

Please follow directions. Attention to details is one third of the battle. Good writing is another third, and correct presentation of quotes and sources is the last third.

You should create an interesting title for your paper.

You did not write *The Great Gatsby*, F. Scott Fitzgerald already did, so your title should be something else, like

The Quest for Love and the American Dream

Your title does not need any punctuation embellishments, just center it and capitalize most or all of its words.

Any time you name the film or the book, you must either underline or italicize it

Atonement or *Atonement*

If you feel you still need help, after carefully reading all of his documents, email me with specific questions or try the library 24/7 Ask a Librarian service available from the library website:

<https://library.citytech.cuny.edu> for City Tech

<https://bergen.edu/library/get-help/> for Bergen CC

Meanwhile, most people will be doing Google searches to do their research.

A Google search using the book title, its first year of publication, and words Book Review + the name of a major periodical might get you something. Try looking in these periodicals: *N Y Times*, *The Nation*, *Saturday Review of Books*, *New York Review of Books*, *Time.com*, *Newsweek*.

Unfortunately, *Goodreads* reviews are not by professional critics but by people who like to read. If you see a "critic" with just one name, you can assume this is an amateur.

Nevertheless, if you sincerely try hard and come up with very few professional book reviews, you may use *goodreads* sources for books. No amateur writers for the film reviews, though

I know from experience it is not so easy to find book reviews in this internet age. Films dominate our culture far more than books. After much searching using a novel (*Midnight Cowboy*) from 1965 that was made into a film from 1969, I came across just one excellent book review:

<https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1965/11/11/queer-lives/>

The review is about a page long, and it may have been cut off partway through for non subscribers of the periodical's website:

The New York Review of Books but it gave me enough to find a usable quote or two.

The review is entitled “Queer Lives” and the critic is Stanley Kauffmann

I found the date, November 11, 1965, but not the page, so when I create a Works Cited entry, using easybib.com, the source type will be a website or internet article, not a periodical (meaning a newspaper or magazine)—things which are published “periodically”, like monthly, weekly, daily—unlike books that are published once when they are brand new.

I chose this segment to quote from:

Joe Buck is a twenty-five-year-old Southwesterner, an illegitimate child who was brought up by his wayward grandmother. After her death, he makes his way, eventually, to New York in a new cowboy outfit (although he has never been a cowhand), believing that he can earn a fortune studding for rich ladies. But he is not a knowledgeable operator; he is an ignorant, likeable gull. He has never really had a friend and has never really been taught anything. All he confidently knows is the sexual act, and he has believed the myths he has heard about the use he can make of his youthful vigor in the big town.

I will pick just enough of it, highlighted in yellow, so I do not have to Block Quote it. For brevity, I am going to edit out some words indicated by [...] to show there was more but the rest that I did use is accurate, a direct quote, not a paraphrase.

Thus, the quote:

“Joe Buck is a twenty-five-year-old Southwesterner, an illegitimate child who was brought up by his wayward grandmother. After her death, he makes his way [...] to New York in a new cowboy outfit [...], believing that he can earn a fortune studding for rich ladies. But he is[...]an ignorant, likeable gull.”

But that is not enough for a documented quote. I must add a signal phrase or tag for context, which will be in green:

One critic says, “Joe Buck is a twenty-five-year-old Southwesterner, an illegitimate child who was brought up by his wayward grandmother. After her death, he makes his way[...] to New York in a new cowboy outfit [...], believing that he can earn a fortune studding for rich ladies. But he is[...]an ignorant, likeable gull.” But that too is not enough.

I have to give a parenthetical reference, which I will highlight in turquoise: (Kauffmann). NOTE: If there were a page number, ex. 63, I could have used his name before the quote and just put the page parenthetically: Critic Stanley Kauffmann says, “Joe Buck is a twenty-five-year-old Southwesterner, an illegitimate child who was brought up by his wayward grandmother. After her death, he makes his way [...] to New York in a new cowboy outfit [...], believing that he can earn a fortune studding for rich ladies. But he is[...]an ignorant, likeable gull” (63). BUT THERE WAS NO PAGE SO THAT IS NOT AN OPTION AND HIS SURNAME MUST GO PARENTHETICALLY. Since the writer’s name cannot be both before AND after

the quote, using an internet source forced me to use the common noun phrase **One critic** (or I could have used **“Another critic”**)

Also note that the original period after “gull” has to wait till after the parentheses.

Here is a finished quote:

Critic Stanley Kauffmann says, “Joe Buck is a twenty-five-year-old Southwesterner, an illegitimate child who was brought up by his wayward grandmother. After her death, he makes his way [...] to New York in a new cowboy outfit [...], believing that he can earn a fortune studding for rich ladies. But he is[...]an ignorant, likeable gull” (63).

w/o my highlighting it would be like this:

Critic Stanley Kauffmann says, “Joe Buck is a twenty-five-year-old Southwesterner, an illegitimate child who was brought up by his wayward grandmother. After her death, he makes his way [...] to New York in a new cowboy outfit [...], believing that he can earn a fortune studding for rich ladies. But he is[...]an ignorant, likeable gull” (63).

Movie reviews are far easier to find than book reviews.

Inevitably when you Google “review of...” even if you say “book” and the year the book was published, Google will more likely than not

give you movie reviews.

Go to rottentomatoes.com, put in your film title. Much will turn up. I used the film [Gone Girl](#) here:

YOU ARE NOT CONCERNED WITH TOMATOE SCORES OR HOW MUCH MONEY THE MOVIE MADE. YOU ARE CONCERNED WITH FINDING EDUCATED OPINIONS BY 'TOP CRITICS' NO OTHER CRITICS, PLEASE. USE THE TAB FOR 'TOP CRITICS,' THEN SEE HOW MANY 'FULL REVIEWS' ARE AVAILBLE TO READ indicated on their site with blue words "Full review." YOU ARE NOT JUST INTERESTED IN ONE-SENTENCE AD-TYPE BLURBS. YOU HAVE TO READ THE WHOLE REVIEW AND SOME SENTENCES WILL POP OUT AS INTERESTING TO YOU—good opinions you wouldn't have thought to say on your own. THAT IS WHAT YOU QUOTE. Remember, you MUST use top critics. Real professionals do not have names like Lily B. or whatever cute "name" someone comes up with. Those are amateurs.

I chose one from the image inserted above

I was linked to, among several others, a film review from [The Globe and Mail](#) (a Canadian newspaper).

<https://www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/film/film-reviews/gone-girl-fincher-builds-an-ingenious-contraption/article20894670/>

title of review: "Gone Girl: Fincher builds an ingenious contraption"

critic's name: [Liam Lacey](#)

Published October 3, 2014 (internet, so no page) The next several paragraphs are the entire review.

Isn't that smart? A New England kind of word, of sensible, harmonious things like matching appliances, button-down shirts and A-line skirts. It's also the take-away word from David Fincher's new film, *Gone Girl*, a chic and perverse take on modern marriage in the guise of a thriller. The premise of the film, adapted for the screen by Gillian Flynn from her own hit novel, resembles most episodes of the current-affairs show *48 Hours*: There's a happy couple that seems to have it all – then the wife mysteriously disappears. Next come the revelations of marital alienation, financial problems, erratic behaviour, the troubling forensic report and ... uh-oh.

Here's another word for *Gone Girl*: "meta." It's a word Flynn uses, which means it's a thriller about thrillers, and a narrative about narratives, especially the form of domestic violence relished by current-affairs television shows. (To quote Elvis Costello's *The Long Honeymoon*: "All the movies and the papers feature the murders of lonely women.")

While this persistent cleverness keeps *Gone Girl* at a simmer instead of a boil, fans of Flynn's 2012 novel will not be one tiny bit disappointed. Rumours of substantial changes are untrue. The author has adroitly adapted her own screenplay, cutting out the padding and maintaining the book's time-shifting he-said/she-said structure and brittle wit.

For the Fincher cult, *Gone Girl* offers the usual grisly absurdism under a domestic guise. Though not as psychologically dark as *Se7en*, *Fight Club* and *Zodiac*, the movie has more bite than his other mainstream efforts (*The Curious Case of Benjamin Button*, *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* and Netflix series *House of Cards*). *Gone*

Girl's closest ally in Fincher's oeuvre is the Howard Hawksian screwball comedy *The Social Network*, which is similarly funny and cuttingly sharp in its examination of everyday sociopathology.

The story is supercontemporary. Nick Dunne (Ben Affleck) is a laid-off New York movie magazine writer (as was Flynn, who used to write for *Entertainment Weekly*) while his wife, Amy (Rosamund Pike), loses her hobby job writing quizzes in women's magazines, and their perfect Manhattan life becomes unsustainable. They move back to Nick's hometown of North Carthage, Mo., a heartland community with a dwindling pulse, and the Dunnes, as a couple, are done-for, inhabiting a beige monster home in an underpopulated, post-crash subdivision.

Along with his twin sister and soulmate, Margo (Carrie Coon), Nick opens a bar called "the Bar," a name that they think of as "meta." Nick is the kind of disenchanted husband who would call his wife "the Wife" and his relationship "the Marriage." Behind the glossy magazine cover of the once-perfect couple, there's a cracked plaster wall over a bulging sewage pipe of resentments.

Amy, a New York trust-fund princess of a wife (her parents made a fortune writing a series of children's books entitled *Amazing Amy*), is traumatized by her Cinderella-in-reverse transition. Throughout, the electronic score by Trent Reznor and Atticus Ross grinds, squawks and groans, communicating the rising panic beneath the placid surface.

The Dunnes' marital dissonance is, no doubt, a metaphor of America's post-2008 economic disillusionment, which is not to say *Gone Girl* is exactly social realism. This is very much a movie to be considered, to be admired, like the elegant complexity of the gear train of a vintage watch.

The story shifts between the rich-hued, romance-novel past of New York and the washed-out present of Missouri, between Nick's and Amy's points of view. There is also a series of handwritten clues that Amy leaves as part of her anniversary treasure hunt, serving as a mystery within the mystery. As well, there are recognizable tropes from film-noir classics (*Laura*, *Double Indemnity*) that movie journalist Nick should pick up on.

The action begins on Nick and Amy's fifth wedding anniversary, in somewhat unorthodox fashion. Nick comes home from an afternoon visit to the Bar, where he has dropped in to see his sister and slosh down some bourbon. The cat is on the step. His front door is open, his wife gone and the coffee table smashed. A couple of small-town cops arrive: Detective Rhonda Boney (Kim Dickens) and Officer Jim Gilpin (Patrick Fugit), who find blood smears. They are chatty and helpful. They recommend a news conference the next morning, attended by Amy's parents, but Nick, hungover and awkward, offers a creepily inappropriate smile for the cameras. The initial wave of sympathy that engulfs Nick soon begins to wane. A Nancy Grace-style TV poisonality (Missi Pyle) gets on his case. Nick's evasive behaviour raises suspicions and then Amy's diary is discovered.

Even audiences who haven't read Flynn's bestseller will be primed for a twist, which comes quickly – at the one-hour mark in this 145-minute film. There's not much more that can be revealed except that a pivotal role is played by someone from Amy's past, a rich, fastidious, sexually ambiguous former private-school boyfriend who turned into a stalker, named Desi Collings (Neil Patrick Harris). The character of Desi is cartoonish, but then the entire movie grows increasingly heightened, tipping into a Pedro Almodovar level of camp melodrama.

Melodrama, thriller, comedy and social commentary: Yes, this is one ingenious contraption of a movie. If there's one area where *Gone Girl* is brilliant, it's in its casting. Affleck and Pike, who superficially seem as blandly pretty as the Dunnes' McMansion, are full of surprises. Affleck's handsome mug and shifty, uneasy manner have never been better suited to a role. Nick wavers somewhere between emotional foundering and soullessness. The pretty English actress Pike, whose range has extended from the decorative (*Barney's Version*) to slyly amusing (*An Education*), is a revelation (though the details can't be revealed here) as a character of near-mythic self-absorption. The exceptional casting choices go right down the line. Coon, a Broadway actress (she's married to playwright Tracy Letts), is another strong candidate for MVP here as Nick's wry, compulsively honest, tomboy sister, with a bit of a crush on her brother. (There's something of Barbara Bel Geddes's character Midge, in *Vertigo*, in her performance.) The biggest surprise? Tyler Perry as an ebulliently mischievous, amoral celebrity defence attorney. Not to forget Dickens

as a folksy, smart cop and Fugit as her skeptical partner, whose performances are so precisely understated that the humour is only fully appreciated in retrospect.

Indeed, the attention to casting is the best argument against charges of misanthropy and misogyny in *Gone Girl*. With the exception of the ridiculous Desi, no one in the story is simply a reductive type. Every character in the film, starting with Nick and Amy, suggests an entire hidden world: capacious, complicated and unnervingly unpredictable.

As you see, reviews are generally a page or two in length. I read it all and chose one sentence to quote:

Another critic writes, "Every character in the film, starting with Nick and Amy, suggests an entire hidden world: capacious, complicated and unnervingly unpredictable" (Lacey).

or move the tag to the end:

"Every character in the film, starting with Nick and Amy, suggests an entire hidden world: capacious, complicated and unnervingly unpredictable," writes another critic (Lacey).

or put the tag inside, interrupting at a logical point—often that can be where there is internal punctuation

"Every character in the film, starting with Nick and Amy," another critic writes, "suggests an entire hidden world: capacious, complicated and unnervingly unpredictable" (Lacey).

The parenthetical reference will always go last!

Please pay attention to where your commas go:

Commas go to the left of quotes, whether opening or closing quotes.

Commas **cannot** go immediately in front of parentheses.

If you quote from the novel, and you should, you will have page numbers, so you may then choose to use the author's surname and page in parentheses or just the page, because the author's name is in the tag.

For example, the novel, Psycho, was written by Robert Bloch. I have the book, so I know the pagination.

The narrator writes, "The rain had stopped but the night was still dark and starless. The upstairs light still burned, and Mary wondered if the old woman was awake, if she had listened to their conversation, heard the final outburst" (Block 25). NOTE : no comma within the parentheses.

Or "The rain had stopped but the night was still dark and starless," the narrator writes. "The upstairs light still burned, and Mary wondered if the old woman was awake, if she had listened to their conversation, heard the final outburst" (Block 25).

Or "The rain had stopped but the night was still dark and starless," Block writes. "The upstairs light still burned, and Mary wondered if the old woman was awake, if she had listened to their conversation, heard the final outburst" (25).

Some last points: **Do not waste your time allegedly quoting a critic who quoted the book or the film. The critic did not create those quotes, so the credit goes to the book or the film. You are looking for opinions from the critic, not using something he or she quoted.**

Do not waste your time quoting facts, like what year the film came or who the movie stars are—those facts, not opinions. You may use them but they are common knowledge, not opinions, not worth quoting. And it makes no difference how much money the movie earned. That is not our concern.

Since, by now, you must be overwhelmed by all these instructions, I will forgo adding further information about paraphrasing or "block" quoting. Leave that for ENG 1121.

If all else fails, try to imitate my example to the letter (copy and paste) then replace each component: tag, quote, reference with YOUR information. That is then following a pattern and it works!

Do not spend two pages out of your four pages merely retelling the whole story. This is not an exercise in summarizing, but an attempt at using your critical thinking about what works for the book and what works for the film (or not). Remember: the book is the source for the film. So the book did not change the detail. The film did.

You have to have a strategy to organize your paper: I suggest you alternate back and forth between the book and the film, the book and the film, writing about whatever points you find interesting to compare. More people are intrigued by the various differences rather than the exact translation, so make note of what was changed and write about each of those.

Last but not least: you need a properly written Works Cited (explained elsewhere) and it must include the book, the film, and six different critics, not two critics you quoted six times, one quote each from six different critics. Insufficient sources mean your paper is incomplete. It should be 3 ½ to 4 pages PLUS the Works Cited page. You may make it longer if you want. It is due before the last day of the semester. The sooner you submit it, the better your chances at revising it if major corrections are needed.