

'Oh goodness, I am watching reality TV': How methods make class in audience research

Skeggs, Bev; Thumim, Nancy; Wood, Helen

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Skeggs, B., Thumim, N., & Wood, H. (2008). 'Oh goodness, I am watching reality TV': How methods make class in audience research. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 11(1), 5-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549407084961>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

'Oh goodness, I am watching reality TV'

How methods make class in audience research

Bev Skeggs

Goldsmiths College

Nancy Thumim

London School of Economics

Helen Wood

De Montfort University

ABSTRACT One of the most striking challenges encountered during the empirical stages of our audience research project, 'Making Class and the Self through Televised Ethical Scenarios' (funded as part of the ESRC's *Identities and Social Action* programme), stemmed from how the different discursive resources held by our research participants impacted upon the kind of data collected. We argue that social class is reconfigured in each research encounter, not only through the adoption of moral positions in relation to 'reality' television as we might expect, but also through the forms of authority available for participants. Different methods enabled the display of dissimilar relationships to television: reflexive telling, immanent positioning and affective responses all gave distinct variations of moral authority. Therefore, understanding the *form* as well as the *content* of our participants' responses is crucial to interpreting our data. These methodological observations underpin our earlier theoretical critique of the 'turn' to subjectivity in social theory (Wood and Skeggs, 2004), where we suggest that the performance of the self is an activity that reproduces the social distinctions that theorists claim are in demise.

KEYWORDS affect, audience research, methodology, morality, 'reality' television, reflexivity, self, social class

Introduction: class, self and audience research

'Making Class and the Self through Televised Ethical Scenarios' is an ESRC-funded 'reality' television audience research project examining current social theory, which proposes that with the rise of the reflexive self,



traditional categories such as class and race have declined in significance. 'Reality' television's obsession with what Dovey (2000) identifies as 'spectacular subjectivity' might be seen as testament to this apparent social shift and we collected audience responses to programmes which foreground self-transformation, in part to interrogate the 'individualization thesis' of Beck (1992) and Giddens (1991) further. The analysis of class formations in audience research has slipped from the research agenda in recent years, despite efforts in the 1980s and 1990s by Andrea Press (1990), Ann Gray (1992), Lyn Thomas (1995) and Ellen Seiter (1999) to keep it alive. These studies followed David Morley's (1980) groundbreaking work in *The Nationwide Audience*, but Morley's study was criticized for social determinism by reifying class through occupational categories (Buckingham, 1991). However, writing of late, Morley notes:

The recent swing away from theories of social determination, towards the now widely held presumption of the 'undecidability' of these influences, has thus given rise to what may be among the most pernicious of the myths that have come to dominate our field . . . [D]espite the claims of much post-structuralist theory, class is still very much with us, if in new and always changing forms. (Morley, 2006: 108)

The reasons for the 'swing' away from class can be attributed to the post-structural theoretical shifts in thinking about contemporary identity formation. Those who agree on a more general move to processes of 'individualization' often suggest that the relocation of shared, grounded and localized forms of identity to more particularized and reflexive forms of selfhood is increasingly resourced by mediated symbolic forms, yet there is still relatively little empirical research that details *how* this process works. Morley's suggestion that 'class is still very much with us' calls for research to address the media's role in changing identity formations, and we intend our project to go some way towards addressing that enigma.

Thus far our audience research suggests, in parallel with other work in sociology on class in the contemporary era, that class as a category indeed remains significant, but it is being remade in new ways (for a useful summary, see Lawler, 2005). In this article we want to highlight how the politics of research – of calling research subjects to account for themselves through the methods available to us – dovetails into the ways in which class is currently being reconfigured. Of course, others have called for a greater understanding of research scenarios as types of interaction generated in situ (for example, see Wilkinson, 1998) and we want to contribute to that debate by exploring how research methods pre-figure the mobilization of class capitals. For example, interviewing relies on self-reflexivity, but self-reflexivity does not offer the uncoupling of agency from structure: as the individualization thesis posits, self-reflexivity *itself* depends upon access to resources and concomitant forms of capital that are classed, raced and gendered (Adkins, 2002; Skeggs, 2002). We therefore draw attention



to how the design of a research project can allow research participants access to different modes of articulation, revealed here through a multi-layered methodology. Thus, the actual findings from the data cannot (and should not) be easily separated out from the form of their production. In our research, the groups of women recruited from different classed and raced backgrounds deploy their available cultural resources to produce 'performances' of class, *made* rather than found, in each particular type of research event. This challenges the traditional methodological emphasis on excavation ('finding' and 'findings') and puts emphasis on the conditions of possibility and techniques available in each research encounter.

Summary of research design

Our multi-layered methodology allowed the production of four different types of knowledge relating to 40 research participants and their relationship to 'reality' television. Because of assumptions about the gendered make-up of these transformative 'reality' formats and their audiences, and due to the complicated relationship that 'new' modes of self work and reflexivity have within a longer history of gender relations, all of our informants were women, as we are primarily concerned with the intersection of class and gender.¹ We began with six months of textual and inter-textual analysis to map the range of 'reality' television, finally choosing ten series (out of 42 airing on free channels available at the time) to represent the scope of self-transformation programmes. Our textual analysis was followed by sociological interviews to locate the participants in terms of their social, cultural and economic contexts, domestic geographies and lifestyles. We then organized viewing sessions using the 'text-in-action' method developed by Helen Wood (2005, 2007, in press), which involved watching television programmes with the women and recording their responses while they viewed. Finally, focus groups were conducted as a way of contrasting individual responses with viewing events and public statements about 'reality' television.

Snowballing was used to contact 40 women living in four different locations of south London,² accessing existing social networks of women from particular geographical areas through key informants in a broad effort to reflect the race and class mix of the social milieu of south London. Our four key informants included a white British middle-class woman, a white British working-class woman, a British-Pakistani working-class woman, and a black British working-class woman. The social make-up of the groups is outlined below:

Addington: 10 white working-class; 5 mothers, 5 not mothers; aged 18–72. Occupations mainly centre around care work and full-time mothering.



Brockley: 6 black British working-class, 3 white working-class, 1 Maltese; 9 mothers, 1 not a mother; aged 26–68. Occupations in public sector and service sector administrative, caring and secretarial work.

Clapham: Southern and British-Asian, Asian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, settled and recently arrived; transnational class differences; 7 mothers, 2 not mothers; aged 18–45. 2 highly educated professional women, 1 student, the rest full-time mothers or part-time helpers with husbands' work.

Forest Hill: 7 white, 3 self-defined as mixed race, all self-defined as middle-class; 3 mothers, 7 not mothers; aged 30–57. Occupations centre around public sector educational, art and drama work.

Class identifications and access

We used a class framework developed from Bourdieu's description of four different types of capital – economic, symbolic, social and cultural – as they are attached to our research participants in different volumes and compositions and convertible into value depending upon the fields in which they are exchanged (see Skeggs, 1997, 2004a).³ This enabled us to see how gender, class and race coagulate over space and time and generate a person's overall symbolic value. For example, the performance of respectability figures class, gender and race in different ways across space and time, conferring different types of value – a 'moral economy' of personhood (Skeggs, 2004a).

We also asked individuals whether and how they would identify *themselves* in class and race terms. Those whom we expected to be 'middle class' (from our key informant) almost all defined themselves as such, or in some cases referred to themselves as part of a 'creative class'. They articulated their position with confidence and without the embarrassment that Sayer (2005) suggests is part of a middle-class disposition, but rather saw the category as an empirical description of their material conditions. The Asian group responded by reflecting on their transnational experiences and we translated class through their movement from one national classification system to another, and often back again, knowing that some forms of capital travel and convert while others do not (e.g. education, occupational knowledge, style, religion).⁴ Specific configurations of economic, cultural, symbolic and social capital located this group in different local exchange-value circuits in South Asia and the UK. Many members of the black and white British-born working-class groups struggled to easily locate a class position and either refused, avoided, dis-identified or read the categories as some form of moral judgement. Some members of the Brockley group when asked about race also avoided or challenged any potential judgement by stating 'the human race' as the 'right' way to talk about race. Gender as a category was not morally loaded here in the same way. However, in response to the discomfort and difficulties around issues of class and race we developed questions such as: 'Do you think you get a fair deal in life?'



These led to responses that were very often explicitly about nation and race and the inequalities of the British class system.⁵

Class also played a significant role in accessing and maintaining contact with our participants over the different stages of the research. Those who planned with diaries, mostly our middle-class participants, were able to organize our demands into a projected future, but at other times we were quite literally left on doorsteps despite our best efforts. We also met with some reluctance from the working-class groups, which can be explained by suspicion of the increased monitoring and surveillance of the working class by government bodies as well as academics.⁶

Our own social positions also helped to *make class* in the research encounters. Participants interpreted us differently as: equals who happened to be academics; junior researchers; students; representatives of the State or social workers; people they could help or who could help them; or people whose identities were simply baffling. As we will discuss later, this can have a profound influence over the discursive terms of engagement in research settings. We three researchers carried out the research each with our own different volumes and compositions of capital, able to draw upon different resources to establish rapport with our participants, thereby impacting upon the production of data. These issues also played out differently depending upon the research method, and therefore the deployment of different methods enabled us to see how class was being performed through the three stages of our empirical research: interviews, text-in-actions and focus groups.

Interviews: self-reflexivity as capital

Our in-depth interviews situated television viewing in daily life, producing a broader social context for the reception of 'reality' television. Perhaps not surprisingly, middle-class women were most comfortable in the interview situation. They spoke as equals to the interviewer, at ease with their shared status as professionals and often encouraging a dialogic encounter. They displayed self-reflexivity in response to questions about their everyday life and provided scholarly and critically distanced views on 'reality' television, involving lengthy elaborations. Our middle-class participants also often assumed that the researchers would share with them the cultural attitude of derision towards 'reality' television, and indeed television per se, as a bad object (see also Seiter, 1990). That is not to say that these women did not watch and express pleasure in 'reality' television, but when asked to discuss particular programmes they did so by displaying their skill in holding the form at a distance, as the following exchange with Ann (who in the initial phone contact claimed not to watch 'reality' television) illustrates:

Ann: Oh yes, oh my goodness, yes I love *Supernanny*, I even bought the book.

Bev: Really, I'll write this one down, book [laughs].



Ann: Oh goodness, I *am* watching ‘reality’ TV.

Bev: So you would purposefully watch *Supernanny*?

Ann: Well I watched a bit of it and I did, I even did watch it purposefully, but I think its novelty would have worn off. I think I must have watched about three of them and the reason I watched them is that I have difficulty with my five-year-old and ... she’s a wilful child and ... in the evening totally strung out over what, she’s very ... really –

Bev: Right so *Supernanny* would be a?

Ann: But also I quite liked, I like the advice, I didn’t, I mean I didn’t like the ‘reality’ aspect of it, I thought these poor families, they were so exposed, these couples with difficulties in their relationships, everything was just wide open for the whole world to see and I thought that was terrible. But in terms of, I did use tips, yes, and I bought the book and I read it in about two hours and it was very accessible ’cos a lot of things, parenting books, are American, and *Supernanny* books ... by her writer under her name, is actually very, I thought it was very accessible ... and it was very English and that was good.

Ann expresses surprise when she realizes that a programme she watches counts as ‘reality’ television and proceeds to assess and evaluate her interest in the programme in question. Through her ability to perform self-reflexively, Ann demonstrates that she is able to provide a contextualized and ‘useful’ educational reason for watching, while still being able to recognize the apparent flaws of the programme type – the ‘reality aspect’ – and demonstrate a considered opinion on exploitation. She even notes the irony in her own position of being engaged in something that she has previously stressed has absolutely no value. She is able to turn her engagement into a cultural skill – reading the book – very quickly, stressing that because it is English it offers ‘tips’ of educational value and therefore contains some worth. Her surprise at her own viewing choice and its conversion into a cultural asset that is both told and performed (as reason and irony) enables Ann to use reflexivity as a form of cultural capital to maintain her critical distance and moral value position in relation to ‘reality’ television. Ann therefore offers a post-hoc justification for her viewing that is a reflexive research ‘performance’. Her viewing is in fact very un-reflexive – she is surprised by the fact she has watched the programme. But it would be impossible for her to have an un-reflexive viewing position, for then she would have to admit that she watches that which she derides and condemns, and which, in the hierarchy of television taste cultures, appears very close to the bottom.

Responses like Ann’s were reproduced with surprising regularity across all three methods with our Forest Hill group, who offered a highly articulate display of reflexive telling that had little bearing on the practice of viewing itself, even though some did admit to just slumping in front of the television (but only occasionally, only when they had worked really hard, only because they wanted to know what was going on in popular



culture, etc.). No other group felt they had to display such a critical stance or self-justification for their television viewing. Ann Gray (1992), in her research on the use of the video in the 1990s, also found that middle-class women had to authorize their viewing through some higher cultural source like a film critic. Just as our working-class participants did not want to be attached to the category of class, our middle-class respondents did not want to be attached to that which is a cultural display of working-class (low) taste. They needed to show not only cultural detachment, but also cultural superiority to the bad object.

The interview was a much more difficult and uncomfortable event for women who were not middle-class (across different race categorizations). Some of the working-class women offered more truncated responses to our questions about television without much elaboration of the kind that was gleaned from the middle-class women. For example when asked why they liked *Wife Swap*, a common response was 'because it's funny', a response which apparently needs no further explanation and certainly no justification. Their approach to 'reality' television as entertainment did not require the mobilization of discourses of cultural value as a form of capital. Instead, their 'performance' was much less reflexive in relation to the display of their understanding of hierarchies of taste, and revolved around questions of immediate pleasure. This could potentially support a finding that 'reality' television is *less* significant to the working-class women, since quantitatively they had less to say even though they acknowledge watching more often than the middle-class women. However, we think that this more accurately reflects which forms of capital can be discursively activated in the research encounter, a point exacerbated further in some of the interviews with the women from the Clapham group who were new migrants to Britain.

In the Clapham group, nation, race, class and gender (via motherhood) intersected, and an extreme example was the interview with Saj. Saj is a Pakistani woman who did not have enough English for the interview (we only discovered this on arrival at her home). But Saj is a fan of *Supernanny* (broadcast on Channel 4, 2004—) and was keen to take part in the project and so the interview continued. The interview was uncomfortable for both parties because it became clear that Saj viewed the interviewer as a representative of the State, offering her bank statements as if to prove her legitimacy. She also desperately wanted to answer the questions 'correctly' in order to say the 'right' things about her daily life in Britain, and was determined to display a positive attitude to 'reality' television. It was as if Saj thought the interview was a citizenship test and that we wanted to hear that she thought Britain and British television was 'good'. There is a powerful context around migration and the politics of culture at work here that *produces* the type of discourse available within the interview encounter. It seems that Saj is attempting to draw upon her knowledge of British popular culture in order to articulate a position of rightful 'belonging' to a more powerful authority.



These different orders of discourse made in our interviews meant that after this stage of our research we worried about the comparability of the types of data generated from each of our groups. It is clear that each research encounter offers a particular mode of articulation that relates as much to available resources and powerful contexts as to the actual 'findings' on 'reality' television. The middle-class women were able to operationalize their capital by self-authorizing through knowledge of cultural value and taste, while the working-class women often gave answers which were immediate, self-evident and seemed not to require contextualization. Even more strikingly, the powerful context of the transnational migrant created a situation that completely determined the way in which the interview was able to unfold. How could these very divergent types of responses, which were as different in form as much as in content, offer us equivalent insights into the women's relationships with 'reality' television? Form and content are obviously intricately entwined, and using alternative methods, giving us access to different types of knowledge, allowed us to explore this further.

Text-in-action and the affective textual encounter

The second empirical method, text-in-action, was developed by Wood (2005, 2007, in press) in research on women's relationships with talk television to capture the dynamic interaction between viewer and television programme as an event taking place in a particular moment in time, rather than traditional reception research where data is only gathered after viewing. Digital voice recorders captured the viewing 'event': the dialogue and sound from the television programme along with any dialogue from the viewer. In these sessions, research participants watched a full-length 'reality' television episode, which they selected from a shortlist of programmes that they had identified as liking, alone or in groups of two or three. Of course, the presence of the researcher and the recording equipment all make the viewing far from 'natural', therefore we do not suggest that this method gives a more 'direct' or 'true' picture of the viewing process; it is still a constructed research event, like the interview.

The text-in-action method produced both comfort and discomfort for our research participants, depending upon their cultural resources. Some working-class women were suspicious of us: 'What, you want to watch us watching television and you're being paid for it!' (Michelle, Addington), whereas our middle-class participants were keen to know the 'rules of engagement', sometimes even questioning the methodological design. However, in other cases the unfamiliar research encounter was made less daunting since the television programme provided a focus, relegating the researcher to the background. This opportunity allowed some women, who had difficulties in directly articulating their responses to 'reality' television in the interview stage, a space to 'perform' their viewing relationship in a less self-conscious way.



Our text-in-action material is transcribed in three columns so that the soundtrack of the television programme appears alongside a description of what is taking place on screen, and alongside any utterances made by the viewer (see Extract 1). What is significant to our argument here is that our viewing sessions enabled working-class British women to display a type of moral authority to which they did not have access in the interview situation. This is an authority not produced through the same reflexive articulation that we have seen before, but through an entirely different relationship to television. The working-class participants responded to the 'reality' television participants as if they were 'real' – not representations – and invested in moral positions related to their 'real' lives. This can be seen in examples from an episode of *Wife Swap*, which pitted two women against each other: Tracy has one child, Lottie, is aspirational and works full-time outside the home for at least 12 hours a day for 'nice things'; Kate has six children and works full-time in the home to concentrate on parenting. In this particular example, participants from Brockley take the moral high ground in relation to parenting, demonstrating empathy and judgement through personal experience and ultimately *immanently positioning themselves* within the unfolding drama. They dramatically enact their own life choice – making maternal and domestic sacrifices for the family – as the right choice, displaying and authorizing their emotional labour.

It has been regularly argued by uses and gratifications researchers (e.g. Katz and Blumer, 1974) that media texts are used as reassurance for people's own lives and choices. This is visible in this exchange. But these exchanges also reveal some of the ways in which 'reality' television enables moral authority to be taken by working-class mothers. This moral positioning was not spoken in the interview setting but was *dramatized* in the text-in-action sessions. Good parenting was appraised, and often placed in opposition to aspiration and social mobility – a structural opposition also constructed through the programme's format. How these responses are enabled through the method cannot be disentangled from an understanding of the operation of gendered and classed discourses and practices in relation to 'reality' television.

The moral position taken by our participants is in conflict with current British government initiatives to encourage mothers to return to the labour market as fast as possible (see McRobbie, 2006). On the one hand, our participants' reaction against the upwardly mobile woman helps legitimate their own positioning outside the labour market. But on the other, in refusing to take up the position of aspiration and mobility in favour of giving time to children through more traditional modes of femininity, these working-class women are actually resisting some of the contemporary pressures on womanhood. Valerie Walkerdine points out how when women enter the labour market without qualifications it is mostly to 'poorly paid, often part-time work, [with] little job security



Extract 1

<i>Visual image</i>	<i>Programme audio extract:</i> <i>Wife Swap*</i>	<i>Viewers' responses: Brockley</i>
Kate driving home from work	Kate: I can't believe it's eight o'clock and I left home 13 hours ago: no wonder I've got a headache, it's just ridiculous.	
Kate pulling onto drive Kate enters the house	Voice-over: By the time Kate gets home it's eight thirty. Kate: How's Lottie? Mark: She's fast asleep. Kate: Ah. Mark: She was shattered.	Sally: Nightmare, absolute nightmare innit? Sonia: I had to leave home at seven with [child's name] to get to work and drop them off, I had to leave at seven.
Kate to camera	Kate: I'm quite disappointed that Lottie was in bed and I didn't get to bath her.	Sally: Oh no she's crying, she had a mare of a day. All: Yeah.
Shot of Lottie sleeping	I'm so tired.	Sonia: She's not had her all day has she? I suppose with all them children ((?))
Kate and Mark in the living room	My body feels really alive but my head feels dead. Quite often at home it's the other way round. Mark: Do you think Tracy would be feeling like that now?	Sal: But <u>that's</u> not fair on <u>that</u> child! (tone of outrage) Sonia: Exactly and that's what she's feelin'. Sal: ((?)) Sonia: Mmm I'm taking the mother's role [<u>performs</u>] and when I woke you up and dragged you out of bed at six o'clock in the morning and dropped you off at seven o'clock. Sal: To have you out by seven. Sonia: And now it's eight thirty at night and you ain't seen me all day. The kid's in bed. Sal: How you gonna make up for that? Sonia: You <u>can't</u> . [tone of righteousness]

*From programme broadcast 22 January 2003. The first series of *Wife Swap* was screened 7 January 2003, made by RDF for Channel 4. It is now into its sixth series, with a US version, *Celebrity Wife Swap* and *Wife Swap: The Aftermath*. It is also a DVD board game.



and periods of unemployment' (2003: 241). Therefore, it appears that our research participants offer a realistic appraisal – through television – of the pain and pleasure of their future possibilities: staying at home with friends and children may be preferable to a dead-end job and life lived at the site of the 'working-poor'.

The text-in-action method was generally *not* used by our middle-class participants to generate a moral authority missing in the interview encounter and, overall, they were less closely involved with some of the details occurring in the lives of 'reality' television participants, showing less empathy with the protagonists and being less likely to immanently locate themselves within the drama. They often expressed concern over fair representation or the format of the programme, its manipulation of the 'real', and its potential for exploitation of participants. This does not necessarily mean that the middle-class women are definitely not drawn into a relationship with those on television, but rather it shows that, as in the interview, they display their ability to be reflexive, often abstracting from the particular scenario on television to wider social debates. For example, while viewing the same episode of *Wife Swap* discussed above, Ruby2 from our Forest Hill group alludes to a wider debate about family life and work/life balance (see Extract 2).

Ruby2's 'it's interesting' was typical of our middle-class viewers' discursive framing of their considered responses. In this way they were able to display their ability to control the images through commentary, which is another resource that stems from their cultural capital. Foucault suggests that 'commentary is a type of discourse that has the aim of dominating the object: by supplying commentary one affirms a superior relation to that object' (Foucault, 1971 cited in Ang, 1985: 97). Ien Ang uses commentary to describe the ironic stance of her viewers watching *Dallas*, but irony does not fully explain what is happening here. It is important to note how Ruby2's moral position is adopted very differently from the personal and emotive response outlined by the Brockley and Addington viewers. Ruby2's commentary is more typical of contemporary public debate about a 'work/life balance' within which there is a more abstracted sense of shared responsibility with much less instancing of personal experience. In this sense, middle-class viewers often deploy a 'neutralizing distance' like that found in public discourse which, according to Bourdieu (1987), serves a double function: indexing the middle-of-the-road approach that middle-class ideology values and marking a distinction between those who 'let themselves get carried away' by their emotional impulses (Besnier, 1990).

It was precisely capturing 'getting carried away' that offered us another insight into 'reality' television viewing. We had spent a few viewing sessions with our white working-class group in particular feeling uncomfortable, as some of them rarely spoke and we wondered if we needed to revise our method. However, by a stroke of luck, when collecting visual examples



Extract 2

Visual image *Programme audio extract:* *Viewer's responses: Forest Hill*
Wife Swap

Image of Tracy
reading a book

Voice-over: Things are also tense in the Thomas household as Tracy decides its time for a break. Trevor has to put the kids to bed before heading off to work.

Cut to Trevor
taking child
out of room

Trevor: Listen I want no talking Josie, no talking to Lucy, you understand me: it's bed time.

Ruby2: I think it's interesting that people say, you know, they have got a full-time job or whatever, they have got a partner that works at home and they feel that they shouldn't have to do anything when they come home. I always think it is interesting that because – yes you do work really hard but you have a family, do you know what I mean? So if you are not willing to invest in the family you might say 'Oh yeah well I am working all the hours and I am providing for my family', but that also means time as well and I think you have got to weigh that up, do you know what I mean?

Trevor to camera

Good night.
Child: Good night.

Shot of Trevor
going out
of door

Trevor: Sometimes like this I'm working 'til about two/four thirty in the morning just so I can get things done.

Trevor: Right bye.

Bev: Mmmm.

Ruby2: He works, he is a doorman as well and he has got another job as well and he is training to be a social worker and have time to look after his kids, do you know what I mean?

Bev: Mmmm.



of close-ups held at 'moral moments' (when the camera holds close on the face to await the participant's response) while listening to the viewing tapes, we were able to find the exact point where participants engaged affectively: they gasped, laughed, tutted, sighed, 'ooh'ed and/or 'aah'ed. Sometimes their affective noise was translated into judgement through mediating statements such as 'oh my God', which were then converted into moral judgements, such as 'How can they let their children behave like that?', or 'How can they get into that state?', or 'How can they let themselves go?'. We began to refer to these instances as 'affective-textual encounters' (ATE) in which, although textually incited (through the close-up), a powerful non-verbal response is made immanently in the television encounter. Asking later about these responses would have relied on accessing an apparatus of reflexive interpretation, possibly teaching us more about the discursive resources that participants brought to bear on television interpretation than telling us about how they engaged with the form. This type of affective data was not readily available through the interview or the focus group, which were reliant on dialogic and linguistic modes of articulation.

We realized that affective textual encounters offer an alternative mode of articulating one's relationship to 'reality' television and one prime example is in the earlier case of Saj. The interview encounter exposed Saj's insecurity in relation to British culture and used alone it might seem that she could only offer a limited appraisal of 'reality' television. However, in the text-in-action stage, Saj was able to take up a strong position of moral authority when watching an episode of *Supernanny*.⁷ Here, Saj did not have to self-consciously articulate her understanding of the programme; rather, she *demonstrated* how she experienced the programme through loud affective declarations of 'No!' Saj is a fan of *Supernanny* because of the way the nanny, Jo, imposes what Saj refers to as 'guidelines' on parents in crisis. Saj shows sympathy for the mother in the *Supernanny* episode, but a certain morality also informs her response to the programme: her periperformative⁸ utterances of 'No!' and her tutting noises suggest the uptake of a moral position as an expert mother, which is more revealing of her relationship to 'reality' television than the data available in the interview stage of the research. Therefore, this method produces a different kind of knowledge about encounters with 'reality' television and suggests that we might explore alternative ways of engaging our research participants in the research process.

Some of the material collected in this stage of the research was linguistically minimal but powerfully significant. It can be explored by opening out the relevance of the nature of 'affective' relationships to cultural forms, which is also helpful to our determination of new class formations. Walkerdine and Blackman (2001) have previously pointed to the problem of over-prioritizing the cognitive and rational over affective dimensions of our relationships with media. In this research project, we develop the



text-in-action method further to locate the circulation of affect between the TV product and audience, using a model of affective economies to show how value circulates and resides in particular figures at particular moments, by examining how affect is converted into judgement.⁹

Therefore, our methods produced stark differences between the groups in their dialogue *with* and responses *to*, as well as *about*, 'reality' television. Being able to understand our respondents' different types of contributions – reflexive, immanent, affective – in this way offers an invaluable lens through which to interpret the findings from our focus groups.

Focus groups: the 'value' of 'reality' television

In the final stage of our empirical research, focus group discussions were used to explore the possibility of group attachments to 'reality' television. While mindful of the criticisms levelled at attempts to reify the role of class in early group interpretations of television, we nevertheless wanted to look for any group dynamics which articulated shared volumes and compositions of cultural resources within and across the focus groups.¹⁰ Reflection on the use of focus groups in social science research has usually concentrated on how group interaction influences the validity of the findings (e.g. Kidd and Parshall, 2000), and here we concentrate on how in our research the focus group method *creates* types of classed discourses which must be explained before one can interpret the data. We explore this by examining one of the dominant distinctions between group readings in the focus groups: whether or not 'reality' television has value in relation to social mobility.

In the black and white working-class Brockley focus group, consensus was reached that 'reality' television offered an alternative way for 'ordinary' people, who otherwise would not have had the opportunity, to make money. The genre was justified as morally worthy in the light of people trying to better themselves. The immanent position through which the women located themselves within the action and made direct comparisons with their own lives, as we have previously seen, helped them to come to this reading:

Nancy: Say a bit more about that?

Sal: About giving them a chance?

Sal: [Inaudible 14.45] ducking and diving, and you get an opportunity through 'reality' TV and then all of a sudden you're able to provide for yourself, provide for your family and not go to bed – and ... you know what I mean.

Ruby: Think about the dole queue the next morning, yeah.

Sal: And not wake up in the morning and think, 'Oh God, where is this going to come from, where am I going to get that from?' 'Reality' TV does that [inaudible 15.10].



The women here directly insert themselves into the lives that are on display on the television; they generate a fantasy of *not* struggling to provide for their families, projecting themselves into the comfort of the subject position of successful participant as a fantasy of a life lived without poverty and difficulty. 'Reality' television is not viewed as morally bad and exploitative (as suggested by our Forest Hill group), but as the remote but imagined possibility of a less constricted future: not as an ideological object but as a structure of opportunity. A similar position was offered by our white working-class focus groups from Addington, whose discussions revealed that they identified with those who had 'made it' and 'kept real', introducing moral judgement as to whether successful 'reality' television participants were worthy of their success on the basis of their lack of pretentiousness and hence proximity to themselves.

The Forest Hill focus group performed consistently across the methods, deploying considerable educational knowledge: displaying their ability to 'read' semiotically, showing an understanding of media economy and production, exploring the possibility of the exploitation of the participants and then linking these issues to wider questions of ideology. The notion that participation in 'reality' television programmes might provide a positive route to economic gain was not discussed; in fact they condemned participants for 'getting something for nothing':

Liselle: It says at what lengths you will go to and I think, I think we start to think that you don't have to work hard at things and we don't have to, it's like kids who just want to be famous, you know it doesn't matter what I do but I want to be famous. It takes away every sense of working hard at things and thinking about making a difference or it's just about this –,

Ann: Yeah.

Orlaine: I think, I think it's ... also about this celebrity thing isn't it? About how people get famous and rich for not having any skills any more.

Participation on 'reality' television is here perceived to be an immoral gain, since it occurs without the requisite labour and forms of capital that have been traditionally associated with success. However, what this shows is not directly what they really think of 'reality' television participants, especially considering that more than one member of this group had considered participating in 'reality' television. Rather, this demonstrated how, in keeping with their other responses, they are able to locate this discussion within broader, more abstracted forms of public debate around celebrity culture, which can be removed from their own experience.¹¹ A parallel can be drawn to Bourdieu's analysis of consumption:

Consumption is ... a stage in a process of communication, that is, an act of deciphering, decoding, which presupposes practical or explicit mastery of a cipher or code ... One can say that the capacity to see is a function of the knowledge, or concepts, that is, the words, that are available to me to name visible things, and which are, as it were, programmes for perception. (1986: 2)



This is why, he argues, the consumption of cultural artefacts is predisposed to fulfil a social function of legitimating social differences.

A different reading of this issue of participation came from our South and British Asian Clapham group, who approached the focus group as an opportunity for a social get-together with children, for dressing up and sharing food. Appearance on 'reality' television was not seen as an imagined opportunity, nor even as immoral gain, but consensually as something potentially shameful to oneself and one's family, related to an alternative moral code of family honour. Their discussion facilitated an encouraging and supportive position in terms of their own cultural difference among a group of women not often able to be together.

Silva and Wright (2005) also report how class was significant to performances in their focus groups, due to issues related to confidence in public speaking and expectations about debate, which were exacerbated further by the politics of talking about cultural taste. Our findings are similar; however, we want to stress here how our access to participants over time, enabling different modes of articulation through different methods, helps to uncover the ways discussions were able to emerge in the focus groups. The content of the discussion is therefore dependent upon the various cultural resources available to participants to authorize themselves and, in the case of the Clapham group, is related to the broader context in which the group meeting was conceived. In that sense, the middle-class women could mobilize a straightforward position of authority through reflexivity and knowledge of public debate and taste, while the working-class participants found a moral position through their affective responses to their immanent knowledge of parenting and their economic position, and the Clapham group through the assertion of cultural difference. Had we relied solely on focus group data in this research project, these positions might have been framed as observable realities, rather than also as modes of articulation, generated through available classed (and raced) capitals.

Conclusion

Research practices do not simply 'capture' or reveal the world out there; they generate the conditions of possibility that frame the object of analysis. We tease out this process in our research by exploring the deployment of reflexive techniques as well as alternative affective modes of articulation, allowing us to see both distanced and proximate relations to the object of television. Our three empirical research methods incited reflexivity from those with both the communicative skills and the desire to operate a more abstracted perspective on 'reality' television, authorizing their position within a cultural taste hierarchy, whereas for those who were not interested in articulating their relationship to television via taste, the three methods offered different forms for enacting their investment in the social roles on display. While the interviews created some linguistic



discomfort for some of our participants, the text-in-action and focus group methods offered an opportunity to perform not just an abstracted perspective of cultural value, but also an immanent and affective demonstration of maternal authority. We do not want to propose, however, a Bourdieuvian class distinction of middle-class distanced abstraction versus proximity to necessity, because this opposition is also complicated by gender and race and relies solely upon the linguistic telling of one's position and perspective, which reproduces the very hierarchy of value that it seeks to critique.¹² That our methodological design enabled different kinds of knowledge to be displayed, and offered a more transparent account of that process than is often rendered in research, reinforces the need to explore how different techniques reproduce what is in fact a demonstration of unequal access to cultural resources, while appearing as if neutral and value-free. Our methods reveal some of the processes by which gender, class and race are re-made through research practices before we even embark upon any in-depth analysis of the content of the data. While we managed to recruit a radically diverse set of people to the project, we did not anticipate how the divergent volumes and composition of cultural capital across (and within) the different groups would cohere and generate 'performances' so tightly connected to classed resources in particular. The use of these capitals can now be analysed further to explore how 'reality' television mediates a complex moral economy, both re-constituting and disrupting social categorizations of class, race, nation and gender, which are still highly significant as analytical and lived categorizations and certainly not in decline, but always known through the techniques that enable their production.

Notes

1. For a more detailed discussion of gendered traditions in emotional management and responses to 'reality' television, see Wood et al. (forthcoming).
2. We drew on our own contacts and those of our colleagues in the Sociology department at Goldsmiths College. Enormous thanks are due to Les Back and Karen Wells.
3. We use attachment rather than embodiment following theories on prosthetic culture (see Lury, 1998; Skeggs, 2004a).
4. For discussion of the convertibility of cultural capital and the limits placed on non-national symbolic capital, see Hage (1998) and Ong (1999).
5. See Payne and Grew (2005) for alternative ways of asking questions that address class issues.
6. There have been massive changes in public culture in the UK since the New Labour government came to power in 1997, with 3000 new criminal charges, 57 new acts and a sustained focus on community surveillance, while various forms of punitive intervention have grown in working-class communities, such as Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs). Indeed, Reynolds (2002) notes that black feminist researchers have met with



similar problems of resistance due to being viewed as agents of state pathologization.

7. Because of the late involvement of Saj in the project and the difficulties of coordinating times for the research, the interview and the text-in-action were done consecutively.
8. These are singular performative utterances that are significant in the way they are clustered and demonstrate beliefs and understandings, adapted from Kosofsky Sedgwick (2003).
9. The idea of affective economies is developed from Sara Ahmed's (2004) work on race, where she extends Marx's formulae of capital accumulation to show how affect circulates and is distributed to produce figures that can be recognized as having (or not having) value.
10. Work that re-analyses Morley's *Nationwide* audience data by Kim (2004) and uses computerized forms of statistical analysis, unavailable in 1979, shows that in fact the decodings of the groups in that project were actually more structured by social position than he originally claimed.
11. Interestingly, their position chimes with that of the then Chancellor, Gordon Brown, when he criticized 'celebrity culture' as empty and without the values of hard work in his interview in *The Guardian*, 14 April 2007: 'Brown: "Britain Has Fallen out of Love with Celebrity"'.
12. See Skeggs (2004b) for an outline on Bourdieu's gender troubles and his difficulty analysing female gender and sexuality.

References

- Adkins, L. (2002) 'Reflexivity and the Politics of Qualitative Research', in T. May (ed.) *Qualitative Research in Action*, pp. 332–48. London: Sage.
- Ahmed, S. (2004) 'Affective Economies', *Social Text* 22(2): 117–39.
- Ang, I. (1985) *Watching Dallas*. London: Routledge.
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Besnier, N. (1990) 'Language and Affect', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 19: 418–51.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1987) 'What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups', *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 32: 1–17.
- Buckingham, D. (1991) 'What are Words Worth? Interpreting Children's Talk about Television', *Cultural Studies* 5(2): 228–45.
- Dovey, J. (2000) *Freakshow: First Person Media and Factual Television*. London: Pluto Press.
- Foucault, M. (1971) *L'Ordre Du Discours*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gray, A. (1992) *Video Playtime: The Gendering of a Leisure Technology*. London: Routledge.
- Hage, G. (1998) *White Nation*. Melbourne and London: Pluto Press.
- Katz, E. and J. Blumer (1974) *The Uses of Mass Communication*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kidd, P.S. and M.B. Parshall (2000) 'Getting the Focus and the Group: Enhancing Analytic Rigor in Focus Group Research', *Qualitative Health Research* 10(3): 293–308.



- Kim, S. (2004) 'Re-reading David Morley's *The Nationwide Audience*', *Cultural Studies* 18(1): 84–108.
- Kosofsky Sedgwick, E. (2003) *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lawler, S. (2005) 'Introduction: Class, Culture and Identity', *Sociology* 39(5): 797–816.
- Lury, C. (1998) *Prosthetic Culture: Photography, Memory and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- McRobbie, A. (2006) 'Four Technologies of Young Womanhood', lecture presented at Zentrum für Interdisziplinäre Frauen und Geschlechterforschung, Berlin, 31 October 2006.
- Morley, D. (1980) *The Nationwide Audience*. London: BFI.
- Morley, D. (2006) 'Unanswered Questions in Audience Research', *The Communication Review* 9: 101–21.
- Ong, A. (1999) *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press.
- Payne, G. and C. Grew (2005) 'Unpacking "Class Ambivalence": Some Conceptual and Methodological Issues in Accessing Class Cultures', *Sociology* 39(5): 893–910.
- Press, A. (1990) 'Class, Gender and the Female Viewer: Women's Responses to *Dynasty*', in M.E. Brown (ed.) *Television and Women's Culture: The Politics of the Popular*, pp. 158–82. London: Sage.
- Reynolds, T. (2002) 'On Relations between Black Female Researchers and Participants', in T. May (ed.) *Qualitative Research in Action*, pp. 300–10. London: Sage.
- Sayer, A. (2005) *The Moral Significance of Class*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seiter, E. (1990) 'Making Distinctions in TV Audience Research: A Case Study of a Troubling Interview', *Cultural Studies* 4(1): 61–85.
- Seiter, E. (1999) *Television and New Media Audiences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva, E.B. and D. Wright (2005) 'The Judgement of Taste and Social Position in Focus Group Research', *Sociologia e ricerca sociale* 76–7: 241–53.
- Skeggs, B. (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender: Becoming Respectable*. London: Sage.
- Skeggs, B. (2002) 'Techniques for Telling the Reflexive Self', in T. May (ed.) *Qualitative Research in Action*, pp. 349–75. London: Sage.
- Skeggs, B. (2004a) *Class, Self, Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Skeggs, B. (2004b) 'Pierre Bourdieu's Analysis of Class, Gender and Sexuality', in L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (eds) *Feminism After Bourdieu*, pp. 19–35. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thomas, L. (1995) 'In Love with Inspector Morse: Feminist Subculture and Quality Television', *Feminist Review* 51: 1–25.
- Walkerdine, V. (2003) 'Reclassifying Upward Mobility: Femininity and the Neo-Liberal Subject', *Gender and Education* 15(3): 237–48.
- Walkerdine, V. and L. Blackman (2001) *Mass Hysteria*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998) 'Focus Group Methodology: A Review', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 1: 181–203.



- Wood, H. (2005) 'Texting the Subject: Women, Television, and Modern Self-Reflexivity', *The Communication Review* 8(2): 115–35.
- Wood, H. (2007) 'The Mediated Conversational Floor: An Interactive Approach to Reception Analysis', *Media Culture and Society* 29(1): 75–103.
- Wood, H. (in press) *Talking With Television*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Wood, H. and B. Skeggs (2004) 'Notes on Ethical Scenarios of Self on British "Reality" TV', *Feminist Media Studies* 4(2): 205–8.
- Wood, H., B. Skeggs and N. Thumim (forthcoming) 'It's Just Sad: The Mediation of Intimacy and Emotional Labour in "Reality" TV Viewing', in J. Hollows and S. Gillis (eds) *Homefires: Affect, Judgement and Emotional Labour in Reality TV Viewing*. London: Routledge.

Biographical notes

Bev Skeggs has published *The Media: Issues in Sociology* (1992), *Feminist Cultural Theory* (1995), *Formations of Class and Gender* (1997), *Class, Self, Culture* (2004), *Sexuality and the Politics of Violence and Safety* (2004; with Les Moran) and *Feminism after Bourdieu* (2005; with Lisa Adkins). ADDRESS: Department of Sociology, Goldsmiths, University of London, New Cross, London SE14 6NW, UK. [email: b.skeggs@gold.ac.uk]

Helen Wood is author of *Talking With Television* (forthcoming, University of Illinois Press), has published a number of articles on talk shows, reality television and cultural studies, and has co-edited the collection of CCCS stencilled papers for Routledge (2007). ADDRESS: Department of Media and Cultural Production, De Montfort University, Clephan Building, The Gateway, Leicester LE1 9BH, UK. [email: hwood@dmu.ac.uk]

Nancy Thumim was Research Fellow from September 2005–April 2007 on the ESRC Identities and Social Action project 'Making Class and the Self through Televised Ethical Scenarios'. She is currently Research Fellow in Mediatized Stories, University of Oslo, and is based at the Department of Media Communications at LSE. ADDRESS: Department of Media and Communications, London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK. [email: n.thumim@lse.ac.uk]