanchi’s depiction of lower-order cinemas as “the natural extension of the road, the bar and the square,” their popularity often causing sections of the audience to watch entire films standing (LAR011, LAR039, LAR070, LAR075, LAR088, LAR103, LAR109, LAR110, LAR128, LAR129, LAR144, LAR145, LAR146, LAR168, LAR187, LAR191, LAR194, LAR279, LAR297).⁴⁰ They were friendly and welcoming (LAR041, LAR011, LAR036, LAR040, LAR045, LAR047, LAR118, LAR154, LAR250, LAR265, LAR304); noisy (LAR062, LAR115); and like a

market (LAR223); but they were also a fun place to be (LAR040, LAR146), where people would make jokes while watching the film (LAR101, LAR106).

However, these qualities were not recognized by all cinemagoers: according to Carla M., third-run cinemas were the most poorly attended, with noisy spectators and men who would often disturb women (Mirella, F., Albina), something that—according to Albina—would never happen at the Adriano, Metropolitan, or Barberini (first-run cinemas). They were cinemas where you often had to watch the whole film standing because they were so crowded (Mirella F.) and where people threw cigarette butts on the floor and shouted as if they were at the stadium (Rita M.). Albina explains that there was a significant difference between educated and uneducated audiences attending cinemas in various runs, while Velia states that she was able to distinguish between a suburban and city-center audience from their clothes as well as general behavior; city-center first-run cinemas attracted a more sophisticated and elegant crowd (Maria, Rita V.). Teresa R. explains the difference this way: “The *popolino* was always a bit shabbier. The bourgeois were easily identifiable, and the difference was obvious. As one would go to cinema on a Sunday after mass, one would normally be elegantly dressed. Where you paid higher prices, the difference was clear. In the third run, the audiences were more unruly and were often moving around, eating *mostaccioli* during the screening.”

Distance and price were the recurrent themes for second- and third-run cinema audiences. The cinemas they attended were close by (LAR019, LAR021, LAR053, LAR129, LAR285, LAR286, LAR304) and affordable—much cheaper than the first-run places (LAR051, LAR128, LAR152, LAR140, LAR146, LAR153, LAR167, LAR168, LAR187, LAR197, LAR214, LAR215, LAR217, LAR231, LAR270, LAR275, LAR283, LAR294, LAR318).⁴¹ One respondent maintained that first-run cinemas were those that an older person could afford (LAR031).

MEMORIES CONNECTED TO THE EXPERIENCE OF CINEMA

Although several participants remembered the technical presentation of films as sometimes poor, in that the film at times would break or the image would be out of focus (LAR063, LAR085, LAR086), this did not stop audiences from feeling that the cinema was a magical place: “a place outside of this world, magic” (LAR063), a “fascinating place which was not part of life and while I was sitting in the cinema I felt part of the film” (LAR113); a place where “every time I was in the cinema I was impressed by these images coming out of a big screen” (LAR097), or a “massive cinema with a screen that captured you” (LAR138).

MEMORIES CONNECTED TO THE INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATION OF CINEMA

Corroborating the velocity at which film programs changed in lower-order cinemas (see table 6), Giuseppe V. remembers: “Third-run cinemas would show a film only for a few days, not like today, as they were neighborhood cinemas and needed to change the programming as otherwise they would run out of audiences. Also there was the story of the film reels which often had to be exchanged amongst cinemas in the neighborhood, so while one cinema was showing the first part, the other would be showing the second.” Giuseppe V. also reminds us of the differences in patterns of film distribution between then and now: “nowadays it is all first run, and if you miss a film after a month that has come out, you can’t see it again ... At the time a film would be programmed for a year, as it would move from first to second and third run.” For lower-order cinemagoers, waiting for a popular film to get to a neighborhood cinema required patience. Carla M. testifies that the success of a film determined the speed at which it would move to lower runs: if it was not very popular, you could see it very quickly; however, if this was not the case, then you had to wait for a long time. Giuliana DT. explains

a further advantage to the extended life of a movie as it was distributed over time across the different runs: “The fact that the films would stay on for a long time allowed you first of all to listen to the film review and being attracted to them, as well as the fact that you could watch them flexibly—you could be late, watch it a second time, and feel welcomed in the movie theaters.” On this point Angelo DT. remembers that once you had paid for a ticket you could stay in the cinema for the rest of the day. Maria Rita V. confirms this practice when saying that not only could you watch it at whatever time you desired, you could watch the same scene more than once, so you could spend the afternoon there.

Another aspect of exhibition was the tradition of showing some films at specific points in the calendar. Angelo DT. remembers how *La Tunica* (The Robe) and *Quo Vadis?*—listed respectively first and fourth in table 7—were “classics and that you could not pass Easter without seeing.” Their characters were the “superheroes of those times.” Nandy P. confirms this by explaining that this strategy allowed people who had not yet seen them to watch them for the first time, while those who had seen them before could see them again.

In addition to those cinemas classified as first, second and third run, was another set comprising half a dozen or so cinemas that were collectively known as Cinema Varietà, combining stage acts with film screenings. These cinemas tended to have multiple changes of film programs during the week, screening films after they had been through both first- and second-run cinemas. Listed in table 5, the cinemas Alhambra, Ambra Jovinelli, Aurora, La Fenice, Il Principe, and Volturmo all served as Cinema Varietà. For Giuseppe V. this was a strategy adopted by some exhibitors “in order to attract larger audiences.” Angelo DT., in fact, remembers how at the Alambra he saw Totò performing onstage. Rita M. remembers Totò, as well as Nino Taranto appearing at Il Principe, where her mother would take her with friends in the afternoon. Mirella F. also remembers seeing Totò, and on separate occasions Anna Magnani, and Alberto Rabbagliati at the cinema Appio (listed by *Il Tempo* as second

run); while Anna N. assures us that the variety shows at the Fenice and Volturno were not really outrageous, as they only presented a few “legs moving across the stage.”

Interestingly, with the threat posed by the arrival of television, some exhibitors took action to ensure that the new medium did not steal audiences from them.⁴² For instance, Natalia M., remembers how those people who could not afford television would go to the cinema on Thursday evenings—the Tuscolo cinema did this—when the highly popular TV quiz show *Lascia e Raddoppia* (Double or Nothing) was scheduled for broadcast, causing the main feature to be interrupted in order for the TV program to be shown. This interesting artefact ties in with the earlier discussion of table 7 concerning the films being made by Italian producers about everyday life.

Finally, Mirella F. remarked on her experience working at the Roman offices of the distribution arm of Twentieth Century-Fox, drawing attention to strong links between audiences and industry that prevailed in the city. In one revealing passage in her interview, she tells of how her employer required local employees to generate interest by word-of-mouth:

There was a small projection room near the office, and before a film was premiered, all employees had to watch it and were asked to publicize it, to say that the film was beautiful and that we had already seen it. So we were the ones who would start the marketing process. And we were happy to do it because—apart from a good salary—we received a bonus when a film came out, it could be a fourteenth or the fifteenth annual salary according to which film was premiered. We would publicize the film, and watching it earlier than everybody else, we would get excited about it!

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This work incorporates two mutually reinforcing methodologies with the purpose of producing a bottom-up account of cinemagoing as a social activity. The oral history

component recounts the memories of elderly Romans who were active cinemagoers in the 1950s. These memories are emotional, experiential, and practical in nature, comprising recollections of location, space, design, comfort, noise, smell, crowds, proximity, intimacy, food, movement, light, and darkness, often occasioned by important personal events such as first dating. Going to the cinema for our participants took the form of repeated rituals that became part of their “shared histories,” a process that Fanchi has termed the “space of vision” (*spazio di visione*).⁴³ Their memories reflect Martin Barker’s concern about “what spaces and traditions are available to people and how ... these shape and enable participation.”⁴⁴ If, as Laura Marks asserts, “sense memories are most fragile to transport, yet most evocative when they can be recovered,” the testimonies offered by our participants help us get a fuller picture of what going to the cinema meant for their contemporaries.⁴⁵

Drawing upon newspaper program listings, and supported by secondary data produced by industry-wide bodies, a second methodology places the reported experiences of our participants in a framework of industrial provision. From the evidence presented in tables 6 and 7 and figure 2, it is clear that audiences made choices between films, the consequence of which was that those films that proved more popular were given greater distribution. From this type of evidence, it is difficult to get away from the idea that films were important to audiences in their own right. Yet, problematically, in the interviews, questionnaires, and diaries, our elderly Roman participants rarely mention the films that they went to see. For instance, Renata I. is frustrated when she admits to not remembering what films she saw during the period, while she remembered the cinemas she attended. Carla M. is similarly disappointed, and although Teresa R. states that “we used to go to the cinemas and choose the films,” in her diary entry the cinemas are recounted while the films are not. Such evidence supports Richard Maltby’s claim that “the primary relationship with the ‘cinema’ has not been with individual movies-as-artefacts or as texts, but with the social experience of

cinema,” a view in keeping with Robert Allen’s conception of film performance based on the “immediate social, sensory, performative context of reception” and Christine Geraghty’s assertion that “gazing at the screen was only one of a number of things which could be done in the cinema.”⁴⁶ Here, Roland Barthes’s well-known distinction between what he terms a “narcissistic body” and a “perverse body” is fitting.⁴⁷

Our elderly Romans remember clearly the noise and smells of going to the cinema (the noise from the auditorium, where “people would make jokes while watching the film,” turning the cinema into a market or a stadium); the boundaries of space (first-, second- and third-run cinemas, lower and upper circles, the closeness of obscure bodies); the darkness of the theater; and the ebb and flow of audiences coming and going.

Is it the nature of memory that provides the key to understanding the conundrum that films seem to matter, at least to a section of the audience, but are not much remembered? Here Katherine Nelson’s distinction between generic event memory (such as going to the cinema) that provides general outlines of a familiar event, without specific information of the event itself (whether it is the date, the time, or the title of a film), and episodic memory, which is triggered when it is part of a personal history, is perhaps pertinent.⁴⁸ For instance, in her video diary, Carla M. remembers watching Walt Disney’s *Fantasia* (1940) because it was the first and only time she went to the cinema with her mother. She remembers it as a special occasion, and she refers to parts of the film that stuck in her mind. However, for the most part cinemagoing was a repetitious activity, and, in general, the films seen were not sufficiently memorable enough to distinguish.

In developing this research, the authors are mindful of Alessandro Portelli’s stricture that “oral history is about the historical significance of personal experience on the one hand, and the personal impact of historical matters on the other.”⁴⁹ In allowing film audiences to speak for themselves “through the labour of memory and the filter of language,” it has been

possible to sense their particular collective experience of going to the cinema in 1950s Rome. At the same time, the audiences give form to the institutional arrangements that made that experience possible and provide evidence of the films that were particularly attractive to audiences at the time.⁵⁰ The mixed-methods approach adopted here has allowed what Nigel Fielding has termed “convergent validation” to take place, making the findings derived from each method deeper than would have been the case had a single-method approach been used.⁵¹ The fact that box-office and film-programming data lend themselves to a narrative about choice and preferences that appears to be at odds with what is remembered suggests that as a general rule the specific “narcissistic” experience of seeing films may be transient.⁵² Nevertheless, films were ultimately why people went to the cinema, and we shouldn’t lose sight of this.

Finally, this case study about the film business and audiences of Rome is part of a broader mixed-methods project that studies the experiences of audiences and the business structures that supplied them with films throughout the Italian peninsula during the 1950s. Investigating distributive circuits and exhibitor chains by means of the films released and their exhibition histories is still an underdeveloped area of study, revealing as it does a great deal about the international alliances formed between Hollywood distributors and local groupings of exhibitors in competition with indigenous producers, distributors, and exhibitors: an essential backdrop for understanding the different aspects of film reception. Putting the film at the center of a study in which complex industrial practices and box-office outcomes are contextualized by the experiences of filmgoers is at the heart of this national study.

Notes

¹ This share was similar to that absorbed by cinema in the American and British markets at this time. See H. E. Browning and A. A. Sorrell, “Cinema and Cinema-Going in Great Britain,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 117 (1954): 133–65; and John Sedgwick, “Product Differentiation at the Movies: Hollywood, 1946 to 65,” *Journal of Economic History* 62, no. 3 (2002): 676–705.

² Elena Mosconi, “L’offerta, il consumo e la produzione di cinema nell’Italia anni Cinquanta,” *Comunicazioni sociali* 17, no. 2–3 (April–September 1995): 332.

³ Browning and Sorrell, in “Cinema and Cinema-Going in Great Britain,” derive their data from a report published by UNESCO in 1952, *Basic Facts and Figures*. Also see *Vent’anni di Anica per il cinema italiano, 1944–1964* (Rome: Anica, 1965).

⁴ See, for instance, Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe since 1945* (London: Pimlico, 2007), 231–35; Richard Pells, *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture since World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 1997); Richard Pells, “American Culture Abroad: The European Experience since 1945,” in *American Mass Culture in Europe*, ed. R. Kroes, R. W. Rydell, and D. F. J. Bosscher (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1993), 67–83; Giuliana Muscio, “Invasion and Counterattack,” in “*Here, There and Everywhere*”: *The Foreign Politics of American Popular Culture*, ed. R. Wagnleitner, and E. Tayler May (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2000), 116–31.

⁵ See Daniela Treveri Gennari, “A Regional Charm: Italian Comedy versus Hollywood,” *October* 128 (Spring 2009): 51–68.

⁶ Barbara Corsi, *Con qualche dollaro in meno: Storia economica del cinema italiano* (Rome: Editori Riuniti, 2001), 107; Barbara Corsi, “Il pubblico, un gigante sconosciuto,” in *Storia del cinema italiano*, vol. 9, 1954–1959, ed. Sandro Bernardi (Venice: Marsilio Editori, 2004), 442–60, 445.

⁷ The survey of and interviews with elderly Romans were made possible by a British Academy Mid-Career Fellowship awarded to Daniela Treveri Gennari in 2011.

⁸ Martin Barker and Ernest Mathijs, eds., *Watching Lord of the Rings: Tolkien's World Audiences* (New York: Peter Lang, 2008); Daniel Biltereyst, Kathleen Lotze, and Philippe Meers, "Triangulation in Historical Audience Research: Reflections and Experiences from a Multi-Methodological Research Project on Cinema Audiences in Flanders," *Particip@tions* 9, no. 2 (November 2012): 690–715.

⁹ Evidence presented in table 3 suggests that the major cities in Italy had similarly developed distribution and exhibition systems.

¹⁰ This finding also differs from that proffered by Paola Valentini, *La scena rubata: Il cinema italiano e lo spettacolo popolare (1924–1954)* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2002), 114. On "mercato di profondità," see Alessandro Ferraù, "Rapporto tra gli incassi delle prime visioni di 16 città capozona e il resto del mercato nazionale," *Cinespettacolo*, January 30, 1956, 1–2.

¹¹ Annette Kuhn, *An Everyday Magic: Cinema and Cultural Memory* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2002), 35.

¹² Douglass North, *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990). For a discussion on this, see John Sedgwick, Clara Pafort-Overduin, and Jaap Boter, "Explanations for the Restrained Development of the Dutch Cinema Market in the 1930s," *Enterprise and Society* 13, no. 3 (2012): 634–71.

¹³ Catherine Jurca and John Sedgwick found that during the 1930s, Philadelphia audiences attending third- and fourth-run cinemas had their favorites every bit as much as those attending first-run houses. See Jurca and Sedgwick, "The Film's the Thing: Moviegoing in Philadelphia, 1935–36," *Film History* 26, no. 4 (2014): 58–83,

¹⁴ For detailed historical analysis based upon film programs, see John Sedgwick and Michael Pokorny, "The Film Business in the U.S. and Britain during the 1930s," *Economic History*

Review 58 (2005): 79–112; Sedgwick, Pafort-Overduin, and Boter, “Explanations for the Restrained Development of the Dutch Cinema Market in the 1930s”; John Sedgwick, Michael Pokorny, and Peter Miskell, “Hollywood in the World Market—Evidence from Australia in the mid-1930s,” *Business History* 56, no.5 (2014): 689–723.

¹⁵ Questionnaires were given out and collected by the principal investigator (PI) of the research project and by a research assistant (RA).

¹⁶ *L’Unità*, Archivio Storico, <http://archivio.unita.it/>.

¹⁷ The trade journal exhibitors’ organization, AGIS, produced a biweekly publication *Bollettino dello Spettacolo* in which box-office returns of first-run cinemas in the largest Italian cities were published. The entries for Rome were sporadic. The twenty-eight days between January 2 and 29 were selected because they were included in the most comprehensive listing of Roman cinemas to appear in the journal in 1953 and 1954, making it possible to cross-reference the frequency of screenings in Rome and the box-office returns of the films screened.

¹⁸ Corsi, *Con qualche dollaro in meno*, 117–18. There were several films that became very successful in first-run cinemas, and there were also several films that—thanks to their success in first-run cinemas—were able to find a *mercato di profondità*’ linked to the box-office profit of first-run cinemas. See Alessandro Ferraù, “Un anno di ‘prime visioni,’” *Borsa Film*, no. 41 (August 1, 1959).

¹⁹ Alessandro Ferraù, “Rapporto tra gli incassi delle prime visioni di 16 città capozona e il resto del mercato nazionale,” *Cinespettacolo*, January 1–30, 1956, 1–2.

²⁰ Peter Miskell and Marina Nicoli (unpublished monograph).

²¹ Daniela Treveri Gennari, *Post-War Italian Cinema: American Intervention, Vatican Interests* (New York: Routledge, 2009). In 1954 there were around four thousand parish cinemas in Italy, 1875 of which were able to screen feature-length films. See Mariagrazia

Fanchi, “Non censurare ma educare! L’ esercizio cinematografico cattolico e il suo progetto culturale e sociale,” in *Attraverso lo schermo: Cinema e cultura cattolica in Italia*, ed. R. Eugeni, and D. Viganò (Rome: Ente dello Spettacolo, 2006), 106.

²² Ruth Vasey, *The World According to Hollywood, 1918–1939* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1997), 92

²³ On widescreen display of films, see J. Belton, *Widescreen Cinema* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992). For the attraction of this format in Italy, see Federico Vitella, “Una questione di standard: Il passaggio dall’ Academy ai formati panoramici,” in *Geometrie dello sguardo: Contributi allo studio dei formati nel cinema italiano*, ed. Federico Vitella and Luca Mazzei (Roma: Carocci, 2007), 65–130, 78–81.

²⁴ M. Siniscalco, “Settecento milioni di spettatori,” *Rassegna del Film* 1, no. 8 (1952): 26; see also Mariagrazia Fanchi “Non censurare ma educare!,” 107.

²⁵ Società Italiana degli Autori ed Editori (SIAE), *Annuario dello Spettacolo*, 1957, table 45.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, table 56.

²⁷ How this figure is arrived at is not explained and may well include approximately thirty open-air cinemas (mainly operating during the summer months) and over fifty parish cinemas.

²⁸ Daniela Treveri Gennari, “‘If You Have Seen It, You Cannot Forget!’: Film Consumption and Memories of Cinema-Going in 1950s Rome,” *Historical Journal of Film Radio and Television* 35, no. 1 (2015): 53–74.

²⁹ The *Bollettino dello Spettacolo* lists the earnings of films in each of the three runs for Rome and Milan. Box office in other cities is restricted to first run. A better source of information on this subject is to be found in the city editions of national newspapers and, of course, local newspapers.

³⁰ SIAE, *Annuario dello Spettacolo* (1957), table 26.

³¹ Cinemas that have incomplete exhibition records or are closed for more than two days during January 1954 have been excluded from the analysis.

³² Effective, but not necessarily sophisticated. Later in the paper, one diarist (Giuseppe V.) recalls reels of films being transported from one cinema to another during the course of a screening.

³³ The most popular film screened in Rome, *La tunica* (The Robe), released in December 1953, is not listed in table 6 because it was screened at just one cinema, amassing only twenty-eight playing days.

³⁴ Milan is an exception, with listings drawn from first-, second-, and third-run cinemas.

³⁵ A. De Vany, and W. Walls, “Bose-Einstein Dynamics and Adaptive Contracting in the Motion Picture Industry,” *Economic Journal* 106 (1996): 1493–1514.

³⁶ Sedgwick and Pokorny, “Product Differentiation at the Movies”; Sedgwick, Pokorny, and Miskell, “Hollywood in the World Market”; Sedgwick, “Product Differentiation at the Movies: Hollywood, 1946 to 65.”

³⁷ Titles of top-ranking films in the United States are obtained from *Variety*’s annual presentation of top-grossing films found in one of the January editions of the trade journal. See Sedgwick, “Product Differentiation at the Movies.”

³⁸ See the discussion in Federico Villa, “Consumo cinematografico e identità italiana,” in *Spettatori: Forme di consumo e pubblici del cinema in Italia, 1930-1960*, ed. Mariagrazia Fanchi and Elena Mosconi (Rome: Bianco & Nero, 2002), 189–203, 194–97.

³⁹ These numbers add up to more than 325 because respondents were given more than one choice. For an account of social class and the type of cinema audiences attended, see Corsi, “Il pubblico, un gigante sconosciuto,” 446.

⁴⁰ Francesco Casetti and Mariagrazia Fanchi, “Le funzioni sociali del cinema e dei media: Dati statistici, ricerche sull’*audience* e storia del consumo,” in *Spettatori*, ed. Fanchi and Mosconi, 135–71, 154.

⁴¹ On the subject of cinemas within walking distance of home, see Kuhn, *An Everyday Magic*, 34.

⁴² Paola Valentini, *La scena rubata: Il cinema italiano e lo spettacolo popolare (1924–1954)* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2002), 96.

⁴³ Katherine Nelson, “The Psychological and Social Origin of Autobiographical Memory,” *Psychological Science* 4, no. 1 (1993): 13; Mariagrazia Fanchi, *Spettatore* (Milano: Editrice Il Castoro, 2005), 17.

⁴⁴ Martin Barker, “Crossing Out the Audiences,” in *Audiences: Defining and Researching Screen Entertainment Reception*, ed. Ian Christie (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012), 190.

⁴⁵ Laura Marks, *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), 111.

⁴⁶ Richard Maltby, “On the Prospect of Writing Cinema History from Below,” *Tijdschrift Voor Mediageschiedenis* 9 no. 2 (2006): 85; Robert Allen, “From Exhibition to Reception: Reflections on the Audience in Film History,” *Screen* 31, no. 4 (1990): 352; Christine Geraghty, “Cinema as a Social Space: Understanding Cinema-Going in Britain, 1947–63,” *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media* (2000), accessed November 26, 2013, <http://www.frameworkonline.com/Issue42/42cg.html>.

⁴⁷ Roland Barthes, *The Rustle of Language* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1987), 349.

⁴⁸ Katherine Nelson, “The Psychological and Social Origin of Autobiographical Memory,” *Psychological Science* 4, no. 1 (1993): 7.

⁴⁹ Alessandro Portelli, “A Dialogical Relationship: An Approach to Oral History,” accessed October 23, 2013, http://www.swaraj.org/shikshantar/expressions_portelli.pdf.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Nigel Fielding, “Triangulation and Mixed Methods Designs: Data Integration with New Research Technologies,” *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 6, no. 2 (2012): 127.

⁵² F. J. Shih, “Triangulation in Nursing Research,” *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 28 (1998): 633.