



Submission to the National Cultural Policy Consultation

Recognising cinemas as essential cultural and civic infrastructure

Prepared May 2026

Introduction

Independent Cinemas Australia welcomes the opportunity to contribute to consultation on Australia's next National Cultural Policy.

Revive rightly repositioned arts, culture and heritage as central to Australia's future. The next stage of national cultural policy must now ensure that cultural participation is not only supported at the point of creation, but also at the point of public access.

Cinema exhibition is one of the most visible, affordable and widely used forms of cultural participation in Australia. Cinemas are not simply commercial entertainment venues. They are cultural, civic, social and economic infrastructure. They are where Australian stories meet Australian audiences. They are local gathering places, employers, main street anchors, regional cultural venues and part of the everyday cultural life of millions of Australians.

Yet cinema exhibition remains under-recognised in national cultural policy. Public policy has historically supported the making of screen works, but has given insufficient attention to the infrastructure that allows those works to be encountered by the public. A national cultural policy that seeks to support access, participation and cultural equity must recognise cinemas as essential cultural infrastructure.

This submission makes three central points:

1. Cinemas matter because they are essential cultural and civic infrastructure.
2. Exhibition is the missing public access link in Australia's screen policy framework.
3. The next digital cinema transition, Digital Mark II, must be planned and managed nationally before it becomes a crisis.

1. Cinemas are essential cultural and civic infrastructure

Cinemas are one of Australia's most accessible cultural venues. They operate across metropolitan, suburban, regional and rural communities, often in places with limited access to other cultural infrastructure. For many Australians, particularly outside capital city cultural precincts, the local cinema is the most regular and affordable point of contact with arts and culture.

Cinemas provide more than the private consumption of entertainment. They create shared public experiences. They bring communities together across age, income, language and background. They support collective storytelling, public conversation, social connection and cultural memory.

Independent cinemas in particular are deeply embedded in their local communities. They host school events, fundraisers, festivals, Q&As, community screenings, seniors' sessions, local premieres, charity events and civic gatherings. In many regional towns they are among the few venues capable of bringing large groups together for cultural activity.

Cinema also supports local economies. A trip to the cinema is often linked to spending in nearby restaurants, bars, cafes, retail and transport. The presence of an active cinema can strengthen night-time economies, main streets and town centres. Where cinemas close, the loss is rarely confined to the cinema business alone. It affects local cultural life, local employment and surrounding businesses.

For these reasons, cinemas should be understood alongside libraries, galleries, museums, performing arts centres and community halls as part of Australia's cultural and civic infrastructure.

2. Cinema is where screen culture becomes public culture

Australia has long recognised the importance of screen production. Public investment supports development, production, post-production, distribution and promotion. These interventions are necessary and valuable. However, a screen work does not fulfil its cultural purpose simply by being made. It must be seen.

Cinema remains the most powerful public setting in which Australian screen stories become shared cultural events. A theatrical release gives a film visibility, legitimacy and public presence. It creates reviews, word of mouth, community discussion, media attention and downstream value across later release platforms.

This is particularly important for Australian films. Without a viable exhibition sector, Australian screen stories risk becoming less visible, less communal and less able to reach audiences beyond niche or algorithmically determined pathways.

A national cultural policy should therefore recognise exhibition as part of the screen value chain. The current policy framework often treats exhibition as external to cultural policy, despite cinemas being the point at which many Australians actually experience screen culture. This creates a structural gap between public investment in production and public access to the work created.

The next National Cultural Policy should close that gap.

3. Cultural access is also an infrastructure question

Cultural participation depends on infrastructure. For cinema, that infrastructure includes screens, seating, sound, projection, accessibility, building compliance, energy systems, digital connectivity and trained staff.

Independent cinemas operate on tight margins. Many are small businesses or family businesses. Many serve regional or outer suburban communities where cultural alternatives are limited. These cinemas deliver public cultural value, but they do not always have the balance sheet capacity to manage major infrastructure renewal without support.

This is particularly urgent because the sector is approaching a second digital transition.

The first digital cinema transition replaced 35mm projection with digital projection. That transition was largely supported through distributor-backed mechanisms because studios had a clear commercial interest in moving away from film prints. That support will not be repeated at the same scale.

The next phase, Digital Mark II, is different. It involves the replacement or major refurbishment of ageing digital projection systems, servers, sound systems and related equipment. Much of the equipment installed during the first transition between approximately 2009 and 2014 is now approaching or has passed the end of its optimal operating life.

ICA estimates that approximately 60% of Australia’s national cinema projection fleet will reach practical replacement or major refurbishment age within the next four years.

Australia currently operates approximately 2,300 cinema screens nationally. Using a conservative assumption that 60% of those screens require significant projection renewal, the sector is facing replacement pressure across approximately 1,380 screens.

Using a conservative modelling assumption of \$100,000 per screen for replacement or major refurbishment, the projected national infrastructure task is approximately \$138 million over the next four years.

While entry-level digital projection systems have fallen in price and can in some cases be sourced for under \$40,000, these are generally not the systems used in many established commercial cinemas. Depending on screen size, brightness requirements, premium formats, sound integration and infrastructure needs, replacement costs for contemporary cinema systems commonly range from approximately \$55,000 to \$250,000 per screen. Emerging premium technologies such as direct-view LED cinema walls can exceed \$500,000 per screen before associated installation and infrastructure costs.

For independent operators managing multiple screens, regional venues or heritage sites, the cumulative replacement burden can quickly reach hundreds of thousands, and in some cases millions, of dollars. These costs arrive at a time when many cinemas are still recovering from the long-tail impacts of the pandemic, changing audience behaviour and rising operational costs including insurance, wages and energy.

Without a managed response, Digital Mark II risks becoming a slow-moving infrastructure crisis. Cinemas may defer upgrades, reduce screen capacity, limit programming options or, in some cases, close screens altogether. The communities most exposed are likely to be regional, outer metropolitan and lower-income areas where commercial replacement economics are weakest and cultural access is most fragile.

This is precisely the type of cultural infrastructure issue that national policy should anticipate rather than respond to after failure.

Digital Mark II modelling assumption	Estimated value
National screen fleet	2,300 screens
Share approaching renewal	60%
Screens potentially requiring renewal	1,380 screens
Conservative modelling cost	\$100,000 per screen
Estimated national renewal task	\$138 million

4. Digital Mark II should be managed nationally

ICA recommends that the Australian Government recognise Digital Mark II as a national cultural infrastructure priority.

Australia is potentially facing an estimated \$138 million cinema infrastructure renewal task over the next four years, with approximately 60% of the national projection fleet approaching replacement or major refurbishment age. Without strategic intervention, the greatest risk exposure sits in regional, outer suburban and culturally underserved communities where replacement economics are weakest but dependence on local cinema infrastructure is often strongest.

This does not require government to replace normal commercial investment. Rather, it requires a planned, targeted and evidence-based framework that identifies where public support is justified because the cultural, civic and regional access benefits exceed the private commercial return.

A national approach could include:

- a national audit of digital cinema infrastructure condition, age and replacement risk
- priority mapping of regional, outer suburban and culturally underserved communities
- targeted grants or low-interest loans for digital projection renewal
- energy-efficiency and sustainability upgrades linked to equipment replacement
- support for accessibility improvements, including captioning, audio description and venue access
- recognition of cinemas within regional development, night-time economy and cultural infrastructure programs
- coordination with Screen Australia, Creative Australia, state screen agencies and regional development bodies

The policy goal should be clear: no Australian community should lose access to cinema simply because the second digital transition was not anticipated, planned for or strategically supported.

5. Cinemas support the objectives of national cultural policy

Cinemas directly support the objectives of a national cultural policy concerned with access, participation, sustainability, cultural diversity and place-based cultural life.

They support:

Access: Cinemas provide regular, affordable access to Australian and international screen culture.

Participation: Cinema attendance is a mass cultural activity, not limited to specialist arts audiences.

Regional equity: Independent cinemas often provide cultural access in places without major performing arts or screen institutions.

Australian stories: Cinemas give Australian films public visibility and help turn screen works into shared national conversation.

Economic resilience: Cinemas support local employment, hospitality, retail and night-time activity.

Social connection: Cinemas provide safe, inclusive spaces where people gather, share stories and participate in community life.

Cultural continuity: Many cinemas are long-standing local institutions with heritage, memory and civic significance.

A policy that values cultural participation must value the places where participation happens.

6. Recommendations

Independent Cinemas Australia recommends that the next National Cultural Policy:

1. Recognise cinema exhibition as essential cultural and civic infrastructure within Australia's national cultural policy framework.
2. Acknowledge exhibition as a necessary part of the screen value chain, ensuring policy supports not only the making of Australian stories but also public access to those stories.
3. Develop a national Digital Mark II framework to assess and support the renewal of ageing digital cinema infrastructure.
4. Create targeted cultural infrastructure support for independent and regional cinemas, with priority given to communities where cinema access is most vulnerable.
5. Ensure cinemas are eligible for relevant cultural, regional development, sustainability, accessibility and night-time economy programs.
6. Improve national data collection on cinema access, attendance, screen infrastructure and regional cultural participation, so policy can be guided by evidence.
7. Encourage collaboration between Screen Australia, Creative Australia, state screen agencies, regional development bodies and industry to support audience access and exhibition sustainability.

Conclusion

Cinemas are where screen culture becomes public culture.

They are places of access, participation, employment, community connection and shared national storytelling. They support Australian films, local economies, regional communities and the social life of towns and suburbs across the country.

The next National Cultural Policy should recognise that cultural policy does not end when a work is made. It must also consider whether Australians can see it, where they can see it, and whether the infrastructure that makes that possible is secure.

Independent cinemas are commercially active, but they also deliver clear public value. They are cultural and civic infrastructure. They should be recognised and supported as such.

Digital Mark II is the immediate test. If managed well, it can strengthen cultural access, modernise cinema infrastructure and protect regional participation for the next decade. If ignored, it risks leaving communities without the venues that make screen culture visible, shared and alive.

ICA urges the Australian Government to recognise cinema exhibition as an essential part of Australia's cultural future.

The Public Value of Cinema: A Policy and Evidence Review

Why Cinemas Should Be Recognised as Cultural, Social and Economic Infrastructure

By **Nick Hayes** B.Sc MAICD

Prepared for advocacy, policy discussion and government engagement

Research note

The direct peer-reviewed literature on cinema attendance is narrower than the wider literature on arts, culture and health. This paper therefore distinguishes between cinema-specific evidence, broader cultural-attendance evidence, and urban and economic policy evidence.

Rather than a systematic review, the document is a targeted, policy-oriented evidence review. It synthesises cinema-specific research, broader arts and cultural participation literature, cultural economics and urban policy evidence relevant to cinema exhibition. Claims should therefore be framed according to the strength and specificity of the underlying evidence.



Used with thanks to and with the permission of **Hayden Orpheum – Cremorne**

Executive Summary

Cinema is commonly classified in public policy as a discretionary entertainment business. This framing understates its demonstrated public value and creates a mismatch between the societal benefits cinemas generate and the policy settings that govern them.

Evidence from public health, cultural policy, urban economics and international screen policy indicates that cinemas deliver material benefits across multiple portfolios, including mental health and wellbeing, social cohesion, disability inclusion, high street and precinct activation, night-time economy diversification, national storytelling, and the broader screen production value chain.

These benefits are not fully captured by private market returns or ticket sales. As a result, market provision alone is likely to under-supply cinema infrastructure relative to its public value.

Comparable jurisdictions increasingly treat cinema exhibition as cultural infrastructure rather than purely commercial retail. This paper argues that Australia should adopt a similar policy approach.

Core proposition

- Cinema is not only a venue for film consumption. It is a repeatable public setting for cultural participation.
- The public value of cinema includes health, social, civic, cultural and economic benefits that are only partly captured by box office.
- Public support can be justified where cinema access produces spillover benefits that private markets do not fully price.

Contents

1. Mental Health and Wellbeing
 2. Social Connection and Loneliness Reduction
 3. Empathy, Perspective-Taking and Social Understanding
 4. Social Prescribing and Preventative Health
 5. Disability Inclusion and Community Participation
 6. High Street and Precinct Activation
 7. Night-Time Economy Diversification
 8. National Culture and Storytelling
 9. Market Failure and Public Economics
- Conclusion
Consolidated References

1. Mental Health and Wellbeing

“Art is not a luxury. It is a necessity of the human spirit.”
Sir Ken Robinson

Policy Rationale

A growing body of evidence links regular cultural attendance with improved mental health outcomes, including reduced depression risk, lower loneliness and improved life satisfaction.

Cinema sits within this wider cultural attendance evidence base and has particular strengths as a mental wellbeing intervention due to its accessibility, familiarity and low social barrier to participation.

Longitudinal UK data has found cinema attendance to be positively associated with self-reported happiness and negatively associated with anxiety/depression measures. Broader arts and cultural attendance literature strongly reinforces this relationship.

Cinema’s value in this context is not merely recreational. It provides routine, structured, low-pressure public participation that supports psychological wellbeing.

Evidence Base

Cinema-specific evidence: Uhrig’s analysis of British Household Panel Survey data found cinema attendance was positively associated with happiness and negatively associated with self-reported anxiety or depression.

Broader cultural-attendance evidence: WHO Europe’s review identified a substantial evidence base linking arts engagement with prevention, health promotion, management and treatment of illness.

Longitudinal evidence: studies using ageing and population datasets have found cultural engagement is associated with lower risk of later depression and better wellbeing outcomes.

Talking points

- Cinema can function as a preventative mental-wellbeing asset, not merely a leisure activity.
- Regular cultural attendance is associated with better mental health and lower depression risk.
- Cinema provides one of the most accessible forms of out-of-home cultural participation.
- Supporting cinema access may reduce pressure on other wellbeing systems over time.

References supporting this section

- Uhrig, S. C. Noah (2005). Cinema is good for you: the effects of cinema attendance on self-reported anxiety or depression and happiness. ISER Working Paper Series 2005-14, Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex.
- Fancourt, D., & Finn, S. (2019). What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? A scoping review. WHO Regional Office for Europe, Health Evidence Network synthesis report 67.
- Fancourt, D., & Tymoszuk, U. (2019). Cultural engagement and incident depression in older adults: evidence from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 214(4), 225-229.
- Wang, S., Mak, H. W., & Fancourt, D. (2020). Arts, mental distress, mental health functioning and life satisfaction: fixed-effects analyses of a nationally representative panel study. *BMC Public Health*, 20, 208.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8109-y>

2. Social Connection and Loneliness Reduction

“People need people. We are social creatures.”
Johann Hari

Policy Rationale

Loneliness and social isolation are increasingly recognised as major public-health and economic concerns.

Cinema provides repeatable, low-barrier opportunities for shared public participation without requiring high levels of social confidence, cost or prior cultural literacy.

Unlike many social settings, cinema attendance allows individuals to participate alone or with others, without social performance pressure, in structured communal settings.

This makes cinemas particularly suitable for older adults, carers, socially isolated residents and people returning to community participation after illness or mental-health episodes.

Evidence Base

Frequent arts engagement has been associated with reduced odds of loneliness among older adults, including longitudinally.

Film screenings in care-home communities have been found to support social connection, reminiscence and intergenerational conversation.

The key cinema-specific policy strength is not that cinema forces interaction, but that it offers shared presence with low social demand.

Talking points

- Cinema is one of the lowest-friction forms of public social participation available.
- It allows people to be socially present without social pressure.
- Local cinemas can support anti-loneliness and ageing strategies.
- The loss of cinemas reduces public participation opportunities, especially in vulnerable communities.

References supporting this section

Tymoszuk, U., Perkins, R., Fancourt, D., & Williamon, A. (2020). Cross-sectional and longitudinal associations between receptive arts engagement and loneliness among older adults. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 55, 891-900.

Breckenridge, J. P., et al. (2021). Remembering the past, enhancing the present and sharing the future: a qualitative study of the impact of film screenings in care home communities. *Ageing & Society*.

Fancourt, D., & Finn, S. (2019). What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? WHO Regional Office for Europe.

Wang, S., Mak, H. W., & Fancourt, D. (2020). Arts, mental distress, mental health functioning and life satisfaction: fixed-effects analyses of a nationally representative panel study. *BMC Public Health*, 20, 208.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8109-y>

3. Empathy, Perspective-Taking and Social Understanding

“The movies are like a machine that generates empathy.”

Roger Ebert

Policy Rationale

Narrative film exposes audiences to experiences, perspectives and identities beyond their own.

Peer-reviewed literature in psychology and narrative theory supports the proposition that narrative engagement can foster empathy, theory of mind, emotional reflection and perspective-taking.

While effects vary by content and context, the evidence base supports the proposition that narrative film contributes to social understanding in ways distinct from purely informational media.

This is particularly relevant in diverse multicultural societies where public institutions seek to strengthen mutual understanding and social cohesion.

Evidence Base

Narrative empathy theory identifies the capacity of stories to invite perspective-taking and emotional sharing.

Experimental and quasi-experimental studies suggest narrative transportation can increase empathy and prosocial responses in some settings.

Film-specific and education-setting studies suggest selected movie viewing can produce short-term empathy and mental-health-literacy effects, although these should not be overstated as automatic or permanent.

Talking points

- Cinema allows audiences to inhabit lives beyond their own for extended periods.
- Narrative film can strengthen empathy and social understanding.
- Shared film culture contributes to broader social cohesion.
- Cinema supports public understanding across cultural, generational and social divides.

References supporting this section

Keen, S. (2006). A theory of narrative empathy. *Narrative*, 14(3), 207-236.

Bal, P. M., & Veltkamp, M. (2013). How does fiction reading influence empathy? An experimental investigation on the role of emotional transportation. *PLOS ONE*, 8(1), e55341.

Johnson, D. R. (2012). Transportation into a story increases empathy, prosocial behaviour, and perceptual bias toward fearful expressions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(2), 150-155.

Ahmadzadeh, A., et al. (2019). Does watching a movie improve empathy? A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Canadian Medical Education Journal*, 10(4), e4-e12.

Kidd, D. C., & Castano, E. (2013). Reading literary fiction improves theory of mind. *Science*, 342(6156), 377-380.

4. Social Prescribing and Preventative Health

“Culture is basic. It is not optional.”
UNESCO

Policy Rationale

Health systems internationally are increasingly incorporating non-clinical interventions into preventative and community health policy.

Arts and cultural attendance are now recognised components of social-prescribing frameworks in the UK and Europe.

Cinema is particularly well suited to such frameworks because it is familiar and non-stigmatised, geographically distributed, low cost, repeatable and scalable.

Its inclusion within preventative wellbeing frameworks would align Australia with emerging international best practice.

Evidence Base

Systematic review evidence indicates that Arts on Prescription programmes can improve psychosocial wellbeing.

Arts-on-prescription research repeatedly identifies social connection, belonging, structure and confidence as important mechanisms.

Cinema is a practical delivery partner because sessions already exist, are scheduled, and can be adapted for community, carer, seniors and supported-attendance programs.

Talking points

- Cinema is a scalable preventative-health asset.
- It should be eligible for social-prescribing and wellbeing referral programs.
- Cultural participation can reduce downstream health costs, although local program data should be collected before claiming quantified savings.
- Cinema provides a non-clinical pathway into community participation.

References supporting this section

- Jensen, A., Holt, N., Honda, S., & Bungay, H. (2024). The impact of arts on prescription on individual health and wellbeing: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, 1412306. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1412306>
- Stickley, T., Hui, A., & Souter, G. (2012). Arts on prescription: a qualitative outcomes study. *Public Health*, 126(7), 574-579.
- Fancourt, D., & Finn, S. (2019). What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? WHO Regional Office for Europe.
- National Academy for Social Prescribing. (2023). Arts, culture and heritage: evidence briefing. UK National Academy for Social Prescribing.

5. Disability Inclusion and Community Participation

“Access to culture is access to community.”

Adapted cultural participation framing

Policy Rationale

Cinema supports structured, predictable and repeatable public participation for NDIS participants, neurodivergent audiences, people with psychosocial disability, older Australians and supported community groups.

Accessible screenings, sensory sessions and companion-card schemes demonstrate cinema’s potential as inclusive public infrastructure.

Unlike many activities, cinema offers controlled environments, scheduled programming, affordable entry and scalable group attendance.

The strongest claims here concern participation and inclusion rather than direct clinical outcomes.

Evidence Base

Arts and cultural participation research supports the role of cultural settings in belonging, participation and psychosocial wellbeing.

Disability policy frameworks emphasise community participation, social inclusion and access to mainstream community life.

Cinema can translate these objectives into practical participation through accessible design, audio description, captioning, sensory-friendly sessions and supported group attendance.

Talking points

- Cinema aligns with disability participation and inclusion objectives.
- Accessible cinemas are important public participation venues.
- Cinema attendance supports community inclusion goals.
- Subsidising accessibility upgrades delivers direct public benefit.

References supporting this section

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2024). People with disability in Australia: social participation and inclusion indicators.

National Disability Insurance Agency. (2023-2024). NDIS participant outcomes and community participation reporting.

Fancourt, D., & Finn, S. (2019). What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? WHO Regional Office for Europe.

Jensen, A., Holt, N., Honda, S., & Bungay, H. (2024). The impact of arts on prescription on individual health and wellbeing: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, 1412306.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1412306>

Arts Access Australia. (2024). Arts, disability and access policy resources.

6. High Street and Precinct Activation

“A city’s public spaces are its living room.”
Amanda Burden

Policy Rationale

Cinema is a proven anchor use within mixed-use and town-centre environments.

Cinema generates predictable foot traffic, evening visitation, restaurant and hospitality spillover, longer precinct dwell times and stronger viability for adjacent retail and food uses.

Unlike intermittent event venues, cinemas produce repeatable weekly attendance.

This makes them unusually valuable in supporting local high streets and suburban centres.

Evidence Base

The BFI and Creative PEC study found cinema venues create social and economic value beyond direct market measures.

Urban cultural-economy literature links cultural anchors to local development, place identity and precinct vitality.

Cinema’s particular contribution is routine: unlike one-off festivals, it provides regular weekly footfall and early-evening activation.

Talking points

- Cinemas are anchor tenants with public spillover benefits.
- They generate foot traffic beyond their own ticket sales.
- Cinema-led precincts support hospitality and small business growth.
- A cinema closure often weakens surrounding businesses.

References supporting this section

- BFI and Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre. (2023). Measuring the economic value of cinema venues. Research by Ipsos, Nordicity and the Bennett Institute for Public Policy. Research commissioned with Ipsos, Nordicity and the Bennett Institute for Public Policy.
- BFI and Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre. (2023). Social and cultural value of cinema venues: qualitative analysis.
- OECD. (2022). The Culture Fix: Creative People, Places and Industries. OECD Publishing.
- Evans, G. (2009). Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy. *Urban Studies*, 46(5-6), 1003-1040.
- Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge University Press.

7. Night-Time Economy Diversification

“Cities need a diversity of uses that give people reasons to be out at different times of the day.”
Jane Jacobs

Policy Rationale

Night-time economy policy increasingly seeks to diversify away from alcohol-dominated models.

Cinema supports safer and more inclusive night-time economies by providing non-alcohol-led evening activity, family-friendly participation, mixed-age attendance and early-evening activation.

This contributes to more balanced urban nightlife and broader demographic participation.

Cinema should therefore be understood as part of night-time economy policy, not only arts or screen policy.

Evidence Base

Night-time economy policy literature increasingly recognises the need for diversified, inclusive, culture-led evening activity.

Alcohol-led nightlife can create public-order and health externalities; cinema offers a lower-risk evening anchor that can coexist with hospitality without depending on alcohol consumption.

Cinema contributes to early-evening activation, which helps bridge daytime retail and later hospitality periods.

Talking points

- Cinema broadens the night-time economy beyond alcohol-led venues.
- It attracts families, older adults and mixed-age groups.
- It supports safer, lower-risk evening activation.
- Cinema is a stabilising force in the evening economy.

References supporting this section

URBACT. (2024). Cities After Dark Baseline Study. European Union URBACT programme.

City of Sydney. (2020). International evidence literature review: night-time economy. City of Sydney.

Greater London Authority. (2018-2019). London at Night: an evidence base for a 24-hour city.

Roberts, M., & Eldridge, A. (2009). Planning the Night-Time City. Routledge.

Hadfield, P. (2015). The night-time city: four modes of exclusion, assessment and policy development. In M. Acuto, W. Steele, S. Maloney, & K. P. Parnell (Eds.), Global City Challenges: Debating a Concept, Improving the Practice. Palgrave Macmillan.

8. National Culture and Storytelling

*“Stories are how we understand ourselves.”
Richard Flanagan*

Policy Rationale

Cinema remains the principal public encounter point for feature film culture.

Theatrical exhibition creates shared national cultural moments, establishes public legitimacy for films, amplifies national storytelling and supports discoverability of local content.

Without cinemas, governments risk funding film production without ensuring meaningful public encounter.

This is directly relevant to public subsidy: public investment in national storytelling should include the conditions through which the public encounters that storytelling.

Evidence Base

Cultural-policy literature recognises screen culture as a vehicle for national identity, cultural diversity and public value.

International screen policy often pairs production support with distribution, exhibition and audience development mechanisms.

Theatrical release remains an important cultural signal because it converts a film from a completed work into a public event.

Talking points

- Films only become public culture when the public encounters them.
- Cinema is the primary shared platform for national storytelling.
- Screen policy without exhibition support is incomplete.
- Supporting cinema strengthens the return on film-production investment.

References supporting this section

UNESCO. (2005). Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

European Audiovisual Observatory. (2022-2024). Yearbook and reports on theatrical exhibition, cinema markets and national film performance in Europe.

Cunningham, S., & Silver, J. (2013). Screen Distribution and the New King Kongs of the Online World. Palgrave Macmillan.

BFI. (2022). Screen Culture 2033. British Film Institute.

Throsby, D. (2001). Economics and Culture. Cambridge University Press.

9. Market Failure and Public Economics

*“Not everything that counts can be counted.”
Often attributed to William Bruce Cameron*

Policy Rationale

Cinema generates private benefits, including ticket revenue, food and beverage sales, leasing and commercial returns.

It also generates public benefits, including wellbeing, social cohesion, cultural participation, high-street activation, public storytelling and local economic spillovers.

Private markets price the former. They do not fully price the latter.

This creates classic under-provision risk where socially valuable infrastructure is not supplied at optimal levels absent intervention.

Evidence Base

Cultural economics identifies public-good characteristics, externalities, option value, existence value and merit-good arguments as relevant to cultural policy.

The BFI and Creative PEC cinema-venue valuation work provides a directly relevant applied example: cinema users and communities place value on cinemas beyond direct market transactions.

The public-economics case is strongest where support is targeted, transparent, evidence-based and tied to measurable access, equity or renewal outcomes.

Talking points

- The market captures box office, not social value.
- Public-benefit venues are structurally underprovided by market logic alone.
- Cinema is infrastructure with positive externalities.
- Subsidy corrects for market underpricing of public benefit.

References supporting this section

Musgrave, R. A. (1959). *The Theory of Public Finance: A Study in Public Economy*. McGraw-Hill.

Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge University Press.

Towse, R. (2019). *A Textbook of Cultural Economics*. Cambridge University Press.

BFI and Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre. (2023). *Measuring the economic value of cinema venues*. Research by Ipsos, Nordicity and the Bennett Institute for Public Policy.

OECD. (2022). *The Culture Fix: Creative People, Places and Industries*. OECD Publishing.

Conclusion

“Cinema creates shared cultural spaces where communities connect, stories are experienced together and audiences become part of something larger than themselves.”
Independent Cinemas Australia

The evidence indicates that cinemas generate material public benefits across health, social, economic and cultural domains.

Their contribution extends substantially beyond private recreation and ticketed entertainment.

Accordingly, cinemas should be recognised in Australian public policy as cultural, civic and economic infrastructure rather than solely as discretionary entertainment businesses.

Recognition of this status would support a stronger policy basis for exhibition renewal funding, planning protections, cultural infrastructure frameworks, social prescribing inclusion, disability-access investment and targeted operational support in under-served areas.

Policy conclusion

- Cinema access should be considered within cultural infrastructure planning.
- Public support should be tied to measurable public benefits: access, inclusion, renewal, audience reach and local economic spillovers.
- The strongest case is not that every cinema must be subsidised, but that the public value of cinema should be recognised in policy, planning and funding design.

Consolidated References

1. Uhrig, S. C. Noah (2005). Cinema is good for you: the effects of cinema attendance on self reported anxiety or depression and happiness. ISER Working Paper Series 2005-14, Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex.
2. Fancourt, D., & Finn, S. (2019). What is the evidence on the role of the arts in improving health and well-being? A scoping review. WHO Regional Office for Europe, Health Evidence Network synthesis report 67.
3. Fancourt, D., & Tymoszuk, U. (2019). Cultural engagement and incident depression in older adults: evidence from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 214(4), 225-229.
4. Wang, S., Mak, H. W., & Fancourt, D. (2020). Arts, mental distress, mental health functioning and life satisfaction: fixed-effects analyses of a nationally representative panel study. *BMC Public Health*, 20, 208. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8109-y>
5. Tymoszuk, U., Perkins, R., Fancourt, D., & Williamon, A. (2020). Cross-sectional and longitudinal associations between receptive arts engagement and loneliness among older adults. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 55, 891-900.
6. Breckenridge, J. P., et al. (2021). Remembering the past, enhancing the present and sharing the future: a qualitative study of the impact of film screenings in care home communities. *Ageing & Society*.
7. Keen, S. (2006). A theory of narrative empathy. *Narrative*, 14(3), 207-236.
8. Bal, P. M., & Veltkamp, M. (2013). How does fiction reading influence empathy? An experimental investigation on the role of emotional transportation. *PLOS ONE*, 8(1), e55341.
9. Johnson, D. R. (2012). Transportation into a story increases empathy, prosocial behaviour, and perceptual bias toward fearful expressions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(2), 150-155.
10. Ahmadzadeh, A., et al. (2019). Does watching a movie improve empathy? A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Canadian Medical Education Journal*, 10(4), e4-e12.
11. Kidd, D. C., & Castano, E. (2013). Reading literary fiction improves theory of mind. *Science*, 342(6156), 377-380.

12. Jensen, A., Holt, N., Honda, S., & Bungay, H. (2024). The impact of arts on prescription on individual health and wellbeing: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, 1412306. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1412306>
13. Stickley, T., Hui, A., & Souter, G. (2012). Arts on prescription: a qualitative outcomes study. *Public Health*, 126(7), 574-579.
14. National Academy for Social Prescribing. (2023). Arts, culture and heritage: evidence briefing. UK National Academy for Social Prescribing.
15. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. (2024). People with disability in Australia: social participation and inclusion indicators.
16. National Disability Insurance Agency. (2023-2024). NDIS participant outcomes and community participation reporting.
17. Arts Access Australia. (2024). Arts, disability and access policy resources.
18. BFI and Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre. (2023). Measuring the economic value of cinema venues. Research by Ipsos, Nordicity and the Bennett Institute for Public Policy.
19. BFI and Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre. (2023). Social and cultural value of cinema venues: qualitative analysis.
20. OECD. (2022). *The Culture Fix: Creative People, Places and Industries*. OECD Publishing.
21. Evans, G. (2009). Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy. *Urban Studies*, 46(5-6), 1003-1040.
22. Throsby, D. (2001). *Economics and Culture*. Cambridge University Press.
23. URBACT. (2024). Cities After Dark Baseline Study. European Union URBACT programme.
24. City of Sydney. (2020). International evidence literature review: night-time economy. City of Sydney.
25. Greater London Authority. (2018-2019). London at Night: an evidence base for a 24-hour city.
26. Roberts, M., & Eldridge, A. (2009). *Planning the Night-Time City*. Routledge.
27. Hadfield, P. (2015). The night-time city: four modes of exclusion, assessment and policy development. In M. Acuto, W. Steele, S. Maloney, & K. P. Parnell (Eds.), *Global City Challenges: Debating a Concept, Improving the Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.
28. UNESCO. (2005). *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions*.
29. European Audiovisual Observatory. (2022-2024). Yearbook and reports on theatrical exhibition, cinema markets and national film performance in Europe.
30. Cunningham, S., & Silver, J. (2013). *Screen Distribution and the New King Kongs of the Online World*. Palgrave Macmillan.
31. BFI. (2022). *Screen Culture 2033*. British Film Institute.
32. Musgrave, R. A. (1959). *The Theory of Public Finance: A Study in Public Economy*. McGraw-Hill.
33. Towse, R. (2019). *A Textbook of Cultural Economics*. Cambridge University Press.

Use of Evidence

For policy and advocacy purposes, cinema-specific claims should be made carefully. The strongest direct cinema evidence concerns self-reported wellbeing, cinema venue valuation, public cultural participation and local economic value. The strongest wider evidence concerns cultural attendance, arts engagement, loneliness, depression risk, social prescribing and wellbeing.

Claims about clinical mental-health outcomes, disability outcomes or avoided public costs should be framed as plausible and evidence-aligned unless supported by local program data. Where a cinema participates in a social-prescribing, seniors, disability-access or community-health initiative, evaluation data should be collected to strengthen future subsidy and partnership cases.