

Contemporary American Cinema: Final Paper

Each student is required to submit a 2,000 response to **ONE** of the following questions:

1. As both King and Newman argue, the Indiewood films of the mid-to-late 1990s and the 2000s were seen to balance elements primarily associated with Hollywood cinema with markers of distinction that, from an Anglo-American perspective, tend to be associated with “art cinema” or “quality cinema”. Explain the commercial logic driving this key aspect of “Hollywood” output, and how it takes unique form in an Indiewood film that has not been screened on this course.
2. While most scholars frame the twenty-first century blockbuster as a culmination point for the high concept mode that developed across the contemporary period, this period also witnessed a return to the “internationalized” ultra-high-end cinema of the 1950s and 1960s. Thus, since the late 1990s, and especially since the year 2000, the content of most of Hollywood’s calculated blockbusters has been deliberately tailored to make them both marketable and appealing to key non-US audiences, as well as the “domestic” North American market. Explain why this is the case and how it is reflected in the content and themes of ONE twenty-first-century calculated blockbuster that has not been screened on this course.

With respect to both prompts, you may use any film of your choosing so long as that film has **not** been screened on this course.

I strongly advise students contact me regarding their choice of film.

Presentation

The paper is to be typed in size 12 Times New Roman (or a similar, easily readable font). It is to be double-spaced or 1.5 spaced, with 2.5 cm margins at either side of the page. Each page is to be numbered. US or UK spellings are accepted. Titles of films, TV series, books etc. are to be italicized with the year of original US release included in parentheses after the first citation only (e.g. *Jaws* (1975); thereafter *Jaws*). All quotations are to be placed in double

inverted commas (e.g. Smith describes the period as a “golden age for Stephen Spielberg”). Imbedded quotations are to appear in single inverted commas (e.g. Smith goes on to suggest “Spielberg knew the ‘good times’ were over by 1991”). For quotations of 40 words or longer, omit commas, single space, and indent at either side by 2cm (additional to the 2.5 cm margins) on a separate line.

Footnotes

References should be in Oxford Style. Please use an automated numbering system.

Book:

John Caughie, *Television Drama: Realism, Modernism and British Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Edited book:

Jonathan Bignell, Stephen Lacy and Madeleine Macmurrough-Kavanagh (eds), *British Television Drama: Past, Present and Future* (New York, NY, and Houndmills: Palgrave, 2000).

Article in own book:

Dai Vaughan, ‘Rooting for Magoo: a tentative politics of the zoom lens’, in *On Documentary: Twelve Essays* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999), p. 144.

Article in someone else’s book:

Bruno Latour, ‘The Prince for machines as well as for machinations’, in Brian Elliot (ed.), *Technology and Social Process* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1988), p. 33.

Article in journal:

Madeleine Macmurraugh-Kavanagh, 'The BBC and the birth of "The Wednesday Play"', 1964-70: institutional containment versus "agitational contemporaneity", *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, vol. 17, no. 3 (1997), pp. 67-84.

Translation:

Michel Ciment, *John Boorman*, trans. Gilbert Adair (London: Faber and Faber, 1986), p. 45.

Follow-on references:

Ciment, *John Boorman*, p. 47.

Macmurraugh-Kavanagh, 'The BBC and the birth of "The Wednesday Play"', p. 59.

Latour, 'The Prince for machines'.

Bignell et al. (eds), *British Television Drama*.

Or, if referring to directly previous footnote, use 'Ibid., p. 59.' Just 'Ibid.' if page reference is the same.

Internet references:

Address in angle brackets; access date in square brackets.

The Deanna Durbin Page,

<<http://www.geocities.com/Hollywood/Academy/5228/ddpage.html>> [accessed 7 April 2001].

See Anthony H. Cordesman, 'Iran's Revolutionary Guards, the Al Quds Force, and other intelligence and paramilitary forces' (rough working draft), 16 August 2007, Centre for Strategic and International Studies,

<www.csis.org/media/isis/pubs/070816_cordesman_report.pdf> [accessed 24 September 2008], p. 10.

Details

Value: 50% of Final Grade

Deadline: Midnight CET Sunday 8 December 2013

(Please send as PDF or Word file to richard_nowell@hotmail.com)

Penalties for Late Submission of Work

On the day following the due date – 5 marks out of 100 deducted

On the 2nd day following the due to date – 10 marks out of 100 deducted

On the 3rd day following the due date – 15 marks out of 100 deducted

On the 4th day following the due date – 20 marks out of 100 deducted

After the 4th day following the due date – all marks deducted

Grading/Evaluation: Grades from 1-4 will be awarded based on the following criteria:

	Argumentation/Understanding	Sources/Evidence	Communication
1 70<	Insightful, vigorous, and demonstrating considerable depth of understanding and a significant amount of original thought; addressing question directly through a wholly coherent synthesis of ideas; demonstrating a degree of mastery over subject; demonstrating a deep and thorough understanding of key concepts.	A wide range of sources consulted; sources employed with significant discrimination and sound judgment; thorough assessment of evidence; use of a broad range of examples.	Near-Faultless typography and layout; near-flawless turns of phrase and expression; sophisticated and precise vocabulary; clear structure; exemplary citation and bibliography.
2 55–69.9	Perceptive and insightful; some evidence of original thought; for the most part addressing question directly; mainly coherent synthesis of ideas; thorough and somewhat critical understanding of key concepts.	A fairly wide range of sources consulted; solid assessment of evidence; sophisticated use of a fairly broad range of examples.	Very Solid typography and layout; few errors in grammar; mainly sophisticated turns of phrase and expression; mostly clear structure; strong citation and bibliography.
3 40–54.9	Solid understanding addressed, for the most part, to the question; good synthesis of ideas; reasonably solid understanding of key	Several sources consulted; evidence of some assessment of evidence; use of mostly workable examples.	Good typography and layout; comprehensible and largely error-free grammar, turns of

	concepts; evidence of gaps in knowledge and some minor misunderstandings of key concepts.		phrase, and expression; reasonable clearly structured; some attempt to provide citation and bibliography.
4 (Fail) <40	Barely if it all addressed to question; no real synthesis of ideas; mainly descriptive rather than analytical; weak and patchy understanding of key concepts; significant gaps in knowledge and misunderstanding of key concepts.	Restricted range of sources consulted; superficial understanding of evidence; limited range of examples, many of which are inappropriate.	Poor typography and layout; numerous errors of grammar; limited vocabulary; ambiguous or inaccurate turns of phrase; weak or missing citations and bibliography.