

# Compare and contrast

[Art & Culture](#), [Artists](#)



9 May Now and Then When first looking at how I used to look at films, I realize that I typically watched movies that looked interesting, had a big all-star cast or were in a specific genre. If it was a comedy or a drama, chances were that I usually would watch it and like it. That is as detailed as I would get about how I would analyse films. I would think about whether or not someone did a good acting job or if they did not. I would consider if it was funny or not and then after watching it, I did not really give it a second thought.

Bruce F. Kawin, author of *How Movies Work*, when discussing the language of film said that when he was a kid, “ I thought that movies were made in an hour and a half and that they were shot in sequence.” I can relate to that statement prior to actually learning more about how to appreciate how films are made. I never realized that so many factors took place when creating the perfect scene. The plot, content, character, music, lighting and camera angles have to be just right in order to convey the message that the filmmakers want their audiences to see so that it is engaging.

Now that I know a lot more about what goes in to making a film and that I realize that sometimes there are more methods of looking at a movie from a cinematographic perspective, it means something completely different.

There are themes in movies that are underlying the whole plot and sometimes they can be difficult to identify. However, when looking at film, I realize I am able to do it with a more critical eye. It makes it harder to watch movies just for entertainment. I now find myself noticing simple jump cuts or if a portion of the plot is missing continuity.

I had also never thought about the different places that I have watched films.

If it were in the theater, on television, on a computer or a phone, some of the elements can get lost. Sure, a person is able to view a movie but not with the same impact. In a theater, it is easier to just get lost in the movie. The effects are so much more intense. I think of movies that I have seen on DVD or online and wish that they were something I had seen in the theater because it would have been a completely different experience. On a computer there are sometimes elements lost because of the aspect ratio on the screen. Parts of the film can get cut off. The same is true with watching it on a mobile phone. The movie picture is simply too small to be able to capture all of the elements so part of the message can get lost because it is harder to see little details that are not so obvious.

Though we are able to have access to cinema virtually anywhere and at any time, watching it in a theater is a whole new experience. Even though high-technology equipment is affordable and can turn a person's home into a big picture with surround sound, it still is not the same as forking out the \$10 to go see the movie a complete atmosphere. Theaters have made upgrades too with real 3D and IMAX features on 30 foot screens. Plus, there is the community atmosphere of the audience (Monfette and Pirrello). The whole way that I have looked at film is from the perspective of an art. It is not just about entertainment. It is about seeing a film for all of what it has to offer. It is more than big names and box office sales. Even some of the films that never make it to the theater are some of the best.

#### Works Cited

Kawin, Bruce F. "Film Language and Elements of Style." Film Foundation, n. d. Web. 8 May 2014. Monfette, Christopher, and Phil Pirrello. "Why Movies

Are Better in the Theater - IGN." IGN.

IGN Entertainment, Inc. 22 Dec. 2009. Web. 8 May 2014.

.