

Who Gets to Take Home That Shiny Symbol of Prestige at the International Film Festival

Titia van Ree, 436706

MA Arts, Culture and Society

Master Thesis, CC4008/CC4050

Supervisor: Michael Berghman

Erasmus University Rotterdam

22-05-2017

Words: 25,634

Who Gets to Take Home That Shiny Symbol of Prestige at the International Film Festival

ABSTRACT

Audiences are important in the success of films, they can make or break a film. However, audiences differ in their levels of cultural capital, and consequentially in their position within the fields of cultural production, tastes, habitus, judgements standards and legitimacy. They assign different kinds of recognition (popular, professional, and critical) and add different kinds of value (economic or symbolic capital) to filmmakers and their films. The interest of this thesis is the assigning of professional recognition through prestigious prizes at international film festivals, and researching what attributes these award winning films possess. This research then contributes to filling up a gap left in previous studies, and gaining a better understanding of professional recognition, international film festivals and prestige. The aim of this research resulted in the following research question: *Looking at several international film festivals—their award winners and nominees—from 1996 to 2016, how do cast and content related attributes influence or contribute to the chances of winning the award for best film at these prestigious cultural events?* A quantitative approach was used to study the award winners and nominees over a period of twenty years at the three most prestigious international film festivals: Berlin, Cannes and Venice. The theoretical background already provided some research expectations, based on (logics of) the field of films and the position film festivals take therein. Film festivals position themselves as (crucial) authoritative institution within the field of films as art, which assigns (symbolic) value to films and filmmakers. Therefore, the award winning attributes should match with the characteristics that make an art film. The data was gathered using online databases, and analysed in SPSS. The results showed that juries of professional recognition indeed use aesthetic judgements standards that fit with the logics of the field of art films. Directors who (co)wrote the script and the artistic reputations of the directors and writers had a positive effect on the odds of winning. Only actors seemed excluded from these logics, where their star power and name recognition through economic reputations have more effect on the odds of winning. Experience also had either no effect or a negative effect on the odds of winning, reflecting that status does take precedence. In relation to content, dramas, R-ratings, and true stories had a positive effect on the odds of winning. Whereas adaptations, runtime, and budget had no effect on the odds of winning. Overall, attributes that fit with the concept of the auteur, artistic reputations, and attributes that signal artistic, unique, novel, innovative, meaningful and significant content have a positive effect on the odds of winning. These finding then implicate that film festivals are indeed positioned in the (autonomous) field of restricted production, focussing on films as art, symbolic capital and recognizing artistic achievements. Consequently, they are crucial institutions, contributing to maintaining the cultural position of art films, and the valorisation and consecration of films and filmmakers. They are a gateway to cultural legitimization.

KEYWORDS: *Prestige, international film festivals, professional recognition, prizes, artistic attributes*

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Theoretical Framework	6
2.1	Films and Fields	6
2.1.1	The Field of Film	6
2.1.2	Legitimate Recognition.....	9
2.1.3.	Prizes	11
2.2	International Film Festivals	13
2.2.1.	Film Festival Origins.....	14
2.2.2.	Film Festival Practices.....	16
2.3	Artistic Attributes	19
2.3.1.	The Art of the Festival Film.....	19
2.3.2.	The Auteur(s).....	22
2.3.3.	Content.....	24
3.	Method.....	28
3.1	Research Design	28
3.2	The Sample and Data Collection.....	29
3.3	Operationalization.....	31
3.4.	Analysis.....	35
4.	Results.....	36
4.1	Analysis and Results	36
4.1.1.	Cast	36
4.1.2.	Content	42
4.1.3.	Cast and Content	47
5.	Conclusion.....	52
	References	57
	Appendix	62
	Appendix A: Films, Festival winners	62
	Appendix B: Films, Festival Nominees.....	65
	Appendix C: List of industry awards used for data gathering	68
	Appendix D: Frequency tables, cast variables.....	69
	Appendix E: Frequency tables, content variables	71

1. Introduction

A film festival takes place every day somewhere around the world (De Valck, 2007). Right now—at the time of writing this, that is—Cannes is in full swing, with frequent updates about all the glitter, glamour, and stars as well as reviews of the latest movies screened. However, the big question is, of course, who will get to take home that grand prize, the prestigious Palm D’Or? Which filmmaker will get this symbol of cinematic excellence, and be crowned the filmmaker of Cannes 2017? Yet, should we perhaps also be asking a different question, why? That is, as a cultural medium, films are one of wide variety. Films have something to offer for all types of audiences, while not all types of audiences like all or even similar types of films. It would perhaps not be an overstatement to say that many films that have won a Palm D’Or, or another prestigious prize at other film festivals, might not be the type of films that find many audiences. Admittedly, other audiences might decide to watch the film because it won the Palm D’or, this stamp of artistic excellence signalling that the movie is worth their time. Still, different audiences might thus search for different attributes in films, and/or appreciate films differently. Hence, the question why? What do these films have that make them so successful at international film festivals? That a jury of filmmaking peers decides to bestow the prestigious main prize on this one film, over (at least) 20 other films that made the festival cut as well as many other that did not? Thus, the interest of this research is film and prestige, as well as how the appreciation of film attributes might differ among various types of audiences. More specifically, the area of interest is the assigning of professional recognition through prestigious prizes found at international film festivals¹. An area of study that has been generally untouched so far. The next paragraphs will provide some background to this research and its relevance, before discussing the research question and outline the rest of this thesis.

Film is a cultural genre that enjoys widespread popularity, and has a lot of cultural influence in the daily lives of people. It makes up a large eight billion dollar industry, containing a wide variety of film (sub-)genres and styles (Kersten, 2005; Terry et al., 2005). Despite its popularity, however, as a cultural industry it is subject to a high amount of demand uncertainty. Nobody knows what will actually make a hit (or not) and a few major box-office hits often make up for a majority of flukes (e.g. De Vany & Walls, 1999). As soon as a film leaves its production stage and goes into distribution it is up to the audience, they decide its fate and anything can happen. They can make a film a success, or a bomb (De Vany & Walls, 1999). Audiences who might vary in their tastes, and whose choices are difficult to predict and control. Add to this that the film industry is one where both economic and artistic success exist (Terry et al., 2005), a distinction that is the result of historical and social shifts

¹ “International film festivals” and “film festivals” are used interchangeably throughout this thesis, both referring to international film festivals.

within the field of film. This resulted in the belief that films could be seen as art rather than just strictly being commercial entertainment (e.g. Baumann, 2007), and where success can thus be measured along two different dimensions: market performance and artistic excellence (e.g. Delmestri et al., 2005; Holbrook & Addis, 2008). Success in one dimension also does not necessarily mean success in the other. What makes it even more difficult is that success in either dimension is the result of general film attributes such as cast and content, but where these are attributes perceived and appreciated differently along these two dimensions. These seemingly simple attributes influence the classification (as art or commercial entertainment), the judgement, and the (consequential) success of films among audiences. Still, despite the difficulty of predicting performance due to the dual nature of films and the uncertainty of audience reception, (predicting) film success has remained an area of study for many researchers (e.g. Chang & Ki, 2005; Simonton, 2009). Ultimately, knowing what might improve the performance or success of a film is not just important to this large industry (and its profits), but also for the filmmakers and their films who wish to survive and perhaps even thrive in this industry (be it by gaining economic or artistic success).

Thus, in this industry success is an elusive concept that is not easily attained, mainly because in the end audiences seem to hold most of the power in making a film successful or not. A power that also differs among different types of audiences. That is, popular (mainstream), professional (peers) and critic audiences. All three of these actors are central in the classification and valorisation of films. They might appreciate or perceive films (and their attributes) differently due to differences in their cultural capital, and consequently in their positions, tastes, dispositions (or habitus) and legitimacy. Their recognition then also results in different levels of added value and success for a film (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Kersten, 2012). In brief, popular recognition often adds economic value (economic capital, measured by market success), while professional and critical recognition often add honour and prestige (symbolic capital, signalling artistic recognition and excellence) (e.g. Kersten, 2012).

This brings us to films and prestige. Value is not intrinsic to cultural products, but is assigned (Kersten, 2012). In the film industry a film's mainstream success—i.e. popular recognition—might easily be glanced from its box-office revenues and general popularity. Whereas critical recognition includes critic ratings and the inclusion in lists such as the best movies of all time. However, professional recognition is perhaps something more distinct, tied to peer votes and award ceremonies—one more prestigious than the next—where only few films can be nominated and only one can win. Here the added value is prestige. Prestige is the “respect and admiration given to someone or something, usually because of a reputation for high quality, success, or social influence” (Prestige, n.d.). Furthermore, this value is a (culturally) symbolic one. Symbolic capital can be found

in honours, acclaim, nominations and prizes, and is assigned by specialist audiences such as experts (i.e. critics) and other professionals (i.e. peers) in the field (Kersten, 2012). Especially professional recognition has taken the form of various prizes. The large proliferation of award ceremonies and prestigious prizes that has taken place has only increased their importance as objects of prestige and tools for measuring cultural value (of both films and filmmakers) (English, 2005), as well as adding value to the genre of film as a whole (e.g. Baumann, 2001; Kersten, 2012). Furthermore, prizes are a signal of quality (for audiences) that is especially important in the (experience-based) cultural industries, and are able to launch and sustain the careers of (aspiring) filmmakers (e.g. Gemser et al., 2007). Thus, film and prestige provide an interesting and relevant area for further research. The aim of this research is to find out what qualities or attributes these films might possess that result in prestigious prizes. Furthermore, by looking at international film festivals this research fills-up a gap in the study of film success.

Despite the difficulty of predicting the possible performance of a film, there has not been a lack of trying. Yet, a lot of previous research has focussed on success factors for (predicting) popular recognition (e.g. Basuroy et al., 2003; Chang & Ki, 2005; Terry et al., 2005), and critical recognition (e.g. Delmestri et al., 2005; Simonton, 2009). While research on professional recognition has mainly touched upon the Oscars (e.g. Holbrook & Addis, 2008; Pardoe & Simonton, 2008; Simonton, 2002, 2009), leaving a wider or more global field of professional recognition untouched until now. The Oscars might indeed prove an important—or perhaps a rather well-known—source of professional recognition, their awards ceremony drawing millions of viewers worldwide (Simonton, 2011). Yet, at the same time this popular (or commercial) global reach of the Oscars does seem to go against this prestigious position of films as art rather than commercial products, where film festival seem more at home in this position. Ideally film festivals are associated more with art films, while the Oscars are seen as a (more commercial) Hollywood phenomenon (De Valck, 2007; Gemser et al., 2007). Albeit that this latter perception should not be oversimplified, film festivals do take a (indispensable) distinct position as a more (prestigious) international and art focused platform of professional recognition. They honour and add prestige to films that differ from those found at the Oscars as well as act as a more global platform for cultural exchange (e.g. De Valck, 2007; De Valck & Soeteman, 2010). In brief, both the Oscars and international film festivals such as Cannes are important and well-known sources of professional recognition, but the focus on mainly the Oscars thus far has left a gap in the study of professional recognition and prestige.

International film festivals play an important role in the global film industry, and provide an area where the assigning of prestige—the award winning films—has not been structurally researched. Previous research has looked at film festivals in general, their history, developments,

institution, networks, practices and meaning (e.g. De Valck, 2007; Elsaesser, 2005; Evans, 2007; Wong, 2011), as well as what happens behind the scenes (De Valck & Soeteman, 2010). However, there has been no research yet into what films win the prizes at international film festivals, and what attributes these award winning films possess. International film festivals are a powerful instrument or institution of cultural legitimization. They serve as, among other things, gatekeepers, tastemakers, and assigners of value (e.g. Czach, 2004; De Valck, 2007; Elsaesser, 2005; Wong, 2011). The prestige produced and circulated through international film festivals is a sort of symbolic capital or currency that constitutes a global, legitimate and credible form of prestige as it is assigned by a recognized institutional mechanism (English, 2005). Thus, international film festivals provide an interesting area to study this phenomenon of film and prestige in a wider, more global, distinct and highly influential context. This research then also contributes in filling a gap in the study of international film festivals.

The relevance of this research is thus found in the dynamics of the film industry and field itself where the various forms of audience recognition and capital (or added value) play an especially important role, and where a gap exists in earlier studies. The aim of this research is to fill-up this gap and contribute to a better understanding of professional recognition, international film festivals, and prestige. The focus is on the (statistical) analysis of film attributes—related to cast and content—among festival award winners and nominees, researching what attributes result in films winning the prestigious main prize at international film festivals (and why). The main research question is: *Looking at several international film festivals—their award winners and nominees—from 1996 to 2016, how do cast and content related attributes influence or contribute to the chances of winning the award for best film at these prestigious cultural events?* Furthermore, two sub-questions have been set-up to allow for a better analysis of the two relevant areas—cast and content—and their corresponding attributes (or variables). The first sub-question is related to the cast: *How do central or core cast members—directors, screenwriters, and actors—influence the chances of winning?* The second sub-question is related to the content attributes: *How do the content attributes of genre, MPAA-rating, true stories, adaptations, runtime and budget influence the chances of winning?*

The outline of this thesis is as follows: The next chapter is the theoretical framework, which will discuss the theories, concepts and previous studies relevant for this research. This chapter starts with a more general look at the field of film, types of recognition and prizes. This is followed by looking more concretely at international film festivals, including their position in the field, importance and roles. This chapter ends with looking more deeply into the relevant film attributes. The theoretical chapter is followed by the methods chapter. A quantitative research approach is used to study the award winners and nominees (over a period of twenty years) at three of the largest, most prestigious international film festivals—Berlin, Cannes, and Venice. The data will be

gathered using several online databases such as IMDB and the film festival websites, and analysed using logistic regression in SPSS. The results chapter will discuss the specific steps in building the models with the independent variables as well as the findings of the analysis, and answer the research sub-questions. In the final chapter the main research question will be answered leading to the final conclusion of this research, as well as discussing the limitations and possibilities for future research.

2. Theoretical Framework

This chapter is divided into three main parts. The first part will discuss the broader field of film. This starts with conceptualizing the field of film and how certain films gained the opportunity to be called art. While strict distinctions between art versus commercial films might be blurring (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012), this section does provide some background into the field of film today as well as the perception and appreciation of films. This is followed by taking a look at the relevant agents in the field of film and the various types of recognition that these agents assign in accordance to the logics of the field, which contributes to the valorisation of (various types of) films (e.g. Allen & Lincoln, 2004). Yet, prizes (can) serve as perhaps the highest form of recognition that field agents can assign. Therefore, the last section will elaborate on the meaning and roles of prizes as a tool in the economy of prestige (e.g. English, 2005). Part two will then go deeper into these concepts in relation to international film festivals. This will look at the origins of film festivals and how they came to take a central position in the field and global industry of film, followed by taking a more specific look at their importance and various functions. Having provided some insight into what films might be seen and awarded at film festivals through the guiding logics of the overall field within which films and film festivals exist, the third part will take a closer look at what attributes are important for the evaluation of films (at film festivals). First, a general overview of the distinction between film types that (ideally) represent either art or commercial entertainment will be given, and also relate this to festival films. Next, a deeper look at the role of the auteur and other cast members will be taken, who on the one hand provide creative input and on the other hand contribute to evaluation practices of films. Finally, the characteristics or attributes that shape film content will be discussed, providing some insight into what content characteristics award winning films at international film festivals might possess.

2.1 Films and Fields

2.1.1 The Field of Film

Film as a cultural field and product possesses an interesting characteristic, that is, it is one of the few cultural forms where a distinction is made between art and non-art films (Baumann, 2007; Tudor, 2005). This distinction is the result of historical and social shifts in the field of film that resulted in the recognition that some films might be seen as art, but not all films (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012). Hence, this shift affected the way films could be perceived and appreciated, as well as classified. Classification is important as it structures cultural fields; it helps to bring order to and make sense of the large supply of films released. It involves creating aesthetic standards, describing, labelling and evaluating cultural products according to a particular field's logics (Kersten, 2012).

Moreover, this shift resulted in various forms of audience recognition, who classify (different) films differently (e.g. Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Kersten, 2012). This shift, distinction, and classification by various audiences requires an elaboration on Bourdieu's theories, and how his concepts structure(d) the cultural field of film.

According to Bourdieu a cultural field—and its products as art—is constructed and maintained by various agents, based on the key processes or concepts of legitimacy, consecration, and autonomisation (Heise & Tudor, 2007; Tudor, 2005). To put this process briefly, at the centre of each field is the struggle for legitimacy. That is, the right or power to define what is art and who is an artist (Tudor, 2005). However, legitimacy is primarily a social process. That is, certain cultural products becoming perceived and appreciated as art is not just based on the artistic merits of these products themselves, but is also the result of a collective effort of various agents within the art world or a particular field (Baumann, 2007). Cultural consecration takes place where distinctions are drawn between artworks and artists who are worthy of admiration and those that are not. This consecration then helps to establish and maintain the boundaries of a field (Allen & Lincoln, 2004). Additionally, a fundamental component of this process is the ideology of authorship. An artwork does not gain value through the artist who made it, but rather through the universal belief in the creative power of that artist. The quality of an artwork is seen as the achievement of an individual and highly creative artist. This assigning of value is primarily symbolic and contributes to maintaining the distinction of a field (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Bourdieu, 1983; Heise & Tudor, 2007; Tudor, 2005). The final key concept, autonomisation, is related to a commercial versus art for art's sake distinction, where only those artists and artworks that take the latter position can be considered (legitimate) art. This process revolves around the two principles of hierachization: the autonomous and heteronomous pole. Autonomisation involves a field's independence from the dominant or ruling logic, namely the market and its commercial influences. The more autonomous a field is, the better it is able to establish its own standards as well as impose its own norms and sanctions on all the producers within the field. Hence, in the more autonomous field art is valued for art's sake, and there exists pro-authorship and anti-economic ideology (Baumann, 2007; Bourdieu, 1983; Heise & Tudor, 2007; Kersten, 2012; Tudor, 2005). Symbolic capital—e.g. acclaim, honours, and prizes that add prestige—is the most valuable currency, rather than economic capital—e.g. large market shares, revenues—(Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012). Thus, legitimacy is about justification, and cultural products should fit within a certain aesthetic standard or rationale that helps distinguish what can be considered legitimate art or not. Consequently, legitimate art and artists are those who do not follow the logics of the marketplace and who search for symbolic capital instead (Baumann, 2007).

The autonomy and the ideology of authorship thus constitute the fundamental principles on which a field and its art distinction are generally established and maintained.

The initial construction of film as art was based on those two fundamental principles. This process started in Europe where the cultural traditions and social contexts were more strongly connected to the autonomy of the arts, and a film for film's sake ideology was thus more easily established. Moreover, constructing a new category of films provided a way to resist Hollywood's growing dominance by establishing Europe's own niche genre (Baumann, 2007; Heise & Tudor, 2007; Tudor, 2005). This process then started later in the US (and other countries), following the European example and rationale (Baumann, 2007; Heise & Tudor, 2007). This construction of film as an art form was initiated by various social agents. Institutions and individual agents—intellectuals, critics and filmmakers—were increasingly advocating the idea of a distinctive cinema that was artistic. Their efforts included consecrating (autonomous) individual artists and their artistic products in their writings, along with establishing aesthetic conventions (or standards) and a canon (Baumann, 2007; Heise & Tudor, 2007; Tudor, 2005). Additionally, the growing institutionalization of practices through film festivals and awards also contributed to creating legitimacy for the idea that films could be considered art. Film festivals created an atmosphere where films could enjoy prestige, and at the same time were part of the movement or goal to promote films as art (Baumann, 2007). However, the fundamental principles—autonomisation and authorship—used to establish films as art were based on logics found in other art fields, and the autonomous principle proved difficult to maintain in the field of film where production costs are high. Hence, towards the 1960s this principle started to falter, and there was a need for redefining the field's boundaries in order to maintain its distinction. Consequently, the field's logic shifted towards putting a more important focus on the auteur theory (Heise & Tudor, 2007; Tudor, 2005). Similar to the ideology of authorship, the auteur theory considers the director to be the creative genius or driving force, who integrates all the different contributions and shapes the film in accordance with his/her personal vision (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012). This shift resulted in more film types being included in the field of art film, and an increasingly large audience that accepted films as art (Tudor, 2005). Thus, various historical, social processes have influenced the position that (certain) films can now take, as well as how these films can be perceived and appreciated by (different) audiences. The growing commitment to film for film's sake and the auteur were crucial for the establishment of the field of art film, where filmmakers can now be considered skilled artists and films artistic endeavours (Baumann, 2001; Heise & Tudor, 2007).

How a product can then be classified depends on the logics of the field of cultural production it belongs to, or aspires to belong to. That is, the field of cultural production can be

divided into a more subtle opposition between two different kinds of fields of cultural production: the main (relatively heteronomous) field of large-scale or mass production and its (relatively autonomous) subfield of small-scale or restricted production (Baumann, 2007; Bourdieu, 1983). These fields represent two ends of a continuum along which cultural production and products can be classified (Baumann, 2007). The autonomy of a field influences the goals—artistic versus commercial—and (consequentially) the logics the field has as well as to what extent it is able to develop its own logics. These logics guide practices, rules, values, assumptions, and beliefs in relation to cultural production, distribution and consumption (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012). In other words, these two fields incorporate different ideologies, production practices or traits, classification and evaluation processes, (aesthetic) criteria, rewards, and audiences.

The field of mass production pursues commercial interests—economic capital—and produces for the general mainstream audiences. The producers in this field aim to reach an as large as possible market (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012). The field of restricted production is the more autonomous field where producers pursue artistic recognition and prestige—symbolic capital—while showing a disinterest in commercial gains. In this field producers generally produce for specialist audiences, such as peers and other experts who are considered to express more legitimate taste and can bestow symbolic capital. These audiences are believed to possess a larger amount of cultural capital and aesthetic fluency for appreciating art (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012). Films that fit within the logics of the field of restricted production are more readily accepted as (legitimate) art (Baumann, 2007).

On a final note, agents and producers within these two fields of production thus aspire to different goals, answering to different logics (accordingly) (De Valck, 2014; Kersten, 2012). These two goals do not only result in diverging dispositions (aesthetic versus commercial preferences), they also create expectations in relation to production traits. That is, audiences and filmmakers within these two fields have diverging views on what makes a “good” film (Kersten, 2012). Consequently, producers in each field answer to different logics or principles, and frame—or produce—their products accordingly to satisfy the right audiences (who can bestow either the economic or symbolic capital they are pursuing) (e.g. Kersten, 2012). “Whatever forms of recognition filmmakers aspire to achieve, they seek the approval of relevant institutions that are legitimized to attribute this recognition” (Kersten, 2012, p.53).

2.1.2 Legitimate Recognition

Fields, their legitimacy and logics are the (ongoing) result of social processes and contexts. “It takes true believers in the merit of film as art to do the work that is necessary for the wider public to understand how and why film is art” (Baumann, 2007, p.76). Furthermore, to define what is art (or

not) through making evaluations of quality (e.g. consecration) and the assigning of value (e.g. symbolic capital) (e.g. Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2007).

In the field various agents or institutions are responsible for the classification and valuation of films. They are generally divided into three main groups: public, peers, and domain experts (i.e. critics) (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Kersten 2012; Wanderer, 2015). The public consists of the general mainstream audiences, who assign popular recognition. Peers are other artists within the field (i.e. filmmakers), who bestow professional recognition upon artists and their products. Critics refers to experts such as professional film critics and scholars, who assign critical recognition. These three agents (or institutions) possess and grant different kinds of legitimacy (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Holbrook, 1999; Kersten, 2012). What distinguishes them and the added values they assign are the levels of cultural capital they possess. That is, the collection of social and cultural knowledge, experiences, beliefs, habits, and skills someone has acquired (Bourdieu, 1983). The level of (relevant) cultural capital agents have results in different positions or statuses, tastes, habitus, and levels of legitimacy. Consequently, their opinions and judgements are also valued differently (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Holbrook, 1999; Kersten, 2012).

These three agents of recognition arguably represent different positions within the fields of large-scale and restricted production. Where these agents are situated within this continuum is in accordance with the levels of cultural capital they represent (Kersten, 2012). In this model, the public represents the lowest level of cultural capital, where the majority of films recognized by these audiences tend to fall within the (heteronomous) field of mass production. Agents with a higher level of specialized or field-relevant cultural capital are perceived as more legitimate actors of consecration or evaluation, as they are more capable of making expert judgements (in accordance with the standards of the field) (Holbrook, 1999; Kersten, 2012). Such agents include peers and critics, whose judgement standards are often different from those of the more general consumers (Holbrook, 1999), and perhaps even from each other (Kersten, 2012). Only agents that have a high amount of (relevant) cultural capital are believed to possess the necessary dispositions or ability to appreciate and interpret true art. They are then the ones who are perceived to express legitimate taste (Kersten, 2012); the recognition they assign being more effective as an information source (Gemser et al., 2007).

Arguably, these different agents of recognition also appreciate and judge films differently, in accordance to their level of cultural capital. Cultural capital is relevant in the construction of taste, where these different agents thus represent different taste groups who assume different roles in the world of film (incl. classification and valuation) (Kersten, 2012). As Wanderer (2015) explains, taste cultures shape both what it means to be an agent in the film world (e.g. director, actor, critic) as well

as produce different ways of experiencing or viewing cinematic excellence. At the same time, the habitus is also shaped by the level of cultural capital and (social) position people have, and guides how people perceive and act in accordance to the world around them. This includes their dispositions, appreciation and evaluation criteria (Holbrook, 1999). Consequently, when it comes to appreciation or the expression of taste, agents with a higher amount of the relevant cultural capital are believed to possess the relevant habitus that guides their dispositions and (autonomous) judgement standards. They should be more concerned with cultural than economic value; more concerned with expressing legitimate taste (Holbrook, 1999; Kersten, 2012). Thus, different amounts of cultural capital result in diverging positions, tastes, habitus, and consequently in different kind of legitimacy for the agents of recognition themselves as well as the recognition they assign (e.g. Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Holbrook, 1999).

Filmmakers seek the recognition of the relevant agents or institutions within the field they (wish) belong to. These different kinds of recognition add different kinds of value, catering to the different aspirations of various filmmakers (Kersten, 2012). When it comes to popular recognition there is no real need for expertise on filmmaking or for intellectual scrutiny, and it involves general popularity where many people pay to see the film. Thus, popular recognition is often seen as falling within the field of mass production, where the added value is economic capital (large market shares and high revenues). Critical recognition is assigned by domain experts, who are specialized in the analysis and evaluation of films as well as advising audiences, through critical praise or acclaim and inclusion of films on their annual lists. Professional recognition is assigned by peers who are familiar with production practices and are perceived as more capable of separating the mediocre films from the good. This kind of recognition takes the form of industry prizes (and nominations), honours, as well as inclusion in film festivals programs. Both critical and professional recognition are generally considered to be part of the field of restricted production, assigning symbolic capital (prestige and honour) (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Kersten, 2012). Finally, the more autonomous a field becomes, the more producers are (primarily) concerned with the legitimacy bestowed by other cultural producers (professional recognition). Cultural institutions that have the legitimacy to claim their role as cultural consecrators can bestow the most important distinction upon artists. This is often done through formal rites such as bestowing honours and prizes (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012; De Valck, 2007).

2.1.3. Prizes

Prizes fulfil an important purpose in the cultural field, especially in the field of restricted production where they are an essential cultural practice for creating value (Baumann, 2007; English, 2005). The

rise of prizes, their functions, and their meanings should be discussed in order to fully understand their relevance in relation to the field as a whole as well as to its individual agents.

Over the past hundred years, starting with the Nobel Prize (1901), competitive events such as festivals, awards, and prizes have grown rapidly (e.g. English, 2005). This large proliferation of awards that has taken place is, according to English (2005), both a cause and effect of changes in the field of cultural production and the rise of cultural capital. That is, struggles within the field started to focus on creating cultural value, due to a greater reliance on symbolic ranking and prestige to maintain the boundaries and distinctions of a field. Now, prizes might have become the “legitimate measure—perhaps the only legitimate measure—of a person’s cultural worth” (English, 2005, p.22). Hence, while prizes might be part of a (fatal) escalating spiral, thus far they remain the most effective and therefore necessary device of value in the cultural economy since people (still) accept the match between cultural value and cultural prizes (English, 2005). Prizes and their symbolic value are perceived as being worth something. Prizes reflect the modern day economy of prestige, a system of cultural valorisation and consecration that focusses on symbolic cultural production (English, 2005).

In the field of cultural production prizes fulfil various functions. They are especially an integral part of the field of restricted production, since in this field the other everyday measure—popularity—is considered a poor indicator of artistic excellence or quality. For legitimate art—falling within the field of restricted production—awards are an important part of the production of value (Baumann, 2007; Holbrook, 1999). Here, prizes are a cultural practice that allows agents to engage in the collective endeavour of producing value. They serve as an indication or recognition of artistic quality, assigning value to cultural products which they do not intrinsically possess (English, 2005). Additionally, in accordance with the logics of the (more autonomous) field prizes are generally bestowed by other cultural producers, where peers are considered the most capable of determining what is real or good art and represent a reliable sign of artistic excellence (e.g. Allen & Lincoln, 2004). Finally, it should be noted that simultaneously prizes serve as a tool to rank and create (cultural) hierarchy within the field. They (effectively) do so by raising some artists and their works above others, and creating distinctions between them (e.g. between winners and nominees) (English, 2005; Lincoln, 2007). Moreover, there exists a hierarchy between different prize categories (e.g. best film versus best soundtrack) as well as the institutions assigning them (e.g. Cannes versus other festivals). Hence, different prizes offer different levels of (symbolic) rewards, some higher than the others (e.g. Deuchert et al., 2005; De Valck, 2007; English, 2005; Mezas et al., 2011).

For agents or audiences within the field prizes have different meanings or implications (Nelson et al., 2001). Every field has its own (specific) forms of capital, rules, economy of practices,

boundaries or constraints, and unique stakes, where various participants struggle for the power to produce value or over collectively defined stakes (English, 2005). For agents within the field, prizes are a suitable instrument to achieve institutional and ideological objectives. That is, they serve as an institutional claim to authority, and a pronouncement of that authority (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; English, 2005). Here, prizes function as a way to exert control over the cultural economy, including the distribution of prestige and rewards (English, 2005). Ideologically prizes serve as a tool to test and confirm the boundaries as well as legitimacy of a field and maintain its distinction (by assigning value) (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; English, 2005; Rossman et al., 2009). For artists, prizes can provide them with the type of recognition and symbolic capital they seek (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012). Furthermore, prizes can provide them certain (additional) benefits, including: economic capital (e.g. increased revenues or salaries); social capital (social and/or reputational resources); increased reputation, status or fame; career benefits such as better or more film offers, greater responsibilities; and more favourable evaluations of their consecutive work and capabilities (Gemser et al., 2007; Lincoln, 2007; Mezas et al., 2011; Nelson et al., 2001; Pardoe & Simonton, 2008; Rossman et al., 2009). For audiences awards function as a signal of quality, which is especially important in the experiences-based cultural industries (Deuchert et al., 2005; Gemser et al., 2007). Awards can help audiences in their decision making or valuation process of which films to watch (or not), serving as an indicator of what industry experts (peers) consider worthy of (artistic) recognition (Brewer et al., 2009; Gemser et al., 2007; Nelson et al., 2001; Terry et al., 2005).

Thus, symbolic capital is a (increasingly) crucial element within the field of restricted production, where it has various functions and meanings, and is the most valuable type of capital to agents. It is part of the process of cultural valorisation and consecration, where through aesthetic judgement cultural value is assigned to cultural products and producers by legitimate agents and institutions. Moreover, this symbolic capital and its cultural practices have increasingly taken the shape of (professional) institutions consecrating and producing cultural value through competitions and (prestigious) awards, such as those found at the Oscars and international film festivals (e.g. Allen & Lincoln, 2004; De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; English, 2005). Artistic recognition is then achieved (or bestowed) by winning “the right awards at the right film festivals” (Baumann, 2007, p.85).

2.2 International Film Festivals

Film festivals are a central location where these various elements of fields come together. They have established (and maintain) themselves as a legitimate, authoritative institution within the field of restricted production, fulfilling key functions of adding value, classifying and consecrating films and filmmakers (e.g. De Valck, 2007). They represent an institutionalization of (professional) recognition, where symbolic capital is assigned by a jury of peers through prestigious prizes and ceremonial

settings (Kersten, 2012). Overall, film festivals are effective institutions for recognizing the artistic worth of films and filmmakers. They help maintain and improve the cultural position of film, add value to the genre as a whole, and act as a signal of quality that is recognized by various audiences (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012).

A look at the establishment of film festivals, including the changes they have undergone, should provide a better understanding of film festivals as they are today. This then reveals how they have come to occupy such an important global position of power and prestige, fulfilling various (crucial) roles and functions.

2.2.1. Film Festival Origins

La Biennale in Venice represents the oldest of film festivals. It was established as an art forum where films could be appreciated for their artistic excellence and not just commercial popularity. Yet, in pre-World War II Europe the festival soon became subject to nationalistic and fascist tendencies. In order to counter these tendencies and provide a platform with more equal opportunities to (their) filmmakers French, British and US agents worked together to begin a new festival, namely Cannes. However, when World War II broke-out Cannes had to be put on hold. The festival finally took place in 1946. By 1951 Cannes was a large success, and other festivals soon followed (e.g. De Valck, 2007, 2014; Evans, 2007). The success of these film festivals was twofold. First, because they borrowed a Hollywood approach in making it a glamour and star-studded event. Second, because film festivals were not like Hollywood, they were European (De Valck, 2007).

As mentioned, the establishment of the field of art films started within Europe for two reasons. First, the ideology for film as art could be more readily established in Europe due to the prevailing (social) conditions of production and consumption there, which were similar to those in other art fields (Baumann, 2007; Tudor, 2005). Here, film festivals positioned themselves in the field of film as art. They provided a location where—unlike Hollywood—films were not measured in terms of commercial value, but appreciated based on their artistic merit (De Valck, 2014). They were—and still are—a location where films could enjoy prestige (Baumann, 2007); an (international) platform for the exhibition of quality films; and a meeting point for filmmakers (De Valck, 2007; Grunwell & Ha, 2008). Consequently, film festivals became an instrument for legitimizing films as art, and (still) contribute to maintaining this distinction (e.g. Baumann, 2007; De Valck, 2014; Wong, 2011). Second, in post-war Europe that was losing-out to Hollywood film productions, film festivals provided a countermeasure to re-establish a successful European cinema. The creation of the art film genre allowed Europe to establish its own niche market, which countered Hollywood film practices and improved the visibility of European films. Film festivals were then in part created as alternative

exhibition and distribution network; a way to bypass or counter the Hollywood dominance in various (European) national markets (De Valck, 2007, 2014; Heise & Tudor, 2007; Tudor, 2005).

Hollywood and European cinema are often pitted as opposites. One arguably belonging in the field of mass production and the other in the field of restricted production; the Hollywood Oscars on one side and film festivals on the other. This is a popular conception, which is linked to different sets of (competing) logics (De Valck, 2007). However, the relationship between Hollywood and film festivals cannot simply be seen as one of pure opposition, as it is more complex than that. The establishment, form, roles and functions of film festivals rather takes place within a relationship with Hollywood. It can already be argued that the establishment of Cannes was the result of the combined efforts of French, British, and American agents. Furthermore, that the success of film festivals in part lies in copying the successful red carpet, stars, glamour, and media attention formula found in Hollywood (de Valck, 2007; Evans, 2007; Wong, 2011). More importantly one could argue that the one might perhaps not (meaningfully) exist without the other. “The success of the international film festivals has benefitted from its ambiguous relationship to Hollywood, as it both counters and emulates its practices” (De Valck, 2007, p.58). Film festivals constitute a collection of economic, cultural, political and artistic elements that make-up a unique and important arena that exists next to the Hollywood (De Valck, 2007; Elsaesser, 2005).

This link between film festivals and their establishment in Europe shows how they were originally positioned within the field of restricted production. However, with time the (autonomous) position of international film festival as platforms for artistic achievement became contested, forcing film festivals to go through two shifts in order to maintain their authoritative position and credibility (e.g. De Valck, 2007). The first shift started in the 1960s. At that time, dissatisfaction was growing within France about Cannes as people felt the festival was lacking in its commitment to art for art’s sake, with a too strong focus on the spectacle of stars and prizes. After eventual protest in 1968, Cannes—and soon followed by others festivals—went through a restructuring between 1968 and 1972 (De Valck, 2007; Elsaesser, 2005). The most important change was the new focus that was put on filmmakers and their films, where the ideologies of art for art’s sake and the auteur became the golden standard among festivals. Consequently, the festivals themselves—and mainly their directors—became the main actors in selecting the films for their program, rather than national governments. In addition, the global role of film festivals was reconsidered. The greater emphasis on the auteur and the responsibility of film festivals to show outstanding works decreased the national focus. Films were now selected based on artistic merit, quality, and individual achievement, and film festivals became a platform for artistic expression and quality films from around the world (De Valck, 2007; Elsaesser, 2005). Furthermore, festivals started selecting films based on significance, including

in (aspects of) uniqueness, novelty, boldness, innovation, and themes or content. Film festivals became a platform for catalysing issues from technical achievements in films to social causes (e.g. minority groups, LGBT cinema, ecological or political movements, human interest or moral issues, etc.) (De Valck, 2007; De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Elsaesser, 2005; Wong, 2011). The second, less extreme, shift took place between the 1980s and 1990s where an increasing number of festivals started taking place worldwide, making film festivals a truly global phenomenon. Now a film festival takes place every day somewhere around the world (De Valck, 2007). Overall, these shifts led to film festivals becoming more committed to films as art, more competitive and diverse, as well as increasing their overall quality (to maintain their artistic and competitive edge) (De Valck, 2007; De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Elsaesser, 2005; Wong, 2011).

2.2.2. Film Festival Practices

Today film festivals fulfil four central functions or roles within the global industry and field of film, which further reinforces their importance and makes them indispensable actors in the film world. That is, film festivals are producers of knowledge, an alternative and distinct film network, sites of passage, and creators of value.

First, by exhibiting a wide and complex body of films as well as assigning value film festivals act as producers of knowledge in the field of film (Wong, 2011). They serve as a crucial location where knowledge and practices in relation to films are created, and where the search for the meaning and place of film is (re)defined. Furthermore, film festivals play an important role in the shaping of “film product identities”. That is, they form the basis for structuring audiences’ information, perceptions and expectations in relation to a film, which also translates into the film’s performance after the festival is over (Mezias et al., 2011). In other words, they shape what films will be seen and respected by audiences, audience expectations about that film, and often how a film should be read (Mezias et al., 2011; Wong, 2011; Stringer, 2001).

Second, film festivals play an important role in in the global distribution of films, as they provide an alternative and distinct exhibition and distribution network for films (De Valck, 2007; De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Wong, 2011). As previously mentioned, film festivals have a complex and interdependent relationship with Hollywood, which is part of what makes them so successful (and important). Film festivals both incorporate Hollywood elements and oppose them (De Valck, 2007; Evans, 2007; Wong, 2011). Where they oppose Hollywood is in more subtle—field related—manners. For example, Hollywood films are not strictly excluded from the festival (although they often participate outside of the official competition in order to avoid critical ridicule). Instead film festivals oppose Hollywood’s dominance by being an alternative and more global production, distribution and exhibition network for films and filmmakers. They especially are an important network for films

from around the world that would not be interesting to commercial companies or exist outside of the Hollywood network, such as art films, independent films, and world cinema (De Valck, 2007; Wong, 2011). Film festivals are committed to film as art, with a philosophy that outstanding films deserve an audience (De Valck & Soeteman, 2010). They focus on films as unique artistic creations that contain social, political, and cultural value next to economic value, and which should thus be supported irrespective of economic gain (De Valck, 2007; Elsaesser, 2005; Mezias et al., 2011; Wong, 2011). This commitment to artistic achievement or excellence is what sets film festivals apart from more general and commercially orientated exhibition sites, as well as making them crucial as an alternative network for art films (De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Peranson, 2008). Furthermore, they challenge Hollywood's dominance by encouraging (more equalized) cultural exchange, where more contributions from diverse countries and cultures around the world can express themselves. In other words, this increasingly large number of film festivals worldwide provide a liminal space for cultural exchange and (fostering) self-expression of filmmakers who might not be given such an opportunity in the general film market (Evans, 2007). Overall, they provide an opportunity for audiences to see films that they might otherwise not have seen, or even have had the opportunity to see. For filmmakers they provide the (crucial) opportunity to have their films exhibited and distributed, as well as to accumulate honours and symbolic capital (De Valck, 2007; Peranson, 2008; Stringer, 2001; Turan, 2003). Films that might otherwise have gone unnoticed. "It's impossible to imagine the current critical rage for Iranian films without the intense exposure these works have gotten at Cannes, New York, and elsewhere" (Turan, 2003, p.8).

Third, film festivals act as an obligatory site of passage for both films and filmmakers (De Valck, 2007). Again, film festivals are a (powerful) node in the international film network that has made itself indispensable to production, distribution and consumption of films. At the same time, this turns film festivals in a point of passage that films and filmmakers have to pass through (De Valck, 2007; Evans, 2007; Wong, 2011). This involves several ritualistic (e.g. the red carpet) and symbolic performances (e.g. award ceremonies) which create symbolic value. For films and filmmakers this process represent a status transition to another social position (i.e. gaining esteem) and helps them in their cultural positioning within the film world (De Valck, 2007). Here Bourdieu's concept of power relations becomes visible as film festivals do not only set the standards of good taste, but also hold power over the careers and business opportunities of filmmakers (De Valck & Soeteman, 2010). In other words, film festival recognition can launch and sustain careers (as well as films) (De Valck, 2007; Wong, 2011). They do this by providing an important location where films and filmmakers can gain access to other production, exhibition and distribution networks, through the exposure and the (artistic) success or recognition gained at the festival (Czach, 2004; De Valck, 2007;

Elsaesser, 2005; Grunwell & Ha, 2008; Wong, 2011). “No poster of an independent film can do without the logo of one of the world’s prime festivals” (Elsaesser, 2005, p.87). Thus, film festivals act as powerful gatekeepers for filmmakers that wish to make the transition into the professional field. They are source of cultural legitimization and symbolic value, increasing the capital, status and value of films and filmmakers who participate (De Valck, 2007, 2014; De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Mezas et al., 2011).

Their fourth and perhaps most important role is thus the creation of value. The fact that film festivals can create (cultural) value and capital is a key element of their success, as well as one of their primary functions (De Valck, 2007; De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Elsaesser, 2005; Wong, 2011). They “are in the business of prestige” (De Valck, 2007, p.106). How film festivals assign value is twofold. First, by selecting films for their programs. Second, by choosing films to include in the competition, where awards are bestowed by a jury of peers (De Valck, 2007). Film festivals are designed “to categorize, classify, sort, and sift the world’s annual film-production” (Elsaesser, 2005, p.96), through the (supportive) processes of selecting, judging, celebrating, and rewarding those films deemed worthy (De Valck, 2007; Elsaesser, 2005; Kersten, 2012).

Film festivals are a place where various forms of capital or value is created. The most important of which is (cultural) symbolic capital. Czach (2004) uses the term critical capital—similar to Bourdieu’s cultural or symbolic capital—to describe the value films gains when being successful in the festival circuit. She argues that through the tastemakers—i.e. the festival programmers, juries and critics—their stamp of approval, a film acquires a level of distinction above its unselected peers. However, whereas being selected for a festival program thus already adds value, the added value of winning a prize is even higher due to the honour of being evaluated and selected for this award by a jury of peers (De Valck & Soeteman, 2010). These prizes are an important form of symbolic capital and an excellent way of creating prestige. They serve as a (symbolic) indicator of quality, assigning artistic recognition or value to films and filmmakers (De Valck, 2007; De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Wong, 2011). Film festival networks also provide the opportunity for translating symbolic capital into social and economic capital. Film festivals bestow cultural value that increases the (artistic) status of films and filmmakers. Here, film festival participation can generate reputational and social resources (social capital). Furthermore, films might gain additional attention at other film festivals that can improve their distribution chances (outside of the festival network) and possible financial success (e.g. serving as trendsetter for art house or niche and commercial cinemas) (De Valck, 2007; Mezas et al., 2011; Wong, 2011). Thus, film festivals add value or capital to films and filmmakers by selecting and honouring them. Capital that can be used long after the festival is over (De Valck, 2007; Wong, 2011).

On a final note, it is not just films and filmmakers that are dependent upon these festival practices. Film festivals are also constantly supporting and reinforcing their own survival, through these practices. That is, these practices have become part of the sustainability of film festivals themselves, as they provide a way for film festivals to maintain their own importance as well as adding to the belief that film festivals are a serious institution and worth all the attention (De Valck, 2007; Elsaesser, 2005). It should also be kept in mind that such formal consecration projects are an assertion of the right or legitimacy to consecrate artists and their artworks (Allen & Lincoln, 2004). Still, with their focus on evaluating films in cultural rather than economic terms as well as the institutionalization of (generating) cultural value, film festivals have set themselves apart in the film world. They have established themselves as (crucial) “sites of passage that function as the gateways to cultural legitimization” (De Valck, 2007, p.38), and not likely to diminish or go away any time soon (De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Wong, 2011).

2.3 Artistic Attributes

As mentioned, the establishment of the field of art films resulted a distinction between films that can be considered art and those that cannot. As Baumann (2007) highlights, this establishment was primarily a social process. This makes it difficult—or perhaps even impossible—to determine whether the rise in the status of films was mainly the result of the changing content or nature of those films themselves (becoming increasingly artistic), or of a new way of perceiving and appreciating films (Baumann, 2007). However, it is possible to notice that this dual nature of film as both commercial entertainment and artistic products has resulted in a two-path model of film success (Delmestri et al., 2005; Holbrook & Addis, 2008; Simonton, 2005b). That is, films can be assessed on commercial dimensions on one side, and on artistic dimensions or quality of cultural content by the legitimate social actors on the other (Delmestri et al., 2005). In other words, films seem to be created, evaluated and classified in accordance with two different standards that strongly resemble the logics of the two distinct fields of cultural production (Delmestri et al. 2005). Within this framework film festivals position themselves in the field of restricted production, focussing on art (De Valck, 2014). It thus becomes relevant to see what characteristics or attributes films possess to be considered art. This final part will first take a look at the general characteristics of art and festival films, before going deeper into the specific attributes that relate to cast and content.

2.3.1. The Art of the Festival Film

To better understand the characteristic of art films, it is necessary to compare these films their more commercial counterpart. That is, the fields of mass and restricted production represent two (ideal) opposites, where different logics structure the production, distribution and consumption practices of

films. To be able to classify films as art their artistic value should be justified based on a set of conventions (aesthetic standards) that fit within the field of restricted productions. For films this classification process is often based on a juxtaposition between the field of mass production (e.g. blockbusters) and field of restricted production (e.g. art films) (e.g. Baumann, 2007, Delmestri et al., 2005; Simonton, 2005b). These two fields cannot be constructed in isolation from each other (Bordwell, 2002; Kersten, 2012).

The classical or conventional film—falling within the field of mass production—tends to be based on those conventions found and established in Hollywood (Kersten, 2012). In brief, these films generally avoid auteur presence; have simple narratives; are less serious (in screenplay); are more conventional (less innovative); incorporate familiar and universal themes; incorporate familiar cultures and settings; are sense-stimulating; and provide an easy viewing experience (Kersten, 2012; Simonton, 2005b). Additionally, conventional films that follow the Hollywood formula often require more material resources (i.e. money) as these conventions tend to include lavish special effects, hiring superstars, spectacle, and elaborate film sets or universes (Kersten, 2012). Overall, these are the type of films that the majority of audiences are accustomed to, possessing a lot of popular appeal and thus mainly resulting in popular recognition. At the other end of the spectrum—within the field of restricted production—the art film often goes against these classical conventions. In brief, the characteristics of the art film include a focus on the auteur, where films are seen as mediums of artistic expression; an anti-classical and complex narrative; serious films; innovation or perfection of film conventions; themes that are more abstract or distant to audiences; deeper meaning or messages; carefully constructed; aesthetic beauty; often minimalistic and austere; and a more difficult viewing experience (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012; Simonton, 2005b; Wong, 2011). This difficult viewing experience seems to provide a crucial difference between conventional and art films. Art films often require more effort—and perhaps cultural capital—from audiences to be able to comprehend their meaning. This difficult viewing experience also fits with the notion that real art requires effort to be appreciated, where complexity and subtlety is valued over superficial enjoyment (Baumann, 2001; Kersten, 2012).

One important element is the narrative. Whereas a story is told through the use of style and content, the narrative structures the content (Abrahams et al., 2010). Here, the anti-classical narrative of art films often results in (increasingly) ambiguous films, where the audiences themselves are responsible for constructing the coherence of the film (Wong, 2011). The art film's narrative conventions include a focus on authorial expressivity, meaning that attention should be paid to the director's creative choices or stylistic signatures and how these affect the film's content (Baumann, 2007; Bordwell, 2002). Furthermore, the narrative conventions include realism and psychologically

complex characters. Instead of having a conventional cause-effect sequence, art films are driven by psychologically complex characters and their reactions (Bordwell, 2002). These characters also often do not possess any distinctive traits or goals such as those in conventional films, acting seemingly more inconsistent (Bordwell, 2002). In short, the narrative in art films tends to be spare, open (ended), non-linear, evocative, suggestive, and without a single, decisive reading. This makes these films more difficult and demanding for audiences to comprehend (Bordwell, 2002; Wong, 2011).

Novelty and innovation also often result in more difficult viewing experiences. Innovation entails a trade-off between following conventions and experimentation with conventions (to find new audiences or gain the expert approval). Innovation has an important role in classification, as art is often evaluated on uniqueness as well as its relation to established conventions and canons (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012). Furthermore, in relation to their levels of capital, different audiences tend to appreciate innovation differently, where it is believed that professionals and critics possess more aesthetic fluency to appreciate innovation (Kersten, 2012). Themes provide an interesting example of innovation (along with meaningful and significant content). Conventional films represent a limited collection of (universal) social, psychological and cultural themes, which are familiar, related to everyday life, often sense-stimulating, and tend to appeal to the mainstream audiences. In art films the prominence of innovation in production logics has resulted in themes that are more diverse, socially informed, and abstract or distant to the viewer. These themes tend to achieve (relatively) more professional and critical recognition (Kersten, 2012).

Many of these art film characteristics can also be found in the films that participate in film festivals (and might also be kept in mind when it comes to more specific attributes below). Wong (2011) identified several textual, formal and contextual characteristics that often materialize in both the selection and evaluation of festival films. In brief, these characteristics include links to classical and emerging auteurs; challenging or demanding narrative structures; dark, serious films; novelty; diversity in formats, themes, and genres (incl. genre cross-overs or hybrids); controversial, edgy and evocative subject matter; artistic and carefully constructed films (e.g. small moments in great detail); minimalism in vision, sets, effects, and sound; and frequently non-studio produced, low-budget films. Of course, these distinctions are not always absolute, and there are also examples of crossover films—between commercial and art elements—such as *Pulp Fiction* (1994) and *Magnolia* (1999) (e.g. spectacle, high production values, studio produced) (De Valck, 2007; Wong, 2011). Instead, these characteristics of both art films and festivals films (including their overlap) provide some initial insight into what films are screened and awarded at international film festivals.

2.3.2. The Auteur(s)

In the field of film the ideology of authorship takes the form of the auteur theory (e.g. Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2001). Auteurism entails that the director is seen as the creative or artistic driving force—the primary auteur—when it comes to filmmaking (Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012; Wanderer, 2015). The director possesses the ability to shape films in accordance with his/her own personal vision and put his/her own stamp on every film he/she makes, while dealing with the economic and organizational confines of film production as well as the commercial limitations of the film industry (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2007; Simonton, 2004; Wanderer, 2015).

Furthermore, he/she is responsible for integrating all the various artistic contributions by the other cast and crew members into a unified whole (e.g. Simonton, 2002; Zickar & Slaughter, 1999). Thus, the vision of the auteur shines through in this (largely) collaborative product (Wanderer, 2015). An important implication of auteur theory is that it justified the idea that film could be art, since real art requires a creative genius for its production. “Where there’s an artist, there must be an art” (Baumann, 2007, p.83). Now the auteur theory still is the most convenient and accessible tool for evaluating the artistic merit of films. It provides a framework or cultural schema—knowledge structures and default beliefs or assumptions in relation to products and their characteristics—that shapes the aesthetic disposition and judgements used for valorising films (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Kersten, 2012).

However, despite the ideology of authorship, artistic achievements generally are situated (and realized) in a collaborative context. Similarly, filmmaking is an artistic endeavour with an extremely collaborative nature. It incorporates many people working together and providing their creative input (Kersten, 2012; Rossman et al., 2009), but who might not all be considered of equal importance (e.g. Delmestri et al., 2005). The director—the auteur—is often seen as the most central member of this team, who enjoys the highest esteem. The director is followed by the screenwriter, while the actors and actresses represent the most visible filmmakers. Overall, distinctions seem to be made between core cast and crew members—the directors, writers, actors/actresses, producers, cinematographers, composers, editors, and art directors—and the rest (Delmestri et al., 2005; Rossman et al., 2009; Simonton, 2002, 2009). However, that there are separate awards for these various contributions does seem to confirm the ideology of authorship exists in a wider context, by emphasizing individual authorship and achievements in films (English, 2005; Rossman et al., 2009; Simonton, 2002). This is part of the mismatch between the individual nature of awards and collaborative nature of films, but shows that—despite an existing hierarchy—a film is still the sum of its parts where collaborations matter (Elberse, 2007; Rossman et al., 2009; Simonton, 2004).

Filmmakers vary in their levels of experience, talent, legitimacy, and star power (Kersten, 2012), which can consequently influence the evaluations of their separate contributions and of the overall film. To start, time might be an important component when it comes to individual consecration (e.g. nominations) (Lincoln, 2007). Yet, here time has a dual meaning. On one hand it relates to acting experience and the development of skills or additional talent (personal factors), but on the other hand it also relates to the development of social networks and reputations. Research has shown that while the odds for Oscar nominations increase with experience, this is only up to a certain point after which they actually decline again (Lincoln, 2007; Rossman et al., 2009). Thus, while talent might then provide an initial boost, over-time other factors such as reputation and (cumulative) status associations might play a more important role (Rossman et al., 2009).

Reputations and statuses have an important role in the film industry. They contribute to influencing expectations in relation to the characteristics and quality of a film, as well as how filmmakers are perceived by peers. Thus, they are both used to assess potential, making them crucial to film production (e.g. resource availability) and success (Delmestri et al., 2005; Hsu, 2006; Rossman et al., 2009). Reputation and status are often based on the past performances and achievements of a filmmaker (Delmestri et al., 2005; Hsu, 2006; Rossman et al., 2009). However, status also includes the amount of prominence, respect, and influence filmmakers enjoy in the eyes of others as well as in relation to others (Elberse, 2007; Hsu, 2006; Rossman et al., 2009). Filmmakers with a higher status are believed to produce higher quality films, and often receive greater recognition and value addition for their role in filmmaking than their lower status peers. Here, prizes can also have a cumulative effect, resulting in a winner-take-all phenomenon or where successful film directors are often invited back to subsequent film festivals (e.g. English, 2005; Evans, 2007). Furthermore, higher status filmmakers also increase the visibility of the overall team (Elberse, 2007; Hsu, 2006; Rossman et al., 2009). In short, the status of filmmakers influences the evaluation of film (making) quality (Rossman et al., 2009). Finally, fitting with the dual nature of film, it is possible to distinguish between two kinds of statuses or reputations: artistic (e.g. industry prizes and critical acclaim) and economic (e.g. market performance) (Delmestri et al., 2005; Elberse, 2007). The former being an important element of professional recognition and legitimacy; serving as a good indicator for the odds of recognition (Delmestri et al., 2005; Rossman et al., 2009).

Status and individual talent can translate into star power, which also separates stars from their lesser peers (Rossman et al., 2009). Star power (mainly) involves the ability of filmmakers to draw audiences to their films. Especially Hollywood seems to have long favoured bankable stars—award winning or box-office hit filmmakers—in the belief that they will have a positive effect on film performance (Basuroy et al., 2003). However, star power also seems to have a positive effect on the

odds for consecration (Allen & Lincoln, 2004). Stars can act as an information source. This is related to information that is available prior to viewing that can help audiences in their decision making process on whether to watch a film, as well as the valorisation process. This includes whether the movie contains their favourite stars or might fit with their tastes (Albert, 1998; Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Basuroy et al. 2005; Prag & Casavant, 1994). Furthermore, stars are frequently seen to represent a certain genre or brand (e.g. comedians or action hero's), or a certain level of quality based on their past films (Albert, 1998; Chang & Ki, 2005; Desai & Basuroy, 2005). However, other studies found that star presence is not what makes films successful, but rather their ability to select the projects that have the potential to be successful (Brewer et al., 2009). Stars might commit to or initiate a project that they know is of high quality, at the same time acting as a signal of quality (Ravid, 1999). However, it does seem that only some stars really have some significant impact on film performance, which also varies over the course of their careers (e.g. Chang & Ki, 2005; Simonton, 2009).

What attributes might be used in the valorisation and consecration process might, again, vary according to the logics of a particular field. For example, artistic reputation often has a positive effect on professional and critical recognition, while economic reputation can act as an indicator of box-office potential (e.g. Basuroy et al., 2003; Delmestri et al., 2005; Simonton, 2009). To conclude, it should be remembered that cast matters most in the context of auteurism, while elements such as talent, legitimacy, networks and star power seemingly provide some additional or complementary contributions to the odds of artistic recognition.

2.3.3. Content

Content characteristics can help define whether films are aiming at financial gain or focussing on artistic expression (Simonton, 2005b). Thus, content can influence the perception, classification, appreciation and performance of a film (Albert, 1998). For this purpose genre, MPAA-ratings, true stories, adaptations, runtime and budget often provide some (readily) observable content attributes.

Genres are a way of classifying films, which is used both by the industry itself and by audiences (Hsu, 2006; Simonton, 2009). Genres involves certain types (e.g. drama) within a wider product class (i.e. film) (Desai & Basuroy, 2005), albeit that these types are not necessarily mutually exclusive (e.g. romantic comedies) (Simonton, 2009). What makes genre important is that people have certain expectations and attitudes about films in relation to different genres, as they often incorporate different conventions or genre cues (incl. narrative content and stylistic cues) (Visch & Tan, 2008). These genre expectations provide production practices or conventions to follow for producers, while for audiences genre expectations influence preferences, reading styles, interpretation, and evaluation of films (Desai & Basuroy, 2005; Kersten, 2012; Visch & Tan, 2008). Consequently, depending on the criterion of success—popular, professional or critical recognition—

different genres seem to vary in their potential (Simonton 2005b, 2009). Film genre influences the schemas—prior experience and stored knowledge—that will be used for the viewing experiences and the aesthetic judgement of films (Desai & Basuroy, 2005; Visch & Tan, 2008). Genre preferences are often the result of the familiarity and schemas that people have in relation to a specific genre (Desai & Basuroy, 2005). In other words, cultural capital influences the appreciation or appeal of different genres among diverse audiences (Holbrook, 1999). Some genres are relatively more accessible, while other genres are more challenging or intellectually demanding on basis of their level of grounding in realism and (thus) require more familiarity with conventions (Holbrook, 1999). Hence, audiences with higher levels of (field-specific) cultural capital tend to appreciate more diverse and challenging genres, while audiences with lower levels of cultural capital tend to prefer specific and/or more accessible genres (Holbrook, 1999). Correspondingly, dramas tend to outperform other genres when it comes to professional recognition (e.g. Simonton, 2009). Dramas are generally considered more artistic and prestigious, corresponding to artistic (e.g. realism) rather than economic criteria (e.g. often low budget, and lacking in popular appeal) (Holbrook, 1999; Simonton, 2005b). Art films are above all dramatic mediums for artistic expression and creativity (Simonton, 2004).

MPAA-ratings influence which audiences can watch a film by imposing age restrictions, using four main categories: G, PG-13, R, NC-17². These ratings reveal something about the content of a film, affect the film's appeal to various audiences, and influence the type of recognition a film might achieve (Prag & Casavant, 1994; Simonton, 2005b; Terry et al., 2005). In general films with G and PG-13 ratings tend to attract wider audiences, while films with R-ratings have a more limited audience due to the age restriction and rarely achieve (wide-scale) popular recognition (Terry et al., 2005; Simonton, 2005b). However, R-rated films are (just like dramas) considered to be more artistic and prestigious, where the content is perceived to be more edgy, controversial, artistic, unique or unusual, innovative, audacious, and counterculture or counter-conventions. They are more likely to gain professional and critical recognition. Consequently, these prestige productions are often initiated by filmmakers seeking esteem and legitimacy (among peers), rather than by film companies (who greenlight these productions on basis of star power) (De Vany & Walls, 2002; Simonton, 2005b, 2009). Thus, it can be said that R-rated films fall within the (the autonomous) field of art films (De Vany & Walls, 2002).

True stories are films that portray stories and/or characters based on actual events or persons (i.e. non-fiction). This can include the depiction of historical or other notorious events, and

² G: general audiences. PG-13: parents strongly cautioned, may be unsuitable for children under the age of 13. R: restricted, persons under 17 requires accompanying parent or guardian. NC-17: no admittance for persons under 17.

narratives about the lives of certain people (Simonton, 2005b, 2009). These films often serve an ideological function, by projecting a country or group's heritage on screen or by evaluating someone's life (Hayward, 2001). True stories are less likely to receive wide-scale popular recognition, but do perform better when it comes to professional and critical recognition (Simonton, 2002, 2009). Furthermore, true stories might correspond to the film festival's function as a platform for social causes and search for significant films about relevant themes (e.g. De Valck & Soeteman, 2010; Elsaesser, 2005; Wong, 2011). For example, in 2005 the Berlin festival put the spotlight on the Rwandan genocide (in films), drawing attention to the topic, the region, and the social as well as political issues (Elsaesser, 2005).

Adaptations—especially literature adaptations—are a long established tradition in the film world. Initially, adaptations of canons in other fields were to some extent part of a marketing ploy to legitimize film as art and appeal to good taste (Hayward, 2001). Now adaptations seem to have become a common phenomenon, including films adapted from plays such as *Sweeney Todd* (2007), books like *Lord of the Rings* (2001), or comics such as *The Avengers* (2012) (Kersten, 2012; Simonton, 2009). Adaptations of well-known stories or ideas from other mediums are often used as a way to appeal to (existing) audiences, where their already familiar, themes, story, and characters are believed to provide an advantage (e.g. Litman & Kohl, 1989). Adaptations do tend to achieve various levels of success (or recognition). For example, adaptations from plays and (classical) novels are more likely to result in awards and critical acclaim (professional and critical recognition). Yet, they do tend to not stand-out in terms of box-office results (popular recognition) (Simonton 2005b, 2009). Thus, the type of recognition might also depend upon the medium that the adaptation is adapted from (Simonton, 2005a).

Runtime is interesting as it tends to positively influence the artistic and economic dimension of films (Simonton, 2005b, 2009; Wallace et al., 1993), having a positive effect on all three types of recognition (popular, professional, and critical) (Simonton, 2005b, 2009). On the one hand, astonishing visual effects—fitting with the blockbuster formula—frequently result in longer runtimes (Holbrook, 1999). On the other hand, longer films possess a greater potential for richness in relation to its plot and characters, fitting with artistic criteria (Simonton, 2005b). Simonton (2009) even highlights how films that win awards for worst picture, director, screenplay, and actor are often shorter than those films that win at the Oscars. Thus, this film attribute is one that transcends the artistic and commercial boundaries between various films (Simonton, 2005b, 2009). Films need time in order to realize their full creative potential (Simonton, 2009).

Budget might be a predictor of film quality, as large budgets mean that greater value is put into the film and its production (Litman, 1983). Producing films is an expensive endeavour, which

includes large budgets to realize spectacle; lavish special effects, costumes and sets; hiring stars; great skill in filming and editing; marketing campaigns; and more (Basuroy et al., 2003; Chang & Ki, 2005; Prag & Casavant, 1994; Terry et al., 2005). Yet, such big budgets do seem to go against the logic of the field of art films. Furthermore, it might be contested what kind of film quality big budgets lead to. That is, large budgets are often seen as a predictor of the box-office success of films (popular recognition) (Basuroy et al., 2003; Brewer et al., 2009; Chang & Ki, 2005; Litman, 1983; Terry et al., 2005; Simonton, 2009). Yet, big budgets do not increase the odds for awards or critical acclaim (professional and critical recognition) (Simonton, 2005b, 2009), or perhaps even decreasing evaluations of artistic quality (Holbrook & Addis, 2008). Hence, big budgets seem to affect film attributes that the public rather than critics and peers might appreciate such as sense-stimulating effects and visual impact, but without the powerful (artistic) drama (Simonton, 2009). However, it should be kept in mind that cheaper is not necessarily better, but rather that large budgets do not necessarily add to the possible artistic impact of a film. Best film awards are bestowed on films with outstanding screenplays, directing, cinematography and acting (Simonton, 2005a; Zickar & Slaughter, 1999).

To conclude, cast and content attributes serve as characteristics that can help frame aesthetic judgements and distinguish certain films as art, by corresponding to certain aesthetic criteria and separating art films from their commercial counterparts (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2007). These attributes should thus provide a clearer understanding of what films patriciate and win the awards at international film festivals.

3. Method

The interest of this research is the assigning of professional recognition through prestigious prizes at international film festivals. More specifically, what attributes a film possesses that result in winning the prestigious prize for best film at these cultural events, by conducting a statistical analysis of cast and content related attributes.

3.1 Research Design

International film festivals act as agents of legitimacy, whose efforts contribute to the maintaining of films as an artistic product (and field) by assigning prestige—i.e. symbolic capital in the shape of prizes—to films and filmmakers. The cast and content of a film are believed to play an important role in how a film is perceived and appreciated as well as the chances of gaining any (specific) type of recognition. Furthermore, the logics of a field should (ideally) translate into production practices as well as valorisation and consecration practices, where value is assigned based on certain (field-specific) aesthetic standards. Within the film festival context these practices should be based on the goals of artistic merit and the ideology of authorship. Thus, in between cast and content might be found the possible distinguishing attribute that result in prestigious acclaim in the shape of international film festival prizes, where these attributes are expected to correspond to the logics of the field of art films. The focus of this research results in the following research question: *Looking at several international film festivals—their award winners and nominees—from 1996 to 2016, how do cast and content related attributes influence or contribute to the chances of winning the award for best film at these prestigious cultural events?* Furthermore, two sub-questions have been set-up to make a more systematic and organized division between different relevant areas and their corresponding independent variables. The first sub-question is related to the cast: *How do central or core cast members—director, screenwriters, and actors – influence the chances of winning?* The second sub-question is related to film content: *How do the content attributes of genre, MPAA-rating, true stories, adaptations, runtime and budget influence the chances of winning?*

A quantitative framework is used to answer the research question, as it provides several benefits to this research. The previous studies already provided some insight into what might be relevant in relation to winning awards at international film festivals, such as the theories of cultural fields and the auteur as well as attributes used in previous researches. Here, a quantitative framework allows for the testing of theories, where (relevant or valid) concepts are drawn from previous theory and research, turned into variables and tested (Bryman, 2012). Furthermore, it allows for the use of numerical data and statistical analysis. Numerical data is preferable, as it allows for a larger sample size—including data from different festivals and over a longer period of time—and thereby increasing the precision of the sample (Bryman, 2012; Privitera, 2012). Statistical

measurement (or analysis) makes it possible to find and describe fine differences between variables, and allows for more precise estimates of the relationship between the various film attributes and winning awards (Bryman, 2012). A quantitative approach also allows for generalizing findings, including about film festivals, their award winners, and their position in the field (Bryman, 2012). In short, a quantitative framework is most suitable for studying the various causes of social phenomenon and their relative importance (Bryman, 2012). It allows for researching which and how various film attributes influence the odds for winning prestigious prizes at the international film festival.

For the research design both winners and nominees are chosen to allow for a comparison between these two groups. A comparative design is useful for testing concepts across diverse settings as well as finding similarities and differences between two or more groups, in this case festival winners and nominees. Comparing these two (meaningfully contrasting) cases can show whether there are any meaningful differences between these two groups, and allows for a better understanding of phenomena as well as better theory-building (Bryman, 2012; Livingstone, 2003). Furthermore, a period of twenty years was chosen for the design. In the theoretical framework it was discussed how film festivals went through their second (and final) shift between the 1980s and 1990s, becoming a truly global phenomenon (and film festivals as they exist today). Therefore, starting in the 1990s is a good period to research the film festivals in their eventual (and current) form. This also contributes to increasing the sample, and thus decreasing the sampling error and increasing the precision of a sample (Bryman, 2012). This period also provides a sufficient amount of available data for the various film festivals over a longer period of time.

3.2 The Sample and Data Collection

The data sample consists of award winners and nominees at several international film festivals. Non-probability sampling is used, where several international film festivals are selected and used for data collection (Bryman, 2012). The focus is on competitive film festivals that have comparable awards categories, have a (non-specialised or non-themed) global focus, and where the jury consists of (international) peer filmmakers.

The initial sample was found using The International Federation of Film Producers Associations (FIAPF, n.d.). FIAPF is a global organization that represents the interests of filmmaker communities, and is responsible for accrediting film festivals. This accreditation demands that those film festivals uphold a minimum standard of reliability and quality. Furthermore, FIAPF has classified festivals into categories, where several have been labelled (non-specialised) competitive festivals with international juries awarding prizes (De Valck, 2007; Mezias et al., 2011; Wong, 2011). Thus, using FIAPF accredited film festivals ensures that the festivals used for data gathering share a

comparable level of quality, standards, and an international award setting. In total fifteen festivals have the relevant FIAPF accreditation. Three festivals were chosen: Venice, Italy (established 1932); Cannes, France (1946); Berlin, Germany (1951). These three festivals should prove interesting as they represent the three most well-known and esteemed major film festivals worldwide (e.g. De Valck, 2007; Evans, 2007; Wong, 2011), and act as locations “where people, prestige, and power tend to concentrate” (De Valck, 2007, p.36).

These film festivals take place yearly³. Filmmakers can submit their film, which is followed by a selection procedure with the festival director holding the final decision power on the selection and program. The official selection—the in-competition section—consists of a pool of about twenty nominees per festival, where the various festival prizes are assigned to the films within this pool by a jury of international peers. For this research, the award for best film is used, as this prize is considered the most prestigious prize a film can win at the film festivals. This category is thus most suitable for researching what attributes a film possesses that result in this prestigious professional recognition at film festivals. These awards include the Golden Bear at Berlin; Palme D’or at Cannes; and Golden Lion at Venice. Next, all the festivals include special jury prizes that are generally considered the second most prestigious prize at film festivals. These are assigned to one of the others films within competition (i.e. second place), as well as a third place at Cannes. These categories have also been included to widen the sample of award winning films: Jury Grand Prix at Berlin; Grand Prix de Jury (2nd) and Prix de Jury (3rd) at Cannes; and Grand Jury Prize at Venice. Together, these festivals and categories result in a total sample of 157 award winning films (see appendix A). There is no overlap in the sample, since film festivals generally exclude films that are not (regional) premieres as well as films that have participated in other festivals (with some exceptions or variations in regulations) (e.g. Berlinale, n.d.). There were several instances where there were ties between two films or where the award was not awarded: Berlin in 2002 (tie 1st place), as well as Cannes in 1997 (tie 1st place), 2003 (3rd place not awarded), and in 2011 (tie 2nd place).

The pool of remaining nominees at each festival from which the award winners are chosen provides the sample for the nominees. This results in an initial sample of 1154 nominated films, excluding the films that won an award in one of the previous categories. Next, random sampling was used. The size of the sample was selected by taking 1/20 of the total sample—similar to the odds of winning if these were random—for each festival, resulting in 66 films. One film per festival was added to have a sample of at least 200 films. The nominees were assigned a random number in excel, and the sorted from low to high. The first 67 films were then used for the data sample. The final sample consists of 201 nominated films (see appendix B). The winners and nominees together

³ Festival (approximate) timeline: 1. Berlin (February); 2. Cannes (May); 3. Venice (August).

provide a total data sample of 358 films. Limiting the sample to the three most esteemed festivals as well as a (representative) sample of the nominees does result in a smaller data sample, but increases the overall quality (and reliability) of the data set. By limiting the amount of data that needed to be gathered, data could be gathered more carefully (e.g. data triangulation). Furthermore, it provides the opportunity for more detailed analysis of the films and their attributes within this dataset.

For data collection online databases are used. To identify winners and nominees data is collected from the film festivals' individual websites (Berlinale, n.d.; Cannes, n.d.; La Biennale, n.d.) and the Internet Movie Database (IMDB.com). These sites provide an overview of festival winners and nominees per year. Data triangulation is used, where these sources are used complementary as a means of double-checking the data and supplementing missing or incomplete data. The data on film attributes for analysis are retrieved from IMDB (IMDB.com) (used as the primary source), Box-Office Mojo (boxofficemojo.com), The Numbers (the-numbers.com) and Allmovie (allmovie.com) (unless otherwise specified), which provide detailed information on films, filmmakers and their performances.

3.3 Operationalization

The dependent variable is winning an award versus getting nominated. This is a categorical (binary) variable, with a value of 1 if the film won the award for best film and a value of 0 if the film was only nominated. Fitting with the two sub-questions and areas of interest—cast and content—the independent variables have been divided into two main categories of cast and content, with the corresponding independent (predictor) variables and hypotheses.

3.3.1. Cast

The three primary cast members are used for analysing the effects of cast. These include: the director, the main auteur and creative leader; the screenwriter, the second most important collaborator and the auteur behind the script; and the actors, who also provide their creative input and talent as well as represent the most visible cast members. For the latter, the top three lead actors are used, found by cross-referencing the top three listed “stars”, the cast listing, and the plot on IMDB (IMDB.com). Furthermore, for all the variables the average of the (separate) cast members was taken. That is, several films had two directors, in which case the average of these two directors was taken to represent director in the analysis. The same was done in the case of multiple screenwriters. For actors the average of the three aforementioned actors was used. The attributes that are used for the cast include the economic reputation, artistic reputation and experience of these various filmmakers as well as whether the director co-wrote the script (director-writer).

Star power or status (reputation) are a reflection of certain kinds of legitimacy, and can also have a positive effect on the perception of quality of a film as well as the odds of consecration. For this research both artistic and economic reputations are used. Since film festivals place themselves within the field of art film where artistic achievement should be valued over commercial successes, the following hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 1a: Artistic reputations have a positive effect on the odds of winning.

Hypothesis 1b: Economic reputations have a negative effect on the odds of winning.

Economic reputation is often based on the box-office performance of previous films. In this research the highest previous box-office is used. This provides a good indicator of the highest economic reputation (or success) a cast member has achieved. It reflects commercial influence (Mezias et al., 2011), which might also provide certain name (or face) recognition (e.g. Collings et al., 2002). Furthermore, using the highest previous box-office also fits best with the available data, since for several of the cast members in the sample the information available on previous box-office success was frequently limited to information on one film (or no information at all). Artistic reputations are the result of critical acclaim and industry recognition through awards and nominations. The focus of this research is on professional recognition. Therefore, previous wins and nominations at film festivals (in the official main jury categories) as well as industry ceremonies—such as the Oscars and other national academy awards⁴—were used for artistic reputation. For the director and writer previous wins and nominations for best director or writing (respectively) and at film festivals, as well as wins at industry awards for best film were counted. For actors the previous wins and nominations for best acting were counted. Previous wins and nominations were used as two separate indicators for artistic reputation.

The effect of experience is relatively uncertain. Experience can reflect both growth in skills (or talent to some extent) as well as the time for social networks to grow. Thus, one would expect experience to have a positive effect on the odds for consecration. However, previous studies found that this effect of experience decreases after a certain point (e.g. Rossman et al., 2009). Therefore, the following hypothesis was developed:

Hypothesis 2: Experience has no effect on the odds of winning.

For experience the total number of previous films the filmmakers have worked on (in their respective roles) is used.

⁴ A full list of these industry awards is included in the appendix for overview.

Lastly, a variable for director-writer is included. This variable describes whether the director also (co)wrote the script. This fits with the auteur theory where the director is seen as the main creative genius behind the film who has the greatest influence on the final product (e.g. Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2007). A director-writer should then reflect a highly skilled artist—even more so than directors who do not participate in the writing process—and should be even more capable of incorporating his/her creative vision and style into the project (e.g. Simonton, 2005b). Director-writers should thus fulfil this (romantic) vision of the auteur. Furthermore, previous research found that director-writers have a positive effect on winning awards (Simonton, 2009). These considerations resulted in the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Director-writers have a positive effect on the odds of winning.

Director-writer is used as a binary variable, taking a value of 1 if the director was a (co)writer and 0 if this was not the case.

3.3.2. Content

The attributes that were used for content include genre, number of genres, MPAA-ratings, true stories, adaptations, runtime and budget. These attributes contribute to the classification (as art or commercial entertainment) and valorisation of films.

Genres relate to content, are important in the classification of films, and affect the perception and appreciation of films. The previous chapter discussed that drama is often considered the more prestigious and artistic genre (whereas the effect for other genres remains relatively unclear). Thus, the following hypothesis was developed:

Hypothesis 4: The genre of drama has the strongest positive effect on the odds of winning.

For this variable the genres listed on IMDB (IMDB.com) are used, as these all occur in the data sample. This results in a list of 20 genres: action, adventure, animation, biography, comedy, crime, documentary, drama, family, fantasy, history, horror, music/musical, mystery, romance, sci-fi, sport, thriller, war, and western. However, not all of the variables are included in the final analysis (see next chapter). These various genres are used as binary variables, equalling 1 if the film belongs to the corresponding genre and 0 if it does not. However, these genres are not mutually exclusive, as films frequently belong to multiple genres. In this case both genres (or more) have a value of 1.

The use of multiple genres might reflect experimentation with genres or genre cross-overs (e.g. Wong, 2011). Yet, at the same time multiple (or increasing numbers of) genres might have a negative effect on the odds of winning, as it might decrease the coherence of a film (Hsu, 2006).

Since festival films often experiment with genres and peers possess the aesthetic fluency to appreciate this, the following was hypothesized:

Hypothesis 5: Films consisting of multiple genres have a positive effect on the odds of winning.

The number of genres a film has (IMDB.com) is used.

MPAA-ratings reveal something about content, as well as influence the perception and appreciation of films. R-rated films seem to be considered more artistic and prestigious as well as more likely to receive professional recognition than the other the ratings, due to the type of content they represent. The hypothesis thus is:

Hypothesis 6: R-ratings have a positive effect on the odds of winning.

Dummy variables are used for the MPAA-ratings: R-rating, NC-17, PG-13, and G. Films without a MPAA-rating were considered missing values and excluded from the concerned analysis.

True stories fit within the possible ideological functions of films, professional recognition, and the film festivals' search for significant or relevant topics. Thus, the following was hypothesized:

Hypothesis 7: True stories have a positive effect on the odds of winning.

Both IMDB (IMDB.com) and The Numbers (the-numbers.com) provide several manners to assess whether a film is based on a true story (e.g. keywords and source). True stories are used as a binary variable, with a value of 1 if a film is based on a true story and 0 if it is not.

Adaptations are a long established phenomenon in the world of film, and vary in their appeal to audiences as well as original mediums from which they are adapted. Yet, they do seem to do achieve some professional recognition (also dependent upon the original source) (Simonton, 2005b). The hypothesis thus is:

Hypothesis 8: Adaptations have a positive effect on the odds of winning.

The information on adaptations is retrieved from the online databases (e.g. keywords). There are four main adaptation types included in the sample: books, plays, comics, and other. However, the frequency of these sub-types is relatively small. Therefore, adaptations are used a general binary variable, with a value of 1 if the film is an adaptation from another medium and 0 if it is not.

Runtime seems to be related to the overall quality of (various) films, be it in artistic or economic dimension. Therefore, the following was hypothesized:

Hypothesis 9: Runtime has a positive effect on the odds of winning.

For runtime the film's length in minutes is used.

Lastly, budgets are believed to affect the quality of the film, as it influences the resources available. At the same time, budget seems to correspond to two oppositional field logics, with low-budget art films on one side and high-budget commercial blockbusters on the other. Since film festivals position themselves within the field of art film, they should focus on artistic excellence rather than commercial interests. Hence, budget should not be an important element of film success:

Hypothesis 10: Budget has no effect on the odds of winning.

The square root of the production budget in dollars is used for this variable, to reduce the effect of (high valued) outliers and even out the distribution of the data (Field, 2013). It should be noted that many studies highlight that budgets are often difficult to determine or even confidential (e.g. Chang & Ki, 2005). Correspondingly, IMDB (IMDB.com) writes estimate with the budget on their site, while for several films the budget is even unknown (207 in total).

3.4. Analysis

Excel and IBM SPSS Statistics are used to store and organize the data. The data is analysed using SPSS. For statistical analysis binary logistic regression is used, since the dependent variable is a categorical variable with two categories (Field, 2013; Privitera, 2012). The independent variables were used to build two separate models related to cast and content (along with a combined model), and analyse their effects on the odds of winning. The analysis process and results are discussed in the next chapter.

4. Results

In SPSS binary logistic regression was used to analyse the effects of the independent variables (the predictors) on winning versus being nominated (the dependent variable). First, two baseline models were made, corresponding to the two sub-questions. Model 1 corresponds to the effects of the cast on the odds of winning; model 2 corresponds to the effect of content features. Several regressions were run with the independent variables to assess these baseline models as well as the effect of the independent variables on the odds of winning. As a final step the two models were combined in one complete (third) model and run in a regression analysis. The results are discussed below.

4.1 Analysis and Results

4.1.1. Cast

Model 1 addresses the cast. For this model the predictors related to the reputations and experience of the director, writer, and actors as well as the predictor for director-writer were included.

The summary for model 1 can be found in table 4.1 (below). In this analysis only 234 of the 358 cases are included—131 (of 201) nominees and 103 (of 157) award winners—due to missing values for economic reputations. In total 124 cases are missing: 104 values for director, 95 for writer, and 19 for actors (missing values overlap). In block 0—the model before the predictors are included—56% of the cases are classified correctly. Then, block 1—after including all the predictors—shows that the model now correctly classifies 77.9% of the nominees and 61.2% of the winners. Overall, 70.5% of the cases are classified correctly. The addition of the predictors significantly improves the model, with a chi-square of 50.828 and $p=.000$. According to Nagelkerke R^2 26.2% of the variance in the model is explained by the predictors. However, given the large number of missing cases, an additional regression analysis was done without the predictors related to economic reputation to allow for the inclusion of all the 358 cases and analyse how this might influence the effects of the predictor variables. This summary can be found in table 4.1 as well, under model 1a. This model 1a is again a significant improvement, correctly classifying 65.6% of the total cases.

The next step is taking a closer look at the contribution of the independent variables. The effects of the predictors are assessed based on model 1 and 1a. Furthermore, additional regression analyses were done with the predictors individually (model 1c) and per cast member (model 1d). This way the effect for the individual predictors without the other predictors can be analysed. Whereas the analysis of individual cast members allows for analysing their effects per individual cast member. These results can also be found in table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Binary logistic regression of cast attributes

		Model 1			Model 1a			Model 1c				Model 1d		
		B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	Sig. Chi-square; Block 1	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)
Cast														
Director	Director-writer	.390	.440	1.477	.398	.347	1.489	.863**	.279	2.370	***56.1%			
	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000			-	.000	.000	1.000	56.3%	.000	.000	1.000
	Artistic reputation (wins)	.104*	.047	1.109	.084*	.038	1.087	.057*	.023	1.059	*57.5%	.103**	.033	1.109
Writer	Artistic reputation (nom.)	-.062	.063	.940	-.062	.048	.940	-.025	.023	.976	56.1%	-.049	.039	.952
	Experience	-.015	.015	.985	-.015	.012	.985	-.021**	.008	.979	**54.7%	-.021~	.011	.979
	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000			-	.000	.000	1.000	57.8%	.000	.000	1.000
Actors	Artistic reputation (wins)	.021	.044	1.021	.038	.036	1.039	.095***	.025	1.099	***61.7%	.112**	.036	1.118
	Artistic reputation (nom.)	.062	.075	1.063	.061	.058	1.063	.040	.030	1.040	55.6%	-.019	.048	.982
	Experience	-.004	.017	.996	-.003	.013	.997	-.009	.009	.991	56.1%	-.016	.012	.984
—	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000			-	.000**	.000	1.000	***56%	.000	.000	1.000
	Artistic reputation (wins)	-.098	.156	.907	-.149	.129	.861	-.300***	.086	.741	***64.5%	-.118	.124	.889
	Artistic reputation (nom.)	.047	.108	1.048	.014	.090	1.014	-.212***	.065	.809	***64.2%	.012	.095	1.012
—	Experience	-.033**	.011	.968	-.020**	.007	.980	-.027***	.006	.973	***64.8%	-.019*	.008	.981
	Constant	.228	.474	1.255	-.101	.361	.904							
	N	234			358							Director	Writer	Actors
	Block 0	56%			56.1%							254	263	339
	Block 1	70.5%			65.6%							56.3%	57.8%	56%
	- Nominees	- 77.9%			- 73.1%							61.8%	63.5%	66.4%
	- Winners	- 61.2%			- 56.1%							- 80.4%	- 90.8%	- 76.3%
	Chi-Square	50.828***			55.429***							- 37.8%	- 26.1%	- 53.7%
	Nagelkerke R ²	.262			.192							19.656***	15.419**	26.760***
	Hosmer and Lemeshow test	.545			.238							.100	.077	.102
												.602	.262	.041

~p <.10, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.001

Notes: Models: 1—baseline model, 1a— model without the predictor for budget, 1c—individual analysis of predictors, 1d—analysis of predictors in separate models (per cast member).

Hypotheses 1a and 1b were related to reputations. It was hypothesized that artistic reputations would have a positive effect on the odds of winning, while economic reputations would have a negative effect. The artistic reputation of the director based on previous wins consistently has a significant, positive effect on the odds of winning ($p < .05$ in the models 1, 1a and individually; $p < .01$ per cast member). For the writer previous wins have a significant, positive effect in model 1c ($p < .001$) and 1d ($p < .01$). Additional analysis finds that this significant effect disappears when the predictor related to previous wins of the director is included. On the one hand, this might show that the artistic reputation of the director—the primary auteur—is valued over that of the writer (i.e. more important for the odds of winning). On the other hand, it also seems that directors regularly choose to work again with writers that they have worked with (successfully) in the past, where there seem to be some several frequently occurring combinations of directors and writers in the sample (along with the frequent occurrence of director-writers). This could then also be the cause of this decrease in significance in writers' artistic reputations. Interestingly, for actors the two predictors for artistic reputation have a significant effect in model 1c ($p < .001$), but here these effects are negative. For actors the effects of economic reputations are significant, positive instead ($p < .01$ in model 1c). However, both reputations lose significance when other predictors are included in the model. Additional analyses show that (primarily) experience results in this decrease of significance. Lastly, for directors and writers economic reputations never show any significant effect. Overall, hypothesis 1a could not be rejected, except in the case of actors. However, it should be noted that the effect of artistic reputations is primarily based on previous wins. The results do lead to rejection of hypothesis 1b in the case of actors (but not when it comes to directors and writers).

Thus, fitting with the position of film festivals in the field of art films—with a focus on auteurism—the artistic reputation of the director and writer are more important than their economic reputations. For actors this effect seems opposite, with economic reputations tending more towards a significant positive effect and artistic reputations having a negative effect. This might reflect that the logics of art fields are more focussed on the primary auteurs—the director and writer—who should not be interested in commercial gain. Whereas actors are perhaps to some point excluded from this logic. For actors economic reputation might be their sign of star power, that allows for a certain influence and name (or face) recognition. Furthermore, the positive effect of artistic reputations for the director and writer—especially previous wins—shows that there does seem to exist some cumulative advantage, with the legitimacy of high status cast members increasing the chances for (additional) prestige (i.e. awards). Filmmakers who already have a higher status might indeed be perceived as producing higher quality films, influencing quality evaluations

and increasing the odds for recognition (i.e. winning) (Elberse, 2007; Hsu, 2006; Rossman et al., 2009).

Some additional analyses were done to take a closer look at the effects of artistic reputations. In the previous models all the previous wins and nominations were combined into two main predictors. However, for directors and writers it is also possible to make a distinction between the types of wins and nominations, and analyse their relative importance. Therefore, an additional analysis was done with these more specific predictor variables. For the directors and writers these predictors included the previous wins and nominations for best director or writer (respectively) and best film at film festivals, as well as previous wins for best film at industry awards. The predictors remained the same for actors. These more specific predictors were analysed in the model (model 1b), as well as individually (model 1c) and per cast member (model 1e). The summaries can be found below in table 4.2. Model 1b again results in a significantly improved model. The total amount of cases classified correctly, however, is slightly lower than in model 1 (from 70.5% to 68.8%). Hence, the predictors representing total previous wins and nominations might still represent the most useful main predictors for artistic reputations (in the baseline model).

The previous analyses (table 4.1) revealed that for director the previous wins have a significant, positive effect on the odds of winning. Here the results show that especially previous wins at film festivals have a significant positive effect in all three models (1b, 1c, and 1e: $p < .01$). The other previous wins show no significant effects, albeit that the effect for previous wins at industry ceremonies tends towards (positive) significant in model 1e ($p < .10$). This time, there are also some significant (positive) effects for previous nominations for the director (unlike in table 4.1). Previous film festival nominations have no significant effect, but previous nominations for best direction is almost significant in model 1b ($p < .10$) and becomes significant in model 1c ($p < .05$). There do seem to be some interaction effect between the two types of nominations, as both become significant when either of the two is taken-out of the analysis. Consequently, it seems that the director's previous wins are still the better indicator of the odds for winning, where it is likely that nominations do not have an actual effect. For the writer, previous wins showed a significant effect when analysed individually and per cast member in table 4.1. In table 4.2 previous wins for best film at industry awards and at film festivals are both fairly close to significance in model 1b ($p < .10$), and both become significant in model 1c ($p < .001$). Finally, the effect for actors remains the same as in the previous analyses. Thus, artistic reputations of the director and writer remain important attributes. Hypothesis 1a can still not be rejected.

Table 4.2: Binary logistic regression of cast attributes

		Model 1			Model 1b			Model 1c				Model 1e		
		B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	Sig. Chi-square; Block 1	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)
Cast														
Director	Director-writer	.390	.440	1.477	.761	.490	2.140	.863**	.279	2.370	***56.1%			
	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000	.000	.000	1.000	.000	.000	1.000	56.3%	.000	.000	1.000
	Artistic reputation (wins)	.104*	.047	1.109				.057*	.023	1.059	*57.5%			
	Best direction				-.062	.110	.940	-.004	.059	.996	56.1%	-.062	.085	.940
	Best film – industry awards				.103	.163	1.108	.120	.092	1.128	57.3%	.199~	.116	1.220
	Best film – film festivals				.333**	.126	1.396	.109**	.035	1.116	***57.3%	.170**	.054	1.186
	Artistic Reputation (nom.)	-.062	.063	.940				-.025	.023	.976	56.1%			
Writer	Best direction				-.216~	.123	.805	-.176*	.074	.839	*56.1%	-.172~	.099	.842
	At film festivals				-.08	.089	.920	-.005	.027	.995	56.1%	-.028	.044	.972
	Experience	-.015	.015	.985	-.020	.017	.980	-.021**	.008	.979	**54.7%	-.023*	.012	.978
	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000	.000	.000	1.000	.000	.000	1.000	57.8%	.000	.000	1.000
	Artistic reputation (wins)	.021	.044	1.021				.095***	.025	1.099	***61.7%			
	Best writing				.238	.228	1.269	.102	.122	1.108	57%	.145	.154	1.156
	Best film – industry awards				.216~	.122	1.241	.185***	.050	1.203	***59.8%	.090	.100	1.094
Actors	Best film – film festivals				-.384~	.198	.681	.173***	.046	1.188	***61.2%	.152	.093	1.164
	Artistic Reputation (nom.)	.062	.075	1.063				.040	.030	1.040	55.6%			
	Best direction				.162	.125	1.176	-.025	.072	.976	56.1%	.064	.092	1.066
	At film festivals				.101	.109	1.106	.054	.034	1.055	57.3%	-.046	.056	.955
	Experience	-.004	.017	.996	.002	.019	1.002	-.009	.009	.991	56.1%	-.016	.013	.984
	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000	.000	.000	1.000	.000**	.000	1.000	***56%	.000	.000	1.000
	Artistic reputation (wins)	-.098	.156	.907	-.103	.161	.902	-.300***	.086	.741	***64.5%	-.118	.124	.889
—	Artistic Reputation (nom.)	.047	.108	1.048	.060	.111	1.062	-.212***	.065	.809	***64.2%	.012	.095	1.012
	Experience	-.033**	.011	.968	-.038***	.012	.962	-.027***	.006	.973	***64.8%	-.019*	.008	.981
	Constant	.228	.474	1.255	-.043	.510	.958							
											Director	Writer	Actors	
	N	234			234						254	263	339	
	Block 0	56%			56%						56.3%	57.8%	56%	
	Block 1	70.5%			68.8%						66.1%	62.7%	66.4%	
	- Nominees	- 77.9%			- 74.8%						- 84.6%	- 87.5%	- 76.3%	
	- Winners	- 61.2%			- 61.2%						- 42.3%	- 28.8%	- 53.7%	
	Chi-Square	50.828***			61.426**						27.529***	16.856*	26.760***	
	Nagelkerke R ²	.262			.309						.138	.083	.102	
	Hosmer and Lemeshow test	.545			.140						.647	.805	.041	

~p <.10, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***p <.001

Notes: Models: 1—baseline model, 1b—model with specific predictor for artistic reputations, 1c—individual analysis of predictors, 1e—analysis of predictors in separate models (per cast member).

The next hypothesis was related to experience. Previous studies found that the experience only increases the odds for consecration up to a certain point, after which they decrease again (e.g. Rossman et al., 2009). Therefore, it was hypothesized that experience (simply) has no effect on the odds of winning. Interestingly, the effect for experience is actually generally negative. However, the effect is only consistently significant in the case of actors ($p < .01$ in the models 1, 1a and 1b; $p < .001$ individually; $p < .05$ per cast member). For directors the effect is significant in model 1c ($p < .01$). For writers the effect never shows any significance. Still, this leads to a rejection of hypothesis 2. The effect is neither positive or completely absent, but negative instead. This negative or lack of effect might mean that experience does not contribute to the (perceived) artistic quality of a film. Yet, another interpretation could be that the supposed development of additional talent or skills gained by experience might indeed be less important than the perception of talent or artistic quality (i.e. status or legitimacy) in the eyes of others (Lincoln, 2007; Rossman et al., 2009). This does explain the results, where there is either a negative effect for experience or a lack of effect when the other predictors are included in the model, such as directors' artistic reputations.

The last hypothesis for cast was related to director-writer. It was hypothesized that directors who participate in the writing process would have a positive effect on the odds of winning. Director-writers are even more likely to gain prestige (e.g. Simonton, 2009). Yet, more importantly, it corresponds to the notion—or even cultural schema—of the *auteur*, which is a fundamental concept in the field of art films (e.g. Baumann, 2007). The effect for this predictor is significantly, positive in model 1c ($p < .01$). Further analysis finds that mainly the writer's artistic reputation and director's experience seem to result in this decrease in the effect of director-writer. It seems that director-writers have relatively more experience and higher artistic reputations, where the inclusion of these variables then cancel-out the effect of the predictor for director-writer. A final look at the frequencies (see appendix D) shows that there are indeed relatively more director-writers among the award winners than the nominees. Hypothesis 3 could not be rejected.

The first model can then help answer the first sub-question: *How do central or core cast members—director, screenwriters, and actors—influence the chances of winning?* It can thus be said that cast members do indeed influence the odds of winning, with the predictor variables related to the cast significantly improving all of the models—i.e. correctly classifying which films might win or not. The results supported most of the hypotheses, except for hypothesis 2 where experience actually results in a negative effect. On basis of these results and the hypotheses it can be said that the film's cast attributes do seem to be judged in accordance to the logics of the field of art films. The cast members are judged based on their artistic reputations (rather than economic reputations

or experience), albeit that actors represent an exception here (as previously discussed). Furthermore, director-writers showed a significant, positive effect, fitting with the vision (or concept) of the auteur.

4.1.2. Content

Model 2 addresses the content. For this model the predictors related to true stories, adaptations, MPAA-ratings, genres, budget and runtime were included in the model. However, this model included a larger number of predictors, where several did not add to the model. Therefore, this model first went through a more careful building process to find the best baseline model.

An initial test was run with all the predictor variables for content in the model. In this analysis only 151 cases were included—73 (of 201) nominees and 78 (of 157) award winners—with 207 missing cases due to missing values for budget. This initial model did result in a significantly improved model⁵, correctly classifying 76.8% of the cases. However, several of these predictors were less frequent in the data sample, and were taken-out in a stepwise approach. Consequently, the genres action, adventure, sci-fi, western, horror, family and sport as well as rating G were taken out of the model. This improved the predictive strength of the model to 78.1% of the total cases. The other variables for genre were left in the model. Previous studies generally found that dramas are more likely to gain professional recognition, however these studies were often limited to other contexts such as the Oscars and/or to only several genres (e.g. just drama, or the major genres like action, drama, romance, and comedy). It still seems rather uncertain what the effects of these various genres might be in the context of film festivals. Moreover, these remaining genres do add something to the model, as removing them decreases the model's predictive strength.

The model still showed some problems. That is, the genres documentary and animation as well as rating NC-17 were subject to high standard errors (*SE*) and odds ratios, but could not be taken-out of the model without reducing its predictive strength. Therefore, the possible source for these high values was examined. For documentary the high *SE* and odds ratio were related to the missing cases, as the inclusion of more cases reduced these two values. Animation and NC-17 maintained their high *SEs* and odds ratios even when all the cases were included. Here, the high values were connected to their frequency in the data, where both only occur three times among award winners. To reduce these high values rating NC-17 was combined with rating R—both being related to mature content—and animation was combined with the genre of family. This only resulted in one extra value for animation as family occurred two times in the data, once in combination with animation and one time among the nominees. Consequently, there no longer

⁵ Block 0 to block 1: 51.7% to 76.8% (nominees: 71.2% and winners: 82.1%). Chi-square of 69.150, $p=.000$. Nagelkerke R^2 : .490. Hosmer and Lemeshow Test: .733.

were any extreme values for the *SEs* or odds ratios (when all the cases are included in the analysis). This model results in a significant improvement, still correctly classifying 78.1% of the total cases⁶.

The final adjustment to the model was taking out rating PG-13. This did reduce the predictive strength of the model, but would allow for a better analysis of the dummy variables related to MPAA-ratings. That is, the results will show the effect on the odds of winning with a film rated R/NC-17 rather than a film with a lower rating. The rating R/NC-17 is also the one of interest for this research, as these are perceived as being more prestigious and artistic. The summary of (the final) model 2 can be found in table 4.3 (below). In this analysis still only 151 cases are included. In block 0 51.7% of the cases are classified correctly. The model with the predictor variables again shows a significant improvement, with a chi-square of 55.043 and $p=.000$. The predictors explain 40.7% of the variance in the model. Furthermore, now 68.5% of the nominees and 75.6% of the winners are classified correctly. Overall 72.2% of the cases are classified correctly.

The next step is again looking at the contribution of the predictor variables. However, as only 151 cases were included in model 2, an additional regressions analysis was done without the predictor for budget. This allowed for the inclusion of all 358 cases, and analysing how the inclusion of all the cases influenced the effects of the predictors. This summary can be found in table 4.3 under model 2a. This model is again a significant improvement, correctly classifying 64.2% of the total cases. In addition, the predictors were again analysed individually (model 2b) to assess the their effects without the other predictors, as well as analysing several of the predictors together in separate models to assess the effects of certain predictor groups (e.g. only genres together) (model 2c).

The first predictors in the model are true stories and adaptations. While true stories have a positive effect, this effect only comes close to significance in model 2b ($p < .10$). However, this negative effect might also be related to the genres biographies and documentary, since excluding these two predictors in model 2a results in the effect for true stories becoming significant ($p < .05$). In other words, it seems that the biographies and documentary—both also being a form of true stories—cancel-out the effect of the predictor true stories. Consequently, hypothesis 7 cannot be rejected; true stories have a positive effect on the odds of winning. Adaptations have no significant effect (just $p < .10$ in model 2c). Thus, hypothesis 8 is rejected; adaptations have no effect on the odds of winning. It is possible that non-adapted films represent more originality (in screenplay), fitting better with the concept or the rise of the auteur, self-expression of the directors and field of art films (e.g. Baumann, 2007; Kersten, 2012).

⁶ Block 0 to block 1: 51.7% to 78.1% (nominees: 75.3% and winners: 80.8%). Chi-square of 58.816, $p=.000$. Nagelkerke R^2 : .430. Hosmer and Lemeshow Test: .396.

Table 4.2: Binary logistic regression content attributes

		Model 2			Model 2a			Model 2b				Model 2c		
		B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	Sig. Chi-square; Block 1	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)
Content														
	True stories	.479	.785	1.615	.686	.472	1.985	.619~	.339	1.858	~57.8%			
	Adaptations	-.374	.454	.688	-.321	.262	.725	-.415~	.241	.660	~56.1%			
MPAA-rating	Rating R/NC-17	.559	.458	1.749	.400	.257	1.492	.065	.222	.772	56.1%			
Genre	Number of Genres	-1.269*	.604	.281	-1.121*	.450	.326	-.213*	.108	.809	*56.4%			
	Drama	2.583~	1.428	13.234	1.490*	.715	4.437	.240	.418	1.271	56.1%	.429	.567	1.535
	Romance	.089	.798	1.093	.643	.526	1.902	-.386	.254	.680	56.1%	-.549*	.267	.578
	Comedy	1.180	.896	3.255	1.257*	.554	3.515	.169	.290	1.184	56.1%	.156	.310	1.169
	Thriller	.044	.851	1.045	-.137	.613	.872	-1.097**	.362	.334	***56.1%	-1.123*	.439	.325
	Crime	1.013	.846	2.753	1.058~	.601	2.881	-.341	.343	.711	56.1%	.019	.385	1.020
	War	1.287	.794	3.621	1.322*	.556	3.750	.227	.344	1.319	56.1%	.409	.373	1.505
	Mystery	.979	.987	2.661	1.592*	.708	4.915	-.240	.418	.787	56.1%	.311	.491	1.365
	Biography	1.638	1.193	5.145	.459	.762	1.583	-.128	.447	.879	56.1%	-.272	.474	.762
	History	-.271	1.220	.763	.384	.815	1.469	-.584	.611	.558	56.1%	-.721	.632	.486
	Fantasy	3.005~	1.710	20.188	1.936*	.910	6.932	.417	.567	1.517	56.4%	.242	.617	1.274
	Music/musical	1.314	1.086	3.719	1.516*	.763	4.556	.604	.596	1.829	56.7%	.664	.615	1.942
	Documentary	21.445	27404.724	2057078256.322	2.108~	1.144	8.232	1.186	.844	3.273	57%	1.431	1.019	4.185
	Animation (/family)	23.859	21101.975	23014219930.349	2.666~	1.447	14.384	1.360	1.160	3.896	56.7%	1.160	1.209	3.190
	Budget in dollars (v)	-.001***	.000	.999				.000***	.000	1.000	***67.5%	-.001***	.000	.999
	Runtime in minutes	.022*	.011	1.022	.000	.004	1.000	-.002	.004	.998	56.1%	.018~	.009	1.018
—	Constant	-1.685	1.646	.185	-.421	.719	.657							
												Genre	Budget and Runtime	
	N	151			358							358	151	
	Block 0	51.7%			56.1%							56.1%	51.7%	
	Block 1	72.2%			64.2%							60.1%	66.2%	
	- Nominees	- 68.5%			- 82.6%							- 82.6%	- 61.6%	
	- Winners	- 75.6%			- 40.8%							- 33.8%	- 70.5%	
	Chi-Square	55.043***			35.247**							28.563*	20.121***	
	Nagelkerke R ²	.407			.126							.103	.166	
	Hosmer and Lemeshow test	.770			.644							.525	.647	

~p <.10, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***P<.001

Notes: Models: 2—baseline model, 2a—model without budget, 2b— individual analysis of predictors, 2c—analysis of predictors in separate models.

The ratings R/NC-17 also have an insignificant (positive) effect. Interestingly (not shown in the table), the effect for rating R/NC-17 was significant when PG-13 was included in the model ($p < .05$). The frequencies also reveal some additional interesting information about the MPAA-ratings. That is, the frequencies show that rating R is present far more in the data sample. Overall, rating R occurs 124 times and PG-13 32 times in the data (appendix E). In other words, films rated-R outperform the other ratings in their frequency in the data sample, reflecting that these films might already be selected more often than other ratings for inclusion in the film festival program. This also fits with dispositions towards R-ratings which are considered more prestigious and artistic, as well as a disposition towards the edgy and evocative subject matter that R ratings might represent. However, these results do lead to a rejection of hypothesis 6, since there is no (actual) significant, positive effect to the odds of winning (rather a seemingly positive effect on the odds for festival participation in general).

Before discussing the other predictors related to genres, let's first have another look at true stories, biographies, and documentary. Biography and documentary never have any significant effect, only documentary is near significance in model 2a ($p < .10$). However, comparable to true stories the effect for documentary does become significantly positive when the predictor for true stories is taken-out of model 2a ($p < .05$). This does further support hypothesis 7, true stories—in the context of the designation as true story or in the context of genre types—do have some (significant) positive effects on the odds of winning. This also corresponds to the film festivals' search for significance in films through (current) relevant themes and topics, as well as film festivals frequently serving as platforms for social causes. An example of such a film would be Michael Moore's *Fahrenheit 9/11* (2004) about the war on terror and President Bush that won the Palm D'or in 2004.

The number of genres consistently has a significant, negative effect on the odds of winning. Thus, hypothesis 5 is rejected. Films with fewer genres have a better odds of winning (two seems to be the maximum when taking the mean into consideration), while an increasing number of genres decreases the odds of winning. Films with a higher number of genres might indeed be less coherent, decreasing the quality of the film (Hsu, 2006). When it comes to genres the majority of them do have a significant effect in (at least one of) the models. The genre of drama does seem to be the most important, supporting hypothesis 4. The effect of dramas is almost significant in model 2 ($p < .10$), and becomes significant in model 2a ($p < .05$). Looking at the data sample, drama is also the most occurring genre (332 times in total). Thus, the majority of films participating at film festivals are of the genre of drama, occurring as a single genre or in combination with other genres. Several other genres also have a significant, positive effect, including fantasy ($p < .10$ in model 2; $p < .05$ in model 2a), comedy, war, mystery, and music/musical (all $p < .05$ in model 2a). The positive effects for crime,

documentary and animation are all insignificant (just $p < .10$ in model 2a for all three). The two genres romance and thriller both have significant, negative effects. Romance has a significant negative effect in model 2c ($p < .05$), while thriller has a significant negative effect in model 2b ($p < .01$) and 2c ($p < .05$). The only genre that never reaches any significant effect is history.

As expected, the (perceived as) more prestigious and artistic genre of drama seems to have the strongest influence on the odds of winning, being (close to) significant in the models where all the predictors and cases are included. It might be said that dramas also fits better with the characteristic of art films, such as the anti-classical narrative or story content; (psychologically) complex characters; realism; serious tones; meaningful messages and (every day) themes; and minimalism with the relatively low-budget genre of drama. In other words, dramas might better allow for certain art film characteristics to be present in a film than the other genres, and thus correspond better to the relevant aesthetic standards. However, other genres that might have seemed like less likely candidates for gaining prestige also showed significant positive effects, such as fantasy and music/musical. This might still be the effect of anti-genres or genre cross-overs (hybrids) as Wong (2011) described. Films that strongly go against expectations of their genre, crossing or experimenting with boundaries. Films that might be better understood and appreciated by audiences who have the level of cultural capital (i.e. knowledge) and ability or dispositions to do so, such as peers (e.g. Kersten, 2012). This also corresponds to film festivals' search for novelty and innovation in films.

The last two predictors in the model are budget and runtime. Runtime only has a significant (positive) effect in model 2 ($p < .05$). An additional analysis with the predictors for runtime and budget in a separate model also results in a close to significant, positive effect for runtime ($p < .10$). In other words, runtime has a (almost) significant effect when budget is included in the model, but the effect becomes insignificant when budget is not in the model. However, this decrease in significance might also be the result of the inclusion of all the cases (by taking budget out of the model). Therefore, it is decided to reject hypothesis 9 (for now), with runtime having no effect on the odds of winning. Budget consistently has a significant effect ($p < .001$ in model 2, 2a, 2b, and 2c). However, the effect does not seem to have any definite direction, as the regression coefficients go from negative to positive and the odds ratios tend to be around .999 or 1.000. The results thus support hypothesis 10, with budget seemingly having no real effect on the odds of winning. It looks like money does not matter for the film festival jurors, but art does (or the field of films as art and its logics, at least).

The second model provides an answer to the second sub-question: *How do the content attributes of genre, MPAA-rating, true stories, adaptations, runtime and budget influence the chances*

of winning? The content attributes do indeed influence or contribute to the chances of winning, as the predictors consistently improve the model(s) along with the classification of which films might win or not. From the results it can then be concluded that film festivals do search for novelty, innovation and significance in films (their content), along with dispositions towards attributes that are perceived as more prestigious and artistic. In other word, films that can be classified as art along the art versus commercial continuum.

4.1.3. Cast and Content

For the last analysis the two baseline models for cast and content were combined into a complete model (model 3), to determine how this complete model fitted with the data and the dependent variable. In this analysis only 122 cases are included—63 (of 201) nominees and 59 (of 157) winners—with 236 missing due to the accumulation of missing values for economic reputations and budget. The summary of model 3 can be found in table 4.4 (below). In block 0 51.6% of the cases are classified correctly. The model with all the predictors included results in a significant improvement, with a chi-square of 75.866 and $p=.000$. Furthermore, the predictors explain 61.8% of the variance in the model. This model correctly classifies 84.1% of the nominees and 84.7% of the winners. Overall, the model correctly classifies 84.4% of the cases.

An additional analysis was done without the predictors for economic reputations and budget, to again allow for the inclusion of all 358 cases. The summary of this model can found in table 4.4, under model 3a. In block 0 56.1% of the cases were classified correctly. The inclusion of all the predictors results in a significantly improved model, with a chi-square of 81.847 and $p=.000$. The predictors explain 27.4% of the variance in the model. In this model 73.6% of the nominees and 67.5% of the winners are classified correctly. In total 70.9% of all the 358 cases are classified correctly. While these percentages are lower than in model 3, it should be kept in mind that model 3a includes all the 358 cases. Thus, overall, the models predictive strength is rather good for both models (being above the 70%).

Looking at the independent predictors reveals that some effects have changed. An additional analysis was done to assess the effects of the combined predictors without budget—which had the most missing values—to allow for the inclusion of more cases (234). This way, it could also be assessed whether the changes in effects were the result of combining the two predictor models—i.e. relationships between the predictors for cast and content—or whether they were partly the result of the decrease in cases in the analysis. The summary of this analysis can be found in table 4.4 under model 3c.

When it comes to cast most of the effects have remained the same. The predictor artistic reputation of directors through previous wins and the experience of actors still have a significant

effect on the odds of winning, the former still having a positive effect and the latter a negative effect. The only variable that has changed in comparison to the previous models is director experience, which now has a significant, negative effect in model 3 ($p < .05$). However, the effect for director experience was also close to significant in model 1c ($p < .10$). The results still do support the conclusion that experience does not contribute (positively) to the odds of winning, but that other attributes such as reputations are more important. Overall, the conclusion in regards to the hypotheses—related to cast attributes—remain the same.

When it comes to the predictors for content, the majority of effects have changed in model 3 when compared to model 2 (i.e. the models with all the predictors). However, the majority of the effects for these predictors have remained the same in model 3a in comparison to model 2a (the models without the predictor for budget). The effects of model 3c also are most similar to model 2a. Hence, several changes seem to be related more to the decrease in cases than the inclusion of the predictors for cast.

One of the most interesting changes that has taken place is the increase in significance of the predictor for MPAA-rating. The effect of rating R/NC-17 is now close to significance in model 3 ($p < .10$), and significant in model 3a and 3c ($p < .05$). This is an interesting effect, as rating R/NC-17 was not significant in the previous models (except when rating PG-13 was included: $p < .05$). Thus, it seems that the inclusion of all the predictors—especially cast—has positively influenced the significance of this rating. This could relate to De Vany & Walls's (2002) argument that there is a relationship between (successful) filmmakers and R-ratings. That is, they argued that filmmakers who wish to gain additional prestige choose to produce or take-part in films that are rated-R, while these films also often lack in commercial success. Nonetheless, this does result in hypothesis 6 now being supported (instead of rejected), with R-ratings having a positive effect on the odds of winning.

The effect for adaptations still remains insignificant. Thus, hypothesis 8 is still rejected. True stories still do have some (near) significant effects, similar to the previous analyses. Additionally, previously biography and documentary were both insignificant in model 2, with documentary close to significance in model 2a ($p < .10$). Here, documentary is still near significance in model 3c ($p < .10$), with biography now also nearing significance in model 3 and 3c ($p < .10$). Hypotheses 7 can still not be rejected, with these true stories having a positive effect on the odds of winning in one way or another throughout the (previous) analyses.

The predictors related to genres also have some changes. The main genre, drama is now insignificant in model 3, but remains (near) significant in model 3a and 3c ($p < .10$ and $p < .05$, respectively). The effect of the genre drama on the odds of winning is thus still generally positive,

still supporting hypothesis 4. Other genres have increased in significance. The effect for the genre war was previously only significantly positive in model 2a ($p < .05$), but is now significantly positive in all three models ($p < .05$ in model 3 and 3a; $p < .01$ in model 3c). Animation reaches significance for the first time in model 3a ($p < .05$), but not in any of the other (or previous) models. In the previous analysis mystery and music/musical were significant (only) in model 2a ($p < .05$), but have now both decreased in significance ($p < .10$ in model 3a). In short, it seems that the inclusion of (certain) other predictors of cast as well as the amount of cases included have affected the significance of these four genres (war, animation, mystery, and music/musical). The effects of the other genres all have maintained similar effects, all having a significant effect in at least one of the models except for history (table 4.3 and/or 4.4).

Looking at the last two predictors budget and runtime these have also changed in significance. The effect for runtime is still insignificant in model 3a, but is now also insignificant in model 3 and 3c (was $p < .05$ in model 2). This results in a definitive rejection of hypothesis 9; runtime has no effect on the odds of winning. It seems that the small differences between runtime—the majority of films being between the 100 and 120 minutes—result in runtime not adding much to the odds of winning. Budget has become less significant in model 3 ($p < .05$; was $p < .001$ in model 2). This might also be due to the decrease in cases included in the model. However, as budget had a negative to no real effect in the previous models this does fit with the relatively unimportant role of this predictor on the odds of winning. Hypothesis 10 is thus still supported.

The combined models thus still result in a significantly improved model, improving the classification of which films might win (or not). The results for cast corresponded to the results found in the previous analysis. For content the results showed some new effects. The most interesting effect was that of the rating R/NC-17, that now has a significant (positive) effects on the odds of winning. This change indicated that there might indeed be a relationship between (successful) filmmakers and MPAA-ratings (or specifically R-ratings). Other changes that might be the result of this combination where found among the predictors for genre. That is, the genres war and animation increased in significance, while the genres mystery and music/musical decreased in significance. Overall, the (main) effects of the other predictors remained the same. Finally, from the combined model it can be concluded that films that participate in the awards competition at international film festivals are indeed judged in accordance with aesthetic standards that fit within the (logics of the) field of films as art. That is, the attributes of artistic reputations, content that fits within the characteristics of art films as well as films that corresponds to the type of meaningful, artistic and prestigious films that film festivals are looking for have higher odds of winning.

Table 4.3: Binary logistic regression cast and content attributes

		Model 3			Model 3a			Model 3c			Model 3b			
		B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	B (logit)	S.E.	Exp(B)	Sig. Chi-square; Block 1
Cast														
Director	Director-writer	-.109	.850	.896	.438	.380	1.550	.501	.525	1.650	.863**	.279	2.370	***56.1%
	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000				.000	.000	1.000	.000	.000	1.000	56.3%
	Artistic reputations (wins)	.161~	.095	1.174	.085*	.040	1.089	.107*	.053	1.113	.057*	.023	1.059	*57.5%
Writer	Artistic Reputations (nom.)	-.103	.115	.902	-.043	.052	.958	-.038	.069	.962	-.025	.023	.976	56.1%
	Experience	-.087*	.045	.916	-.020	.014	.980	-.025	.019	.976	-.021**	.008	.979	**54.7%
	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000				.000	.000	1.000	.000	.000	1.000	57.8%
	Artistic reputations (wins)	-.096	.073	.908	.034	.039	1.035	.025	.050	1.025	.095***	.025	1.099	***61.7%
Actors	Artistic Reputations (nom.)	.226	.169	1.254	.066	.063	1.068	.064	.085	1.066	.040	.030	1.040	55.6%
	Experience	-.028	.046	.973	-.004	.014	.996	-.016	.022	.984	-.009	.009	.991	56.1%
	Economic reputation	.000	.000	1.000				.000	.000	1.000	.000**	.000	1.000	***56%
	Artistic reputations (wins)	-.119	.259	.887	-.131	.137	.877	-.087	.175	.917	-.300***	.086	.741	***64.5%
Actors	Artistic Reputations (nom.)	.081	.151	1.084	-.005	.096	.995	.084	.120	1.088	-.212***	.065	.809	***64.2%
	Experience	-.032	.022	.968	-.021**	.008	.979	-.038**	.013	.963	-.027***	.006	.973	***64.8%
Content														
MPAA-rating	True Stories	-.881	1.100	.414	.552	.515	1.736	-.281	.604	.755	.619~	.339	1.858	~57.8%
	Adaptations	.486	.699	1.625	.062	.294	1.064	.236	.386	1.266	-.415~	.241	.660	~56.1%
MPAA-rating	Rating R/NC-17	1.359~	.760	3.891	.726*	.294	2.066	.991*	.408	2.694	.065	.222	.772	56.1%
Genre	Number of Genres	-1.942*	.987	.143	-1.115*	.495	.328	-1.726*	.696	.178	-.213*	.108	.809	*56.4%
	Drama	4.026	2.691	56.063	1.502~	.788	4.493	3.840*	1.529	46.546	.240	.418	1.271	56.1%
	Romance	-.158	1.347	.854	.774	.577	2.168	.970	.810	2.638	-.386	.254	.680	56.1%
	Comedy	2.015	1.547	7.499	1.380*	.621	3.976	1.735~	.907	5.666	.169	.290	1.184	56.1%
	Thriller	.112	1.430	1.118	.244	.688	1.276	.844	.908	2.326	-1.097**	.362	.334	***56.1%
	Crime	1.952	1.334	7.041	.870	.659	2.386	1.954*	.921	7.058	-.341	.343	.711	56.1%
	War	3.064*	1.293	21.416	1.277*	.603	3.588	2.188**	.848	8.922	.227	.344	1.319	56.1%
	Mystery	1.550	1.287	4.711	1.324~	.765	3.757	1.457	.944	4.294	-.240	.418	.787	56.1%
	Biography	3.174~	1.829	23.915	.808	.827	2.243	1.841~	1.041	6.300	-.128	.447	.879	56.1%
	History	-.222	1.800	.801	.557	.867	1.746	1.050	1.120	2.857	-.584	.611	.558	56.1%
	Fantasy	5.023	2.898	151.917	2.207*	1.047	9.090	4.627**	1.722	102.180	.417	.567	1.517	56.4%
	Music/musical	1.951	1.459	7.039	1.487~	.847	4.424	1.378	1.086	3.966	.604	.596	1.829	56.7%
	Documentary	20.648	27145.791	927783968.691	1.544	1.189	4.685	3.940~	2.050	51.440	1.186	.844	3.273	57%

	Animation (/family)	25.934	26675.453	1831750843 94.443	3.267*	1.499	26.228	25.857	27208.234	16959096 6445.719	1.360	1.160	3.896	56.7%
—	Budget in dollars (v)	-.001*	.000	.999							.000***	.000	1.000	***67.5%
	Runtime in minutes	.002	.014	1.002	-.002	.004	.998	-.001	.007	.999	-.002	.004	.998	56.1%
	Constant	1.976	2.870	7.215	-.451	.850	.637	-1.757	1.459	.173				
	N	122			358			324						
	Block 0	51.6%			56.1%			56%						
	Block 1	84.4%			70.9%			74.4%						
	- Nominees	- 84.1%			- 73.6%			- 74.8%						
	- Winners	- 84.7%			- 67.5%			- 73.8%						
	Chi-Square	75.866***			81.847***			82.512***						
	Nagelkerke R ²	.618			.274			.398						
	Hosmer and Lemeshow test	.012			.143			.532						

~p <.10, *p <.05, **p <.01, ***P<.001

Notes: Models: 3—all predictors (cast and content), 3a—without predictors for economic reputations and budget, 3b—individual analysis of predictors, 3c—without the predictor for budget.

5. Conclusion

Audiences can make or break films, while filmmakers search for the right kind of recognition from the right type of audiences (with the right type of film). Some filmmakers might search for commercial success—popular recognition—and others for artistic recognition and legitimacy or prestige—critical and professional recognition. Within this context, the topic of this research is the assigning of professional recognition through prestigious prizes found at international film festivals. Since the 1990s film festivals have truly become a global phenomenon. They have positioned and maintain themselves as crucial players in the global film industry as well as in the field of art film where they act as creators of value. Yet, no previous research has studied what attributes these award winning films possess, that result in a jury of peers deciding to bestow the prestigious main prize on these films. Thus, main research question was: *Looking at several international film festivals—their award winners and nominees—from 1996 to 2016, how do cast and content related attributes influence or contribute to the chances of winning the award for best film at these prestigious cultural events?* This research then helps fill the aforementioned gap and gain a better understanding of professional recognition, international film festivals and prestige (or symbolic capital). The various contexts in which international film festivals exists provided an understanding of what the award winning film attributes might or should be. Expectations that were later confirmed in statistical analysis, and led to several interesting insights in relation to both the research question and its related areas. Let's first take another short look at this, before concluding this thesis.

The theoretical framework discussed how changes in the field of film resulted in the opportunity for films to be perceived, appreciated and classified as art. At the same time, this shift resulted in the creation of film festivals and their (consequential) rise to the position that they have to today. The practices of film festivals are guided by field logics, particularly the logics of the field of restricted production where art is valued for art's sake. However, value is not intrinsic to cultural products, value is assigned. It takes social agents and institutions—such as film festivals—to say what is art, as well as maintain the boundaries of the field and its art distinction. Agents and institutions who have the legitimacy to do so, the right to valorise and consecrate artists and artworks through the assigning of value (economic or symbolic) in accordance with the logics of their field. Here, popular recognition is not the right indicator of success when it comes to art, as true art rises above commercial interests. Rather peers (i.e. professional recognition) become the judges of artistic excellence in the field of restricted production, where symbolic capital is the currency of interest. Peers—like the jurors found at international film festivals—who possess a higher amount of the necessary cultural capital to impose judgements, classifications and express legitimate taste. The

more autonomous a field becomes, the more concerned producers are with artistic recognition, prestige and legitimacy (i.e. symbolic capital) that is bestowed by other cultural producers. Cultural institutions like film festivals can bestow the most important distinctions upon artists through formal rites of consecration, including granting prizes and honours. Moreover, the rise of the production of cultural value has made such symbolic capital increasingly important in the cultural economy as well as the experience-based cultural industry. Prizes serve as instrument that can help maintain field boundaries and distinctions, by imposing distinctions between cultural producers who are considered artists and those that are not. Furthermore, prizes can help maintain the authority of the institutions who grant them. For artists and audiences prizes represent a legitimate measure of cultural or artistic worth. This symbolic capital can give artists the legitimacy and prestige they are looking for, and launch careers. For audiences, prizes are a signal of quality, serving as an important element in their decision making process to watch a film. Prizes assign value to cultural products, which they do not intrinsically have.

It is within this field of art films that film festivals have positioned themselves, where they are important producers of value in the (cultural) economy of prestige. The assigning of value is one of the key successes of film festivals, together with the distinct and indispensable position they take within the global field and industry of film. They are assigners of professional recognition, which focus on setting their own standards, artistic achievement and symbolic capital. Filmmakers from all over the world participate in film festivals, not aspiring commercial gain but artistic recognition (or success). Winning the right prize at prestigious international film festivals can make careers and grant (artistic) legitimacy. They provide a space where films are appreciated for their artistic value (not commercial success) and a platform where filmmakers from all-over the world can gain the opportunity to have their films screened. Their position as a recognized and credible institutional mechanism allows them to assign prestige that is globally recognized, making film festivals important actors and gatekeepers in the global field of art film (as gateways to cultural legitimization).

Value is thus assigned by agents and institutions in accordance with the field of production they belong to. Which filmmakers and films are considered worthy of participating in and winning prestigious prizes at international film festivals should then fit with the logics of the field of restricted production. These films should possess some attributes that make them worthy of the designation of art; that allows these films to be classified and judged in accordance with the right cultural schemas and aesthetic standards; and that make them worthy of these prestigious prize. Central to any art distinction is the existence of an artist. Here the auteur theory provides the justification for films as art, with the director as the artistic genius central to the overall production

process and whose creative vision and personal stamp shines through in the film. However, filmmaking is still highly collaborative process. While the director is considered the main auteur and representative of a film, at the same time films are the result of various individuals' contributions that all contribute to the (perception of the) quality of the whole through an intertwining of (various levels of) experience, talent, legitimacy, reputation or status, and star power. Furthermore, fields guide production practices and expectations in relation to content. Art films incorporate a distinct set of film practices, conventions and viewing procedures, where filmmakers frame their products in accordance with the type of audiences they wish to satisfy (i.e. peers). In brief, these (film festival) art films often include anti-classical narratives and themes; innovation; novelty; uniqueness; serious films; controversial subject matter; artistic, social and cultural value or relevance; auteur presence; aesthetic beauty; minimalism; lower budgets; and more difficult viewing experiences. These films tend to be better understood and appreciated by audiences who are familiar with production practices and conventions as well as possess a higher level of (field specific) cultural capital, such as critics and peers. In sum, cast and content attributes represent important elements in the appreciation and perception of films, that can help guide the classification and judging process of films (towards art or commercial films).

These cast and content attributes were translated into independent variables for measuring and analysing their effect on the odds of winning versus being nominated at international film festivals (the dependent variable). These independent variables related to reputations, experience, director-writers, true stories, adaptations, genres, MPAA-ratings, runtimes and budgets represent different elements along the art versus commercial film continuum. These variables could reveal what matters at film festivals, and which distinguishing attributes result in winning prestigious festival prizes. Data was collected spanning a period of twenty years and included 157 awards winners and 201 nominees of the three most prestigious film festivals—Berlin, Cannes and Venice—that were analysed using logistic regression in SPSS.

If film festivals are truly the credible institutions in the field of art they claim or are made-out to be, award winning cast and content attributes should fit with the conception of what makes an art film. The analysis results showed that not only do cast and content indeed contribute to the odds of winning—the predictors improving the predictive strength of the models—but also showed that film festivals do indeed focus on films as art. The main auteurs, the director and the writer are judged according to the logics of the field of art film. Their artistic reputations are the criteria that improved the odds of winning. Furthermore, as the creative genius and artistic leader in the overall filmmaking process, the director improves his/her chances of winning when he/she also acts as the (co)auteur of the script. Only for actors these strict art field logics seem suspended. Rather, their star

power and name recognition through their economic reputations have more effect on the odds of winning. That status (or legitimacy) as seen through the eyes of others is more important when it comes to evaluations of quality and the assigning of prestigious prizes (at film festivals), is also reflected in the negative or lack of effect that experience has on the odds of winning. The development in skill (or talent) that comes with time is less important than the accumulation of artistic (or economic) status, and where prestige and legitimacy provide a cumulative advantage (i.e. previous success increasing the odds of winning or gaining additional prestige). Thus, cast members or attributes—especially in relation to the director and writer—are judged according to the logics of the fields of restricted production, with a focus on the auteur, artistic reputation or status and legitimacy, while actors might contribute more on basis of their star power.

The content attributes were also those that fit with the characteristics of art films. That is, true stories and uniqueness or originality (in screenplay), along with the more artistic and prestigious genre of drama and rating R/NC-17 increase the odds of winning. That many of the other genres also had some (positive) effects on the odds of winning, illustrates that elements that can signal innovation, experimentation, and genre-crossing (or combinations) are indeed also important for the odds of winning. Whereas budget—and runtime—did not have an effect on the odds of winning, fitting with an art for art's sake ideology. Films are valued for cultural and social value rather than just economic value. The films that win prizes at international film festivals include those films that counter or experiment with conventions; that are innovative and novel; that are meaningful and artistic; and that are significant.

To conclude, film attributes positively influence the odds of winning when they fit with the logics of the field of restricted productions. That is, at film festivals agents of professional recognition judge films in accordance to the aesthetic standards that fit with the field of films as art; where film attributes that correspond to the aesthetic criteria or characteristics of art films positively influence the odds winning prestigious festival prizes. At the same time, these findings not only provide an answer to what attributes award winning films possess, but also in a certain sense to what makes film festivals such important cultural events (based on their position in the field of film). Two aspects that are undeniably intertwined. International film festivals have undergone many struggles, from contributing to establishing the concept of films as art to maintaining their authoritative and credible position in the field of restricted production. Today, film festivals still stay true to this position of artistic legitimacy or autonomy and prestige, focussing on films as art, symbolic capital and recognizing artistic achievements. They are a crucial institution in the field of art films, valorising and consecrating filmmakers and films. Finally, they contribute to maintaining the

cultural position of films as art and filmmakers as artists, as well as provide a (crucial) site of passage or gateway to cultural legitimization for filmmakers and their films.

There are some limitations to this conclusion. In the selection of the data sample, detail and quality were given precedence over large numbers. Future research might include more films to have a larger data sample to test the effect of the independent variables. This might prove beneficial as several variables had quite a number of missing values, resulting in smaller sample sizes for certain analyses. Furthermore, including all the nominees of a certain time period can make it possible to research changes over time. This could be interesting, as cultural fields are situated in social contexts and are thus also subject to social dynamics and changes (e.g. new trends in film practices). In addition, including more film festivals in future research can help study whether these results are true for other festivals as well, and research film festivals on an even more global scale. Aside from these limitations, there are also interesting possibilities for further research. This thesis focussed on the effects of cast and content attributes, as these relate to the way films can be appreciated and perceived in accordance with the logics of fields. However, some other content attributes related to art films were left-out in this research to limit the scope, but should prove interesting such as narrative elements and themes. Furthermore, areas that are not strictly related to cast and content, such as the effects of cultural globalization through including country of origin, cultural content elements like language, and more film festivals on a global scale can also prove interesting. This would help to study whether film festivals truly provide a global platform, with equal opportunities for recognition. Lastly, future research might look further into the effects of winning prestigious prizes at international film festivals, such as whether this symbolic capital truly results in additional social and economic capital or even more symbolic capital by additional recognition for the same or other films. This could contribute to an even further understanding of the importance of assigning value (within the field of film).

For now this research provides a first look into the prestige, international film festivals and their awards, and the films that win these prestigious prizes. By now Cannes 2017 is already over—and in case you were wondering *The Square* (2017) got to take home the prestigious (shiny) Palm D'or—and filmmakers as well as other agents within the field might already be preparing for the next film festival this year (e.g. Venice) or perhaps even the next Cannes already. Still, what is clear is that these cultural institutions—film festivals and their prestigious prizes—will be able to keep drawing films, filmmakers and film audiences for quite some time to come as they are not likely to their lose importance any time soon.

References

- Allmovie (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.allmovie.com/>
- Abrams, N. & Bell, I. & Udris, J. (2010). *Studying Film*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Albert, S. (1998). Movie Stars and the Distribution of Financially Successful Films in the Motion Picture Industry. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 22, 249-270.
- Allen, M.P. & Lincoln, A.E. (2004). Critical Discourse and the Cultural Consecration of American Films. *Social Forces*, 82:3, 871-894. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sof.2004.0030>
- Basuroy, S. & Chatterjee, S. & Ravid, S.A. (2003). How Critical Are Critical Reviews? The Box Office Effects of Film Critics, Star Power, and Budgets. *Journal of Marketing*, 67:4, 103-117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.67.4.103.18692>
- Baumann, S. (2001). Intellectualization and Art World Development: Film in the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 66:3, 404-426. Retrieved January 7, 2017, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3088886>
- Baumann, S. (2007). *Hollywood Highbrow: From Entertainment to Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Berlinale (n.d.). Berlin International Film Festival. <https://www.berlinale.de/en/HomePage.html>
- Bordwell, D. (2002). The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film Practice. In C. Fowler (Eds.), *The European Cinema Reader* (pp.94-102). London and New York: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed. *Poetics*, 12, 311-356. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X\(83\)90012-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X(83)90012-8)
- Box Office Mojo (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.boxofficemojo.com/>
- Brewer, S.M. & Kelley, J.M. & Jozefowicz, J.J. (2011). A blueprint for success in the US film industry. *Applied Economics*, 41:5, 589-606. DOI:10.1080/00036840601007351
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods (4th edition)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cannes (n.d.). Cannes Film Festival. Retrieved from <http://www.festival-cannes.com/en/>
- Chang, B. & Ki, E. (2005). Devising a Practical Model for Predicting Theatrical Movie Success: Focusing on the Experience Good Property. *Journal of Media Economics*, 18:4, 247-269. DOI:10.1207/s15327736me1804_2
- Czach, L. (2004). Film Festivals, Programming, and the Building of a National Cinema. *The Moving Image*, 4:1, 76-88. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/171115/summary>
- Collins, A. & Hand, C. & Snell, M.C. (2002). What Makes a Blockbuster? Economic Analysis of Film Success in the United Kingdom. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 23:6, 343-354. DOI:10.1002/mde.1069
- Delmestri, G. & Montanari, F. & Usia, A. (2005). Reputation and Strength of Ties in Predicting

- Commercial Success and Artistic Merit of Independents in the Italian Feature Film Industry. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42:5, 975-1002. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00529.x
- Desai, K.K. & Basuroy, S. (2005). Interactive Influence of Genre Familiarity, Star Power, and Critics' Reviews in the Cultural Goods Industry: The Case of Motion Pictures. *Psychology & Marketing*, 22:3, 203-223. DOI: 10.1002/mar.20055
- Deuchert, E. & Adjamah, K. & Pauly, F. (2005). For Oscar Glory or Oscar Money? Academy awards and movie success. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 29, 159-176. DOI:10.1007/s10824-005-3338-6
- De Valck, M. (2007). *Film Festivals: From European Geopolitics to Global Cinephilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- De Valck, M. (2014). Supporting art cinema at a time of commercialization: Principles and practices, the case of the International Film Festival Rotterdam. *Poetics*, 42, 40-59.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2013.11.004>
- De Valck, M. & Soeteman, M. (2010). 'And the winner is ...' What happens behind the scenes of film festival competitions. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13:3, 290-307.
DOI:10.1177/1367877909359735
- De Vany, A. & Walls, W.D. (1999). Uncertainty in the Movie Industry: Does Star Power Reduce the Terror of the Box Office? *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 23, 285-318.
DOI:10.1023/A:1007608125988
- De Vany, A. & Walls, W.D. (2002). Does Hollywood Make Too Many R-Rated Movies? Risk, Stochastic Dominance, and the Illusion of Expectation. *The Journal of Business*, 75:3, 425-451.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/339890>
- English, J. (2005). *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Elberse, A. (2007). The Power of Stars: Do Star Actors Drive the Success of Movies? *Journal of Marketing*, 71:4, 102-120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.71.4.102>
- Elsaesser, T. (2005). Film festival Networks: the New Topographies of Cinema in Europe. In T. Elsaesser (Eds.), *European Cinema: Face to Face With Hollywood* (pp.82-107). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Evans, O. (2007). Border Exchanges: The Role of the European Film Festival. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 15:1, 23-33. DOI:10.1080/14782800701273318
- FIAPF (n.d.). Competitive Feature Film Festivals, 2017 calendar of FIAPF accredited film festivals. *International Federation of Film Producers Association*. Retrieved from http://www.fiapf.org/intfilmfestivals_sites.asp

- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics using IBM SPSS Statistics* (4th edition). London: Sage.
- Gemser, G. & Leenders, M.A.A.M. & Wijnberg, N.M. (2007). Why Some Awards Are More Effective Signals of Quality Than Others: A Study of Movie Awards. *Journal of Management*, 34:1, 25-54. DOI:10.1177/0149206307309258
- Grunwell, S. & Ha, I.S. (2008). Film Festivals: An Empirical Study of Factors for Success. *Event Management*, 11:4, 201-2010. DOI:10.3727/152599508785899893
- Hayward, S. (2001). *Cinema Studies: The Key Concepts* (2nd edition). New York: Routledge.
- Heise, T. & Tudor, A. (2007). Constructing (Film) Art: Bourdieu's Field Model in a Comparative Context. *Cultural Sociology*, 1:2, 165-187. DOI: 10.1177/1749975507078186
- Holbrook, M.B. (1999). Popular Appeal versus Expert Judgments of Motion Pictures. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 26, 144-155.
- Holbrook, M.B. & Addis, M. (2008). Art versus commerce in the movie industry: a Two-Path Model of Motion-Picture Success. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 32:2, 87-107. DOI:10.1007/s10824-007-9059-2
- Hsu, G. (2006). Evaluative schemas and the attention of critics in the US film industry. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 15:3, 467-496. DOI:10.1093/icc/dtl009
- IMDB (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.imdb.com/>
- Kersten, A. (2012). *Terms of Enjoyment: Film Classification and Critics' Discourse in Comparative Perspective*. (Doctoral dissertation). Erasmus Research Centre for Media, Communication and Culture, Rotterdam.
- La Biennale (n.d.). Venice Film Festival. Retrieved from <http://www.labiennale.org/en/cinema/>
- Lincoln, A.E. (2007). Cultural Honours and Career Promotions: Reconceptualizing Prizes in the Field of Cultural Production. *Cultural Trends*, 16:1, 3-15. DOI:10.1080/09548960601106904
- Litman, B.R. (1983). Predicting Success of Theatrical Movies: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 16:4, 159-175. DOI:10.1111/j.0022-3840.1983.1604_159.x
- Litman, B.R. & Kohl, L.S. (1989). Predicting Financial Success of Motion Pictures: The '80s Experience. *Journal of Media Economics*, 2:2, 35-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08997768909358184>
- Livingstone, S. (2003). On the challenges of cross-national comparative media research. *European Journal of Communication*, 18:4, 477-500. DOI:10.1177/0267323103184003.
- Mezias, S. & Pedersen, J.S. & Kim, J. & Svejnova, S. & Mazza, C. (2011). Transforming film product identities: the status effects of European premier film festivals, 1996–2005. In B. Moeran & J.S. Pedersen (Eds.), *Negotiating Values in the Creative Industries: Fairs, Festivals and Competitive Events* (pp.169-196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, R.A. & Donihue, M.R. & Waldman, D.M. & Wheaton, C. (2001). What's an Oscar Worth?

- Economic Inquiry*, 39:1, 1-16. Retrieved from
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1465-7295.2001.tb00046.x/abstract>
- Pardoe, I. & Simonton, D.K. (2008). Applying discrete choice models to predict Academy Award winners. *Journal of the Royal Statistics Society, Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 171:2, 375-394. DOI:10.1111/j.1467-985X.2007.00518.x
- Peranson, M. (2008). First You Get the Power, Then You Get the Money: Two Models of Film Festivals. *Cineaste*, 33:3, 23-37.
- Prag, J. & Casavant, J. (1994). An Empirical Study of the Determinants of Revenues and Marketing Expenditures in the Motion Picture Industry. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 18, 217-235.
- Prestige (n.d.) In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved February 24, 2017, from
<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/prestige>
- Privitera, G.J. (2012). *Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (2nd edition)*. California: Sage Publications.
- Ravid, S.A. (1999). Information, Blockbusters, and Stars: A Study of the Film Industry. *Journal of Business*, 72:4, 463-492. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/209624>
- Rossman, G. & Esparza, N. & Bonacich, P. (2009). I'd Like to Thank the Academy, Team Spillovers, and Network Centrality. *American Sociological Review*, 75:1, 31-51.
<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3f51g5ww>
- Simonton, D.K. (2002). Collaborative Aesthetics in the Feature Film: Cinematic Components Predicting the Differential Impact of 2,323 Oscar-Nominated Movies. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 20:2, 115-125. <https://doi.org/10.2190/RHQ2-9UC3-6T32-HR66>
- Simonton, D.K. (2004). Group Artistic Creativity: Creative Clusters and Cinematic Success in Feature Films. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34:7, 1494-1520.
- Simonton, D.K. (2005a). Cinematic creativity and production budgets: Does money make the movie? *Journal of Creative Behaviour*, 39:1, 1-15. Retrieved from
<http://escholarship.org/uc/item/9rv1c5q7>
- Simonton, D.K. (2005b). Film as Art Versus Film as Business: Differential Correlates of Screenplay Characteristics. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 23:2, 93-117. <https://doi.org/10.2190/DM5Y-FHEM-CXQT-UEXW>
- Simonton, D.K. (2009). Cinematic Success Criteria and Their Predictors: The Art and Business of the Film Industry. *Psychology & Marketing*, 26:5, 400-420. DOI:10.1002/mar.20280
- Simonton, D.K. (2011). Film Awards as Indicators of Cinematic Creativity and Achievement: A Quantitative Comparison of the Oscars and Six Alternatives. *Creativity Research Journal*, 16:2-3, 163-172. DOI:10.1080/10400419.2004.9651450
- Stringer, J. (2001). Global Cities and the International Film Festival Economy. In Shiel, M. &

- Fitzmaurice, T. (Ed.), *Cinema and the City: Film and Urban Societies in a Global Context* (pp.134-144). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Terry, N. & Butler, M. & De'Armond, D. (2005). The Determinants of Domestic Box Office Performance In the Motion Picture Industry. *Southwestern Economic Review*, 32:1, 137-148. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/0d55/44616785fdd71f11dd83abbe189219c7299c.pdf>
- The Numbers (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.the-numbers.com/>
- Tudor, A. (2005). The Rise and Fall of the Art (House) Movie. In Inglis, D. & Hughson, J. (Ed.), *The sociology of art: Ways of seeing* (pp.125-138).
- Turan. K. (2003). *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film festivals and the world they made*. Los Angeles: University California Press.
- Visch, V. & Tan, E. (2008). Narrative versus style: Effect of genre-typical events versus genre-typical filmic realizations on film viewers' genre recognition. *Poetics*, 36, 301-315. DOI:10.1016/j.poetic.2008.03.003
- Wallace, W.T. & Selgerman, A. & Holbrook, M.B. (1993). The Role of Actors and Actresses in the Success of Films: How much is a movie star worth? *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 17:1, 1-27.
- Wanderer, J.J. (2015). Film Award Choices: Critics and the Academy. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 33:2, 175-191. DOI: 10.1177/0276237415594711
- Wong, C.H. (2011). *Film Festivals: Culture, People, and Power on the Global Screen*. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Zickar, M.J. & Slaughter, J.E. (2009). Examining creative performance over time using hierarchical linear modeling: An illustration using film directors. *Human Performance*, 12:3-4, 211-230. DOI:10.1080/08959289909539870

Appendix

Appendix A: Films, Festival winners

	Cannes			Berlin		Venice	
	Palme D'or	Grand Prix [2nd]	Prix de Jury [3rd]	Golden Bear	Jury Grand Prix [2nd]	Golden Lion	Grand Jury Prize [2nd]
1996	1. Secrets & Lies	1. Breaking The Waves	1. Crash	1. Sense And Sensibility	1. All Things Fair	1. Michael Collins	1. Brigands-Chapter VII
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1997	2. Taste Of Cherry	2. The Sweet Hereafter	2. Western	2. The People Vs. Larry Flynt	2. The River	2. Hana-Bi (Fireworks)	2. Ovosodo
	3. The Eel	-	-	-	-	-	-
1998	4. Eternity And A Day	3. Life Is Beautiful	3. Class Trip	3. Central Station	3. Wag The Dog	3. The Way We Laughed (Cosi Ridevano)	3. Teminus Paradise
	-	-	4. The Celebration	-	-	-	-
1999	5. Rosetta	4. L'huminate	5. The Letter	4. The Thin Red Line	4. Mifune's Last Song	4. Not One Less	4. The Wind Will Carry Us
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2000	6. Dancer In The Dark	5. Devils On The Doorstep	6. Blackboards	5. Magnolia	5. The Road Home	5. The Circle	5. Before Night Falls
	-	-	7. Songs From The Second Floor	-	-	-	-
2001	7. The Son's Room	6. The Piano Teacher	xxx	6. Intimacy	6. Beijing Bicycle	6. Monsoon Wedding	6. Dog Days
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2002	8. The Pianist	7. The Man Without A Past	8. Divine Intervention	7. Spirited Away	7. Grill Point (Halbe Treppe)	7. The Magdalene Sisters	7. House Of Fools
	-	-	-	8. Bloody Sunday	-	-	-
2003	9. Elephant	8. Uzak	9. At Five In The Afternoon	9. In This World	8. Adaptation	8. The Return	8. The Kite

2004	10. Fahrenheit 9/11	9. Oldboy	10. Tropical Milady	10. Head-On	9. Lost Embrace	9. Vera Drake	9. The Sea Inside
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2005	11. L'enfant	10. Broken Flowers	11. Shanghai Dreams	11. U-Carmen	10. Peacock	10. Brokeback Mountain	10. Mary
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2006	12. The Wind That Shakes The Barley	11. Flanders	12. Red Road	12. Grbavica	11. Offside	11. Still Life	11. Dry Season (Daratt)
	-	-	-	-	12. En Soap	-	-
2007	13. 4 Months, 3 Weeks And 2 Days	12. The Mourning Forest	13. Persepolis	13. Tuya's Marriage	13. El Otro	12. Lust, Caution	12. I'm Not There
	-	-	14. Silent Light	-	-	-	13. The Secret Of Grain
2008	14. The Class	13. Gomorra	15. Il Divo	14. Elite Squad	14. Standard Operating Procedure	13. The Wrestler	14. Teza
2009	15. The White Ribbon	14. A Prophet	16. Thirst	15. The Milk Sorrow	15. Everyone Else (Alle Anderen)	14. Lebanon	15. Soul Kitchen
	-	-	17. Fish Tank	-	16. Gigante	-	-
2010	16. Uncle Boonmee Who Can Recall His Past Lives	15. Of Gods And Men	18. A Screaming Man	16. Honey	17. If I Want To Whistle, I Whistle	15. Somewhere	16. Essential Killing
2011	17. The Tree Of Life	16. Once Upon A Time In Anatolia	19. Polisse	17. A Separation	18. The Turin Horse	16. Faust	17. Terraferma
	-	17. The Kid With The Bike	-	-	-	-	-
2012	18. Amour	18. Reality	20. The Angels' Share	18. Caesar Must Die	19. Just The Wind	17. Pieta	18. Paradise: Faith
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2013	19. Blue Is The	19. Inside Llewyn	21. Like Father, Like	19. Child's Pose	20. An Episode In	18. Sacro Gra	19. Stray Dogs

	Warmest Colour	Davis	Son		The Life Of An Iron Picker		
2014	20. Winter Sleep	20. The Wonders	22. Mommy	20. Black Coal, Thin Ice	21. The Grand Budapest Hotel	19. A Pigeon Sat On A Branch Reflecting On Existence	20. The Look Of Silence
	-	-	23. Goodbye To Language	-	-	-	-
2015	21. Dheepan	21. Son Of Saul	24. The Lobster	21. Taxi	22. The Club	20. From Afar	21. Anomalisa
2016	22. I, Daniel Blake	22. It's Only The End Of The World	25. American Honey	22. Fire At Sea	23. Death In Sarajevo	21. The Woman Who Left	22. Nocturnal Animals
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Appendix B: Films, Festival Nominees

	Cannes	Berlin	Venice
1996	1. Fargo 2. Ridicule 3. Too Late	1. Village Of Dreams 2. Twelve Monkeys 3. Portland	1. Ponette 2. Carla's Song
1997	4. Happy Together 5. Welcome To Sarajevo 6. The End Of Violence	4. The Crucible 5. Mai Fu 6. Port Djema 7. Rosewood 8. In Love And War	3. Wild Games 4. The Winter Guest 5. Keep Cool 6. Seventh Heaven
1998	7. Those Who Love Me Can Take The Train 8. Dance Me To My Song 9. Flowers Of Shanghai 10. The School Of Flesh	9. The Naked Eye 10. Sada 11. Xiu Xiu: The Sent-Down Girl 12. Good Will Hunting 13. Jeanne And The Perfect Guy	7. Little Teachers 8. Shooting The Moon
1999	11. Cradle Will Rock 12. Marcel Proust's Time Regained 13. Moloch 14. The Emperor And The Assassin 15. All About My Mother	14. The Color Of Lies 15. Between Your Legs 16. The Hi-Lo Country 17. Simon Magus 18. 8mm 19. Urban Feel 20. War In The Highlands	9. The Cider House Rules 10. Lies 11. Night Wind 12. Mal
2000	16. Eureka 17. The Golden Bowl	21. Of Woman And Magic 22. The Hurricane 23. El Mar 24. The Island Tales	13. Durian Durian 14. The Goddess Of 1967 15. Holy Tongue 16. The Man Who Cried 17. Our Lady Of The Assassins 18. Comedy Of Innocence
2001	18. In Praise Of Love 19. Distance 20. The Pledge 21. Va Savoir Who Knows	25. Chocolat 26. Finding Forrester 27. Malena	19. Bully 20. Hollywood Hong Kong 21. The Navigators
2002		28. Beneath Clouds	22. The Best Of Times

			<p>23.The Power Of The Past</p> <p>24.Far From Heaven</p> <p>25.The Tracker</p> <p>26.Oasis</p> <p>27.Nearest To Heaven</p>
2003	<p>22.The Tulse Luper Suitcases, Part 1: The Moab Story</p>	<p>29.The Hours</p> <p>30.Son Frere</p>	<p>28.21 Grams</p> <p>29.A Good Lawyers Wife</p> <p>30.The Miracle</p> <p>31.Code 46</p> <p>32.Rosenstrasse</p>
2004	<p>23.Clean</p> <p>24.The Ladykillers</p> <p>25.The Life And Death Of Peter Sellers</p> <p>26.Mondovino</p> <p>27.Nobody Knows</p> <p>28.Life Is A Miracle</p> <p>29."2046"</p>	<p>31.Nightsongs</p> <p>32.Your Next Life</p> <p>33.Maria Full Of Grace</p> <p>34.Trilogy The Weeping Meadow</p>	<p>33.Stray Dogs</p> <p>34.Tout Un Hiver Sans Feu</p> <p>35.5x2</p> <p>36.Cafe Lumiere</p>
2005	<p>30.Hidden (Cache)</p> <p>31.Last Days</p> <p>32.A History Of Violence</p>	<p>35.Accused</p> <p>36.In Good Company</p> <p>37.The Hidden Blade</p> <p>38.Thumbsucker</p>	
2006		<p>39.Slumming</p>	<p>37.Private Fears In Public Places</p> <p>38.Black Book</p>
2007	<p>33.The Banishment</p> <p>34.Secret Sunshine</p> <p>35.The Last Mistress</p>	<p>40.Hallam Foe</p> <p>41.I'm A Cyborg But That's Ok</p>	<p>39.Atonement</p> <p>40.The Darjeeling Limited</p> <p>41.Redacted</p>
2008	<p>36.A Christmas Tale</p> <p>37.Synecdoche New York</p> <p>38.Delta</p>	<p>42.Lady Jane</p> <p>43.There Will Be Blood</p>	<p>42.The Hurt Locker</p> <p>43.Milk</p>

	39.Che Part One & Part Two 40.Lorna's Silence		
2009	41.Spring Fever 42.Vengeance	44.Storm 45.Happy Tears	44.Grandmother (Lola) 45.Mr Nobody
2010	43.Chongqing Blues 44.La Nostra Vita 45.Outside The Law	46.A Family (En Familie) 47.Howl 48.The Killer Inside Me 49.Caterpillar	46.Detective Dee: The Mystery Of The Phantom Flame 47.Potiche 48.Post Mortem 49.Road To Nowhere
2011	46.The Skin I Live In 47.Le Havre 48.Pater 49.The Artist 50.The Source	50.If Not Us, Who? 51.Sleeping Sickness 52.The Future	50.Tinker Tailor Soldier Spy 51.Chicken With Plums
2012	51.Lawless 52.Like Someone In Love 53.After The Battle 54.The Paperboy	53.Aujourd'Hui 54.Jayne Mansfield's Car 55.Captive 56.Tabu	52.The Master 53.Spring Breakers 54.Passion 55.Betrayal 56.Beyond Outrage
2013	55.Jimmy P. 56.The Immigrant 57.Shield Of Straw 58.Young And Beautiful (Jeune And Jolie) 59.The Great Beauty	57.Camille Claudel 1915 58.Gold 59.Nobody's Daughter Haewon 60.Paradise: Hope 61.The Nun 62.Harmony Lessons	57.Tracks 58.Under The Skin 59.Jealousy
2014	60.The Search 61.Maps To The Stars	63.In Order Of Disappearance	60.The Last Hammer Blow 61.Red Amnesia
2015	62.Carol	64.Victoria	62.Frenzy 63.Behemoth
2016	63.The Unknown Girl 64.From The Land Of The Moon 65.The Handmaiden 66.Elle 67.The Neon Demon	65.24 Weeks 66.A Lullaby To The Sorrowful Mystery 67.Soy Nero	64.Brimstone 65.These Days 66.Les Beaux Jours D'Aranjuez 67.The Distinguished Citizen

Appendix C: List of industry awards used for data gathering

AACTA Awards or AFI Awards, Australia	Golden Horse Festival and Awards, Taiwan
Amanda Awards, Norway	Golden Precolombian Bogota Festival, Colombia
Argentina Academy of Cinematography Arts and Sciences Awards (Premios Sur/Sur Awards), Argentina	Golden Rooster Awards, China
Ariel Awards, Mexico	Gopo Awards, Romania
Awards of the Isreali Film Academy, Israel	Goya Awards, Spain
Awards of the Japanese Academy, Japan	Guldbagge Awards, Sweden
BAFTA, the UK	Hellenic Academy Awards, Greece
Blue Dragon Film Awards or Grand Bell Awards, South-Korea	Hong Kong Film Awards, Hong Kong
Canadian Screen Awards (Gemini Awards/Genie Awards), Canada	Irish Film & Television Academy, Ireland
Cesar Awards, France	Jussi Awards, Finland
Cinema Brazil Grand Prize, Brazil	Luna Awards, Philippines
Czech Lion Awards, Croatia	Magritte Awards, Belgium
David di Donatello, Italy	National Film Awards, India
German Film Awards (/Deutscher Filmpreis), Germany	New Zealand Film and TV Awards, New Zealand
Golden Arena Awards (/Pula festival), Romania	Nika Awards, Russia
Golden Calf, The Netherlands	Polish Film Awards, Poland
	Robert Awards, Denmark
	Sophia Awards, Portugal
	Swiss Film Award (/Swiss Film Prize), Switzerland
	The Academy Awards, The US

Appendix D: Frequency tables, cast variables

Categorical Variables					
	Award Winners		Award Nominees		Total:
Director/Writer	135		145		280
Ratio Variables					
	Economic Reputation		Award Wins	Award Nominations	Experience
Director					
Winners	1,486,704,608		850	746	1,887
Nominees	2,714,350,189		829	1,061	3,372
	254		358	358	358
	104		-	-	-
	16,539,585.81		4.69	5.05	14.69
N:	2,229,813.162		.253	.245	.863
Missing:	0		0	0	0
Mean:	184,031,112		31	23	120
SE (of the Mean):					
Minimum:					
Maximum:					
	Award Wins <i>best director</i>	Award Wins <i>best film (industry)</i>	Award Wins <i>best film (festival)</i>	Award Nominations <i>best director</i>	Award Nominations <i>best film (festival)</i>
	Win.: 170 Nom.: 220	Win.: 98 Nom.: 91	Win.: 583 Nom.: 518	Win.: 114 Nom.: 236	Win.: 632 Nom.: 825
	Economic Reputation		Award Wins	Award Nominations	Experience
Writer					
Winners	1,040,443,349		780	535.708	1560.625
	1,567,770,580		545.5	587.5	2267.25

Nominees	263 95 9,917,163.23 1,518,330.545	358 - 3.73 .271	358 - 3.14 .186	358 - 10.69 .667	
N:	0	0	0	0	
Missing:	171,031,347	33	20	92	
Mean:					
SE (of the Mean):					
Minimum:					
Maximum:					
	Award Wins <i>best writer</i> Win.: 67 Nom.: 68	Award Wins <i>best film (industry)</i> Win.: 311.5 Nom.: 189.167	Award Wins <i>best film (festival)</i> Win.: 401.083 Nom.: 288	Award Nominations <i>best writer</i> Win.: 108.25 Nom.: 150.083	Award Nominations <i>best film (festival)</i> Win.: 427.458 Nom.: 437.417
	Economic Reputation	Award Wins	Award Nominations	Experience	
Actors					
Winners	5,066,593,577 11,302,727,359	126 279	138 323	3,110 6,337	
Nominees	339 19 48,287,082.41 4,078,027.386	358 - 1.13 .080	358 - 1.29 .106	358 - 26,39 1.199	
N:	0	0	0	0	
Missing:	433,125,293	8	13	130	
Mean:					
SE (of the Mean):					
Minimum:					
Maximum:					

Note: Averaged

Appendix E: Frequency tables, content variables

	Award Winners	Award Nominees	Total:
True stories	23	17	40
Adaptations	37	64	101
<i>Adaptation book</i>	27	53	80
<i>Adaptation play</i>	6	8	14
<i>Adaptation comic</i>	3	2	5
<i>Adaptation other</i> • 1 opera (case 11) • 1 short film (case 160)	1	1	2
MPAA-rating: R	54	70	124
MPAA-rating: NC-17	3	0	3
MPAA-rating: PG-13	15	17	32
MPAA-rating: G	1	0	1
Nr. of Genres	303 Mean: 1.93 Median: 2 Mode: 1 Min.: 1 Max.: 5	428 Mean: 2.13 Median: 2 Mode: 1 Min.: 1 Max.: 6	731 Mean: 2.04 Median: 2 Mode: 1 Min.: 1 Max.: 6
Genre drama	147	185	332
Genre romance	32	55	87
Genre comedy	27	30	57
Genre thriller	11	37	48
Genre crime	15	26	41
Genre war	19	13	38
Genre mystery	10	16	26
Genre biography	9	13	22
Genre history	4	9	13
Genre fantasy	7	6	13
Genre music/musical	7	5	12
Genre action	1	6	7
Genre adventure	2	5	7
Genre documentary	2	5	7
Genre sci-fi	0	6	6
Genre western	0	4	4
Genre animation	3	0	3
Genre horror	1	2	3
Genre family	1	1	2
Genre sport	2	1	3
Budget2 <i>*square root of budget</i>	204,831	256,364	470,195 Mean: 3154.43 Median: 3103/51 Mode (1 st): 3873 SE: 138.796 Min.: 50 Max.: 7211
Runtime	18,139	23,540	41,679 Mean: 116.42 Median: 112 Mode: 100

			Min.: 70
			Max.: 485