

PEER REVIEW WORKSHOP FOR RESEARCH ESSAY ON FILM ANALYSIS

Read your partner's essay and answer the following questions discursively and in as much detail as possible. Answer the questions collectively rather than addressing them point for point.

Introduction

- 1. Does the introduction begin with a statement that grabs the reader's attention and encourages the reader to want to continue reading? Does the opening of the essay establish a clear focus and problem to be addressed? Comment in detail.**

Seung-yeon explains the definition of freedom and the variations of liberty in her introduction. The introductory part, since it is obviously exterior information, is not necessarily creative. However, it does give a solid introduction to some of the concepts that Seung-yeon will use to analyze the movie. It does that immediately grab the reader's attention, but gives more of a structured and stabilized feeling to it. It also has a clear focus since the introduction is consistently about freedom and liberty, and how the movie questions the intrinsic meaning of freedom. Although the thesis could use a little more detail when it comes to the introduction about the techniques that were employed (cinematic elements and interpretive tools), Seung-yeon comments on the main purpose of the film clearly and concisely, which is "questioning the intrinsic meaning of freedom".

- 2. Does the introduction effectively follow the old to new contract while avoiding a "funnel" introduction (going from the general to specific)? Is it sequenced from an explanation of the question to be investigated to background information to a brief preview of the whole paper for the purpose of forecasting and fulfillment? Comment in detail.**

The introduction starts talking about freedom and then goes into detail about the two specific types of liberty that exists. It may seem as a "old to new contract", but the lack of transition between the talk about freedom and liberty makes the reader not really feel the immediate connection between the two sentences. It does, however, start from an explanation of the question to be investigated, which is the intrinsic value of freedom, since the explanation about liberty gives background information to the reader about the specific parts of liberty that people are not that familiar with. The thesis also gives a brief preview of the whole paper for the purpose of forecasting. As previously mentioned, the thesis sentences does a good job in talking about what the message of the movie is, but needs for specification on the techniques that were used in the film in order to convey this message.

3. Does the writer provide a detailed thesis statement that is sufficiently focused and supplies a blueprint or map of the essay as a whole? Does the writer avoid announcing the topic and purpose of the paper? Comment in detail how the thesis statement can be improved and developed.

The first part of this question, I believe, has been previously answered. The writer does not avoid to announce the topic and purpose of the paper. It is easy to identify where the thesis statement starts, and it is fairly clear what she is talking about. However, for a more obvious and easier identification, it would be better if the thesis statement were written in bold, and if the aforementioned problems of the content of the thesis sentence would be improved. It would also be better if the thesis statement would be segmented, since Seung-yeon seems like she's trying to convey too much information in one sentence. It would be easier for the reader to understand the thesis statement if she divided the part about the technical parts of the movie, and the message of the movie. That way, she would be able to supply more explanation about the movie in the thesis statement with more clarity.

Body

4. Do the body paragraphs begin with topic sentences that forecast the topic developed in each paragraph? Do these topic sentences open with transitional devices linking them to the preceding paragraphs? Explain your response.

Seung-yeon has four body paragraphs. The first body paragraph is a brief plot summary with a topic sentence that explains what the movie is about overall. However, I would not say that it is a topic sentence that encompasses the whole paragraph considering its nature as an informative paragraph. The second and third paragraph has topic sentences that somewhat forecasts the content of each paragraph. However, only the last body paragraph starts with a transitional word, "In addition". Considering how the first paragraph was only a plot summary, it is understandable that the second paragraph would have no transitional word in its topic sentence. The third paragraph's transitional word, however, does not seem to link the body paragraphs together well. This is not because the transitional word was inadequate, but more because the second body paragraph ends in a very vague manner which makes it hard to understand why the third paragraph would be seen as offering more in-depth analysis about the movie "in addition" to the second body paragraph. Also, the second paragraph's topic sentence, or more likely the content of the paragraph, could be improved since the topic sentence states that the movie uses imperative "tools", plural, when the paragraph itself only mentions one imperative tool, which is metaphor. In this perspective, I'd say that the second body paragraph's topic sentence lacks a bit of accuracy. In the same context, it would be better if the third paragraph also specifies and exactly clarifies what kind of cinematic elements were used and exactly what kind of effect respectively was produced from these elements. Overall, the topic sentences are not incorrect, but they could use a little bit more accuracy.

5. What is the overall structure of the essay? How is it organized, and how effective is the organization? What could be done to improve it?

The thesis of the essay states that it will explain the cinematic elements in the movie and how they contributed to conveying the movie's message, which is questioning the intrinsic meaning of freedom. The first body paragraph is a plot summary, the second body paragraph is an explanation of the use of metaphor in the film, and the third body paragraph is about the use of lighting and camera movement in the film. The essay is well organized in that it is not hard to understand what the author is talking about. There aren't much vague statements or parts where the reader won't be able to understand its purpose (except a few sentences). Organization-wise, the essay is not complicated. However, it lacks substance to support the thesis. The second and third body paragraphs can be seen as the main analysis of the film, where Seung-yeon really starts digging deeper in. However, the body paragraphs only stop at explaining or illustrating the cinematic techniques that are used, and do not connect them with the thesis. In other words, it is not explained how the techniques used contributed to the "questioning the intrinsic meaning of freedom" part. There is not much explanation or analysis about liberty or freedom in the body paragraphs. Therefore, adjustment relating to the substance is needed in order for the organization of the essay to become more clear. Also, it would be better to just merge the last two paragraphs into one, making it into one paragraph about the techniques used in the film. An additional body paragraph analyzing the plotline, or the contextual

6. What support does the writer use to support the topic sentences? Is the support adequate and sufficient to fulfill the points addressed in the topic sentences? Is it convincing? Please explain.

Since the first paragraph is a plot summary, there is nothing much to be called a topic sentence. In the case of the second body paragraph, not enough points are offered to support the topic sentence. The same sentences are repeated (obviously due to some technical error), and not enough in-depth analysis is given to support the topic sentence. It is also too short, so more information and analysis should be given to fully support the topic sentence. Also, although the topic sentence states that more than one "metaphors", plural, were used in the film, only one metaphor (about the butterfly) is introduced. Therefore, it could be said that either the topic sentence is inaccurate, or the paragraph lacks explanation. The third body paragraph, on the other hand, has the most support given to the topic sentence compared to the other three body paragraphs. However, the plot explanation given during the first half of the paragraph is too long, and compared to that the analysis seems to lack. Some points are left too vague, and some wrong uses of word keep the reader confused on some parts. Generally, more support and explanation is needed for the third body paragraph as well. A similar problem goes with the last body paragraph. There is too much plot explanation, and a block quote is introduced without any introducing or glossing. The last body paragraph lacks the most in support for the topic sentence.

7. Examine the writer's use of sources. Are the sources used appropriately as support and are they integrated well into the body of the text? Are

quotations used infrequently and are they appropriately integrated when used—are they introduced AND glossed? Has the writer effectively and appropriately used signal phrases? Explain.

It was hard to understand the purpose of the two block quotations since they were not introduced or glossed. The quotations do show context that is in line with what the previous and subsequent sentences are talking about, however it is hard for the reader to directly understand the exact use of the quotes. It is only deducible that the quotes are relevant in some way, but not exactly how and why specifically these quotes were inserted. I would say the quotes aren't integrated into the body of the text that well. The distribution of the quotes, however seem relatively even and they are not concentrated in only one section. No signal phrases were used. Overall, it seems that Seung-yeon should work more on natural incorporation and relevance of the quotes.

Conclusion

8. How does the conclusion begin? Do you see a clear and novel transition? Has some attempt been made to connect back to the introduction?

The conclusion is very short, but begins with a transition “To summarize”. It is not an exceptionally novel transition, but it clearly signifies the start of the conclusion paragraph. Since the conclusion is too short, I can see no sign that there was an attempt to connect the conclusion and the introduction together.

9. Does the conclusion adequately summarize the main ideas in the body? Comment in detail.

The conclusion could do a better job at adequately summarizing the main idea of the body. The first sentence of the conclusion is a little bit out of line with the initial thesis statement. The thesis statement talks about how the film “questions the intrinsic value of freedom”. However, the concluding paragraph starts with how the film conveys “that human nature instinctively seek freedom”. To me, these two points seem like separate arguments, and therefore there is a lack of coherence between the main idea of the essay and the conclusion. Also, none of the ideas introduced in the body paragraphs are re-introduced or paraphrased.

10. Does the final sentence of the conclusion give the reader a sense of finality and closure? Do you feel a sense of satisfaction in reading it that the paper has ended on an appropriate note and with a feeling of significance about the topic that was discussed? Please comment in detail.

The final sentence of the conclusion offers a new argument within the essay. It talks about how the protagonist’s “positive liberty was ultimately what prevented him from

getting it”. This is an argument that wasn’t previously mentioned in any of the body paragraphs. As much as this statement is intriguing, since Seung-yeon does not provide any further explanation to this, and considering how conclusions are meant to be a wrap-up of the essay rather than an offer of a new agenda, the conclusion lacks the closure and sense of satisfaction that it should have. On the same note, the conclusion lacks to convey a feeling of significance about the topic that was discussed since the conclusion itself does not repeat the significance of freedom.

11. Does the writer effectively explore the larger significance of the problem or issue addressed in the paper? Does it suggest its own significance in expanding knowledge in the field being addressed?

As previously mentioned, the conclusion comes to an abrupt stop. There was no previous talk about the significance of the matter about freedom, therefore there is no talk about expanding the idea relevant to this or addressing a new question related to this issue.

Documentation

12. Examine the Works Cited page (or References page for APA). Look at the sources being used and make a list of the types of sources being and used (for example, book, anthology, article, internet newspaper, etc.). Write the type and quantity of each source being used below.

- One Movie (Papillon by Franklin J. Schaffner)
- Two Books (Papillon by Charriere, Henri et al, Freedom: reassessments and rephrasings by Jose V. Ciprut)
- One Magazine (Hope for Women Magazine)
- One website (Definition of “freedom” from Merriam-Webster)

13. Examine each of the entries on the Works Cited page. Do they follow exactly the prescribed examples from our text? Note any errors on the page itself, and below write the problems the writer may be having with these entries.

Among the four citations, only one lacks in the context and accurate order of the citation. The first citation of the movie *Papillon* lacks information in that it only arranges the director and title of the film. The order of the citation is also incorrect. However, it does not include the information about the producer or the year of production. Other than that, the other citations from magazines and books all follow the prescribed example for the text.

14. Is the Works Cited page double-spaced, including and starting from the title? Is the title of the page centered? Are the second, third, fourth, etc. lines of each entry indented five spaces? Does each of the entries follow the

prescribed template from our text? Are the entries alphabetized by surname or title of the author is not mentioned?

The page is double-spaced, including the title. The title of the page is centered. However, the second or third lines of each entry is not indented five spaces. As mentioned previously, except for the first entry, all the other entries follow the prescribed template from our text. In the case of the first entry, the correct format would be “*Papillon*. Directed by Schaffner, Franklin J., Allied Artists, 1973.” However, Seung-yeon wrote “Schaffner, Franklin J., director, *Papillon*”. Other than that, all the entries follow the prescribed template. Also, the order of the entries would be alphabetized, however it is not in Seung-yeon’s case, neither in surname or title of the author.

15. Check the entries on the Works Cited page and compare them to the in-text citations. Are all of the entries on the Works Cited page cited in-text? Are there any in-text citations not included on the Works Cited page? Comment in detail below.

The web page of “Merriam-Webster” concerning the definition of freedom is the fourth entry. This definition is mentioned in the very start of the introductory paragraph, however no in-text citation is included to notify the reader that there is a related entry in the “Works Cited” page. The movie, also is mentioned in the introduction, however there is no in-text citation signifying the entry in the “Works Cited” page.

16. Examine the in-text citations. Are these carried out properly? Please comment in detail below.

In the case of the second entry, name of the author is not correctly capitalized in the in-text citation. However, the last two entries of Charriere and Angelia are adequately quoted. However, since the citations were not introduced or glossed, it is hard to exactly know why the quotes had to be introduced as block quotes.

General Issues

17. Has the writer created coherence through the use of effective transitions, including strategies of repetition? Are all paragraphs unified between the support and the topic sentences?

Despite the fact that the thesis statement in the introduction states that the essay will talk about freedom and liberty, coherence concerning the theme of the essay lacks throughout the body paragraph and conclusion. Although a good amount of transitional words was used to keep the flow of the essay natural enough, the idea and emphasis on freedom lessens as the essay progresses. The second body paragraph explaining the metaphor used for freedom explains enough about the meaning of liberty within the film. However, during the third and fourth body paragraph, the link between liberty within the film and the tools used in the film is less apparent. It would have been better

if the last body paragraph or the conclusion offered a clear relevance between all the tools used in the film. That would have shown unification throughout the essay and made all the body paragraphs relevant to each other. The transition within each body paragraphs seem okay to me, although the body paragraphs do lack depth in explanation.

18. Is the writer effectively following the old before new contract in the body paragraphs? Explain in detail.

I will disregard the first body paragraph since it is a plot summary. In the case of the second body paragraph, I would say there is only “old” information and no “new” information. Due to Seung-yeon’s mistake there is a lot of literal repetition of what has been previously said in the same paragraph. Also, not a lot of information that intrigues the reader enough or seems like a deep, interpretive analysis of the movie is given. In the case of the third paragraph, the first half constitutes of the illustration of a scene, while the other half is consisted a deeper analysis of the scene. In this case, the old before new contract seems to be in play, and successfully conveys new information that is enough to interest the reader. The last conclusion, however, also only offers the “old” information by illustrating another scene in the movie during the first half of the paragraph. Seung-yeon seems to make an attempt to transition on to the “new” information by offering a block quote from Henri Charriere, but fails to give any explanation related to this quote, therefore failing to give the full spread of the new information.

19. Do you note any significant grammatical problems? Comment on the draft and note below any repetitive problems in grammar.

There is no recurrent or repetitive problems in grammar, although there are a couple throughout the essay. Seung-yeon omits a few necessary adverbs. She also sometimes uses the wrong choice of vocabulary. For example, using the word “suggest” instead of “offer”. A few mistakes with the use of prepositions also exist. Other mistakes regarding the tense of the word or conjugation exist too. The occurrence of wrong use of conjugation is the most high, but I wouldn’t say it’s a repetitive issue.

20. Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the essay below.

Strengths

Seung-yeon uses simple and easy-to-read words and sentences. Therefore, the reader can glide through her essay with ease, knowing what Seung-yeon is trying to say. She also points out some interesting things about the movie, such as the metaphor of the butterfly tattoo, or the use of camera work in one of the protagonist’s dreams sequences. Seung-yeon’s writing is rather straightforward, which also makes her mistakes quite apparent, which I don’t think is a bad things since this is only part of the writing process (it makes it easier for her to fix things).

Weaknesses

Seung-yeon's essay lacks depth and unity overall. Some of the body paragraphs (such as the first and second one) only offer superficial information that can be easily found on the internet or just by watching the film. Also, as the essay progresses, the focus of the essay becomes vague, and the reader has a hard time grasping what the main point of this essay is. Since the conclusion is way too weak to wrap-up the overall arguments of the essay and organize its points, no feeling of closure can be offered and the reader feels like he or she is left hanging at a loose end. The citations could have been better incorporated in the writing as well. Seung-yeon could have introduced and glossed the quotes better, especially the block quotes which seem quite out of place.

21. Explain your suggestions for revision below.

- 1) Add in-text citations for the introduction of the definition of "freedom" in the first and second line of page one.
- 2) Add "only" after the word "value" on the third line of page one.
- 3) The transition between the two sentences on line three of page one is unnatural. Add a transitional word or extra explanation to smoothen the transition.
- 4) Move the period after the in-text citation on of Ciprut to come after the in-text citation on page one.
- 5) On line nine of page one, the sentence that starts with "The film, *Papillon*..." has an odd structure. Move the word "first" somewhere else to make the structure more natural.
- 6) Italicize the movie title "Papillon" on line nine of page one.
- 7) Make the thesis statement and topic sentence of each paragraph to be **bold**.
- 8) Extract the comma that comes after "elements" on bottom tenth line of page one.
- 9) Divide the thesis statement into two to make it easier to read.
- 10) It is hard to understand what "performance" (of bottom second line of page one) exactly signifies. Clary this.
- 11) Change the word "suggests" to "offer" on bottom second line of page one. And change "of" to "to" on the same line.
- 12) Change "could be" to "was easily" on first line of page two.
- 13) The mention of "betrayal" is made on the second line of page two. Betrayal from whom? Clarify.
- 14) Delete the word "from" from the second line of page two.
- 15) Change "to lose" to "from losing" on third line of page two.
- 16) Throughout the essay, the distinction of "positive liberty" and "negative liberty" is made. I'm not sure if this is exactly necessary, and cannot see how this distinction contributes to the whole essay. Delete these parts or revise some of the parts of the essay to make the need of this distinction more apparent.
- 17) I don't think the first body paragraph, which is a plot summary, is necessary. Try to incorporate the scene illustrations within the analysis!
- 18) A lot of the sentences of the second body paragraph are repeated throughout the paragraph. I'm sure this was a mistake. Revise!
- 19) Change "literal" to "figurative" on line ninth line of page two.

20) Change “tries” to “trying” on line eleven of page two. On the same line, the term “escape from jail to be free” seems redundant. Saying “escape from jail” will be enough.

21) The term “fluid state of freedom” in second body paragraph has a vague meaning. Try to explain what this exactly means.

22) The last sentence of the second body paragraph states that “Papillon is trying to undergo his own version of transformation”. The concept of “Papillon’s transformation” is a new idea, and odd to throw into the last sentence of a paragraph. I think this should be further illustrated.

23) The block quote from “Caterpillar to Butterfly” is not introduced or glossed. Revise this.

24) The last sentence of the third body paragraph is too general and unhelpful. I do not see why “the butterfly being a symbol of hope and beauty” in main media is so important for this film. Further elaboration is needed.

25) In the third body paragraph, the word “literal” is used too much, and not used in an accurate way. Try not using this word.

26) The third body paragraph starts with the transitional word “In addition”. Considering the overall flow of the essay, a better transitional word could be used.

27) The third body paragraph also mentions how Papillon wants to be seen as an idol. No explanation of why this is, or how this is related to the concept of freedom is given. Better elaboration needed.

28) “However”, on the bottom second line of page three seems like the wrong transitional word. Use something else.

29) Overall, the third body paragraph needs more explanation. More than half of the paragraph is just an illustration of one of the scenes in the film. Among all the other hundreds of scenes, why is this so important? What is this scene trying to convey related to freedom? More explanation needed!!!

30) There is a part where Seung-yeon says that the “weird makeup” that Papillon had on “represent death”. Why is this? What kind of make up was it? Further explanation needed!

31) The last sentence of third body paragraph also seems out of topic. It suddenly talks about Papillon’s deprived mental state. What does this have to do with the thesis at all?

32) The last body paragraph talks about striving for your goal. Again, I see no relevance between this and the thesis. The paragraph may need revision considering its direction.

33) The conclusion needs to be much longer. The conclusion does not support the structure of the essay in anyway. Must lengthen and try to gloss over the body paragraphs, organize points, and generally wrap-up!