

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359579378>

# Wanna binge-watch an 18-hour film? Twin Peaks and the psychology of the watching experience

Preprint · March 2022

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.24510.56643/1

---

CITATIONS

0

READS

372

1 author:



**Kristina Šekrst**

University of Zagreb

31 PUBLICATIONS 14 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

# Wanna binge-watch an 18-hour film? *Twin Peaks* and psychology of the watching experience

Kristina Šekrst  
[ksekrst@ffzg.hr](mailto:ksekrst@ffzg.hr)<sup>1</sup>

## An 18-hour film?

Did you ever wonder why you are sometimes too tired to watch a film, and would rather watch some TV show? And then, you might end up watching five or six hours and binge watch an entire season, and yet feel too tired to commit yourself to a single 2-hour film piece. The purpose of this paper is threefold. First, I will try to investigate whether there are any ontological differences in the form of a film or a television show. Second, I will try to connect the newest neurological and psychological research regarding bingeing and attention span and see how *seriality* influences our brains. I will use the recent neurological findings to try to answer the question of why it seems easier to watch the same number of episodes rather than a single movie. Third, I will use David Lynch's and Mark Frost's third season of *Twin Peaks* as an example illustrating the blurry borders between a television show and a film, while contrasting it to the binge-watching phenomenon.

In an interview in 2017 (Tizard, 2017), David Lynch has stated that he sees *Twin Peaks: The Return* as a film:

*I meant it was an 18-hour movie. Television and cinema to me are exactly the same thing. (...) Telling a story with motion, pictures and sound. It ended up being 18 hours.*

The same was confirmed by Jim Jarmusch, describing *Twin Peaks: The Return* as "an 18-hour film that is incomprehensible and dreamlike in the most beautiful, adventurous way, and *Cahiers du Cinéma* (2017) declared it as the best film of 2017. This leads us to the question when we can consider something a film, and in other case, a TV show. Of course, *Twin Peaks: The Return* was not the first "extremely long" film. For example, *Resan* ("The Journey", Peter Watkins, 1987) is a documentary film dealing with nuclear weapons and military spending, spanning 14 hours and 33 minutes. There is, of course, a famous case of a Holocaust

---

<sup>1</sup> For conference proceedings of *Images between Series and Stream* (November 18 – 19, 2021), Laboratorium Techno-Humanistyki, University of Warsaw.

documentary masterpiece *Shoah* (Claud Lanzmann, 1985), over nine hours long, and many others. It is interesting to note that as of 2019, black-and-white Bangladeshi Bengali film *Amra Ekta Cinema Banabo* (Ashraf Shishir, 2019) is considered the longest non-experimental film ever made, with a running time of 265 minutes or over 21 hours. *Logistics* (Erika Magnusson and Daniel Andersson, 2012) is a Swedish experimental film considered to be the longest film ever made, lasting for 51,420 minutes or longer than 35 days.

However, *duration* by itself should not be the case for a television show/film cut-off. If we look at various episodic parts considered a single film, we might find ourselves in the company of television show/film classics. *Heimat* (Edgar Reitz, 1984/1993/2004/2006/2013), a series of films about life in Germany from the 19th up to the 21st century, whose combined length amounts to 59 hours and 32 minutes. *Berlin Alexanderplatz* (Rainer Werner Fassbinder, 1980) is considered a film or a miniseries lasting for around 15 hours, and it was often released theatrically,<sup>2</sup> which seems logical especially if we see the source novel written by Alfred Döblin as a single entity. One similar masterpiece comes to mind: Kieślowski's *Dekalog* ("The Decalogue", Krzysztof Kieślowski, 1988) is appraised as a film or a series of films depicting ten commandments as personal stories in around nine and a half hours.<sup>3</sup>

So, experimental or not, films have been known to last for hours, days, and even weeks. It seems that the notion of simultaneous production might be the relevant case, but then films trapped in development hell or films being shot over decades might not be considered the same. There have been situations of a director change in the films mid-production, for example, Anthony Mann was fired by Kirk Douglas and then replaced with Stanley Kubrick (Winkler 2007, 1) or *Gone with the Wind* (1939), in which George Cukor was fired less than three weeks into shooting and continued to coach the actors even when replaced by Victor Fleming (Wilson, 2014). It leaves us with artistic *intention*, a traditional problem in aesthetics,<sup>4</sup> or we could see such examples as extreme cases of genre and ontology difference, which might be seen as a matter of a degree.

## **Possible differences between a television show and a film**

In order to see whether a clear ontology can be established, I would like to inspect the common characteristics often attributed to television shows and films respectively. My starting point is to state that the difference does not lie in a strict binary opposition, but in a fuzzy interval, where a film piece might end up on either side of the spectrum depending on the amount and intersection of commonly attributed properties for both television shows and films. For McLuhan

---

<sup>2</sup> At the time this paper was finished, it is a happy coincidence that Cinema Tuškanac in Zagreb was showing Fassbinder's *Berlin Alexanderplatz* as a film, screening two episodes daily in the span of a week.

<sup>3</sup> It is interesting to note that for his *Sight and Sound* list in 2002, Roger Ebert (2012) used it as a film entry.

<sup>4</sup> For more details, see, for example, an overview by Livingston 1988, or for more criticism, Beardsley and Wimsatt 1987.

(1964, 22), film is a *hot* medium, full of information and self-sufficient, while a television show is a *cool* medium, which requires more audience participation. Carroll (2001, 16) traces the origin of such a view to the origins of low-resolution television shows, a notion surpassed especially today in the era of high-quality streaming media.

Carroll (2001, 17) mentions the opposition between *gaze* and *glance*, in which the film setting is often associated with theaters, while watching a television show is situated in one's home, where the viewer might be easily distracted. Such difference is nowadays obsolete, since television shows can be screened inside theaters, and films watched on demand in the comfort of one's home. This goes hand in hand with the former dedication to detail, cinematography and scenography attributed to films in general, but high-quality television shows seem to blur that difference even more, considering the cases of critically acclaimed shows such as *Breaking Bad* (Vince Gilligan, 2008–2013).<sup>5</sup>

One thing that might seem relevant today is the *narrative* difference. Even though both films and television shows can occupy the same genres, often the way the story is told makes the difference. A film is served up in one fully integrated, uninterrupted showing and behaves as a representation of an *integrated* event, while a television narrative is a proper example of *seriality*: shown in segments and represents the flow of *disparate* events (Carroll 2001, 18). I think that this might be a candidate for a possible difference, depicting an *ideal* ontological difference, which is going to be manifested (or not) differently in practice. The standard narrative unit in television is the serial fashion from week to week, while the film presents a closed narration as a single story (Carroll 2011, 19). The so-called *appointment viewing*, in which television shows are scheduled on a daily or a weekly basis, requiring the audience to conform to scheduling (Castleman and Podrazik, 2003) seems surpassed in various streaming examples, but it is still a notable way of television show screening. Of course, we are going to see rules being broken here, both in terms of series like the mentioned *Breaking Bad*, *Better Call Saul* (2015–2022, Vince Gilligan and Peter Gould) or *Westworld* (Jonathan Nolan and Lisa Joy, 2016-),<sup>6</sup> where the plot is not self-contained in standalone episodes, as it is the case in standard procedurals or various television shows with villain/monster of the week, including, for example, most of the *Star Trek* series<sup>7</sup> or *CSI* series and its offshoots.

Of course, one might always deny that there is any ontological categorical difference between a television show and film, but I believe that is the case because we are dealing with a fuzzy interval of properties. If a television show is closer to seriality, closed standalone plots, less attention to cinematography and detail, and the film is on the opposite of the spectrum, there will be cases of typical television series, and films that might not possess any of the classical

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Lawson 2012.

<sup>6</sup> *Westworld* is an even more interesting example, since it is based on previous films. The same goes for *Fargo* (Noah Hawlwy, 2014–), based on the famous Coen brothers' film, and creating a new universe after the first season.

<sup>7</sup> There are bigger story arcs in such shows, especially exemplified by *Star Trek: Enterprise* and *Star Trek: Discovery*, but we are focusing mostly on *The Original Series*, *The Next Generation*, *Voyager*, and *Deep Space 9*.

television properties. I argue that *most of the films and television shows fall somewhere between the two extremes of either a film prototype, or a television-show prototype*. Consider *Berlin Alexanderplatz*. Its source story is a novel, signifying a unified non-interrupted narrative, but the origin story itself might be interrupted and produce a unified narrative or vice versa. For example, *The Handmaid's Tale* (Bruce Miller, 2017–) is based on a closed-plot Atwood's novel, which has been expanded in a serial manner. And, on the other hand, *Bedknobs and Broomsticks* (Robert Stevenson, 1971) was based upon multiple Mary Norton books. *Berlin Alexanderplatz* focuses on a single character trying to become good (and failing miserably) but features a lot of soon-to-be resolved subplots and new characters.

A cognitive notion of a *prototype* is departing from an Aristotelian notion of categories, in which most typical examples of a certain category are more easily learned, perceptually salient and the basis of the whole class (Rosch, 1973). For example, a *pigeon* or a *sparrow* is a more prototypical bird in European cultures rather than a *penguin*, and an *apple* is a more prototypical fruit, unlike *dragonfruit*. Prototypes have certain ideal notions of a class, and class members can have all, most, or some properties of a given prototype, the same way that prototypes of a television show and film might have members that are at the intersection of two classes.

There are also various anthology series that might be seen as a counterpart to extremely long movies but are considered television shows because they are closer to the television part of the spectrum. *True Detective* (Nic Pizzolatto, 2014–) features a different cast and a story each season, but one might find a unifying idea of a detective battling a mystery higher than society's normal powers. *Paris, je t'aime* (2006) is, on the other hand, an anthology film featuring 22 directors and an ensemble cast. One might even argue to see different seasons as standalone films, which is often the case with the mentioned *Heimat* being seen as five different films.

I agree with Carroll's criticism of all of the possible differences, but I do not think that finding counterexamples shows that differences are not there. We should be talking about historical or psychological differences instead that may or may not be fulfilled, but the audience has a certain *expectation* regarding both a television show and a film. For example, one possible intuitive view of the film would be that we would indeed, in most of the cases, see a standalone plot with resolved loose ends, or that for a TV show, we can get the same thing in less time. I trust that this ideal difference is found in our background knowledge combined with our psychology and perception. It does not always have to be the case, but we would expect similarity to a prototype, either a film, or a television show. In order to investigate this notion in more detail, we must turn our attention to the notions of seriality and the connected phenomenon of binge-watching.

## **What happens to your brain when you binge-watch**

*Binge-watching* or watching television series over an extended period in one sitting – is a growing phenomenon because of the rise of on-demand viewing platforms. Before the advent of on-demand platforms, such a phenomenon was mostly rare, and amounted to watching DVD or BluRay editions in one sitting but was not as widespread. Scheduled viewing, usually on a weekly basis, has been one of the main characteristics of television shows, where the audience was often seen as a passive participant forced to conform to scheduling patterns (Pingree et al. 2001, 446), which does not always have to be the case, especially today. Horvath et al. (2017) have shown that although binge-watching leads to strong memory formation immediately following program viewing, these memories decay more rapidly than memories formed after daily- or weekly-episode viewing schedules. It turns out that binge-watchers reported enjoying the view program significantly less than the people who watched the same show on a daily or weekly schedule, a pattern that seemed to remain a week later and up to 140 days after viewing the show in question (Horvath et al. 2017).

Such a finding might seem counterintuitive given the popularity of binge-watching, but Horvath et al. (2017) differentiate between the satisfaction for the program provider, the very ability to watch shows at will, and the satisfaction for the show being watched. On the other hand, Netflix's survey (Spangler, 2013) has shown that 73% of users reported positive feelings associated with binge-watching. According to a clinical psychologist Renee Carr, during binge-watching, brain is on a drug-like high, i.e. the neuronal pathways that cause heroin and sex addictions are the same as an addiction to binge-watching (Page, 2017). Psychiatrist Gayani DeSilva confirms that the areas of the brain that are activated while watching a television show are the same as when experiencing a live event: we get drawn into story lines and care about the characters and conflicts (Page, 2017). It seems that binge-watching does shut off stress, in a manner similar to video games, but from a neurological and cognitive standpoint, it might be seen as a short-term relief. For example, Karkamar et al. (2015) have shown that binge-watching is correlated with TV addiction, higher stress, and depression.

If binge-watching provides us with a short-term reward, but ultimately fails to deliver, we must see why it might be the case that the human brain loves seriality. Even though binge-watching is pleasurable, weekly schedule forces the viewer to think about the episodes and the dopamine high decreases, along with the stress (cf. Page, 2017). This leads us back to our first question, why we sometimes feel that it is easier to watch numerous episodes of a television show rather than an equally long film, a phenomenon that seems to be connected to the mentioned neurological background.

### **Why does it seem easier to (binge-)watch 4 hours of a TV show rather than a 4-hour movie?**

Classical television-show episodes are closed narrative structures (cf. Silverstone, 1980). We might encounter cliffhangers, but a regular viewer knows that they are going to be resolved either in the next episode or in the next season premiere. *Cliffhangers* were originally elements

of the Victorian serial novels in the 1840s (Allen, 2014), even though the practice itself is ancient, taking Scheherazade's *One Thousand and One Nights* as a common example (Nussbaum, 2012). Nussbaum (2012) pinpoints that cliffhangers reveal that a story is artificial and dares you to keep believing, and such a practice was commonly employed in prime-time television. Nussbaum emphasizes the psychological background of joy, surprise and pleasure brought to the viewer when a cliffhanger is craftily produced (Nussbaum 2012).

We might conjecture that people like the surprise and puzzles, but they like *the reveal* more, a notion confirmed by recent research. Oh et al. (2020) have shown that people engage in solving puzzles or reading and watching murder mysteries because the *insight is rewarding*. The neural reward signal was traced to partly originate in the orbitofrontal cortex, a region associated with reward learning and subjective experiences of hedonic pleasure.<sup>8</sup> This seems to be an overall neurological background related to problem-solving and may be a possible manifestation of an evolutionary adaptive mechanism for problem solving and creative cognition. In this case, the audience engages in *whodunit* mysteries as an active participant, and even in cliffhanger resolutions as a passive participant, giving us insight rewards for problem resolutions.

I would like to pinpoint the following: television shows are often featured as *closed-story fragments*. Our expectation as the audience is to get the amount of pleasure we would expect from a closed story with no loose ends and problems solved. I have already mentioned that the difference between a television show and a film is a matter of a degree, but we, as the audience, have certain ideal expectations about both sides of the spectrum. We are confident to receive the neural reward signal at the end of an episode or after binge-watching a season or the whole miniseries at once. The quest for a reward signal might be prolonged if the television show in question features unresolved storylines or loose ends. This brings us back to films. I hypothesize that *a regular viewer sees television episodes as closed narrative structures, and we have an intuition that a single episode will provide us with enough neural rewards*. Also, we are aware that films usually take at least an hour to resolve all loose ends, and the reward might seem closer in the case of an episode. The television show is closer to its prototype, and a film is bound to have more characteristics of a film, and thus we will be expected to have certain beliefs about what kind of viewing experience we will get with each choice.

Let us go back to cliffhangers and resolutions. My hypothesis is as follows: even though television shows are notorious for their cliffhangers, especially at the end of the season, it seems *easy* to (rather) watch a television show because, unless the show gets canceled, we are confident to get the resolution of the story at some point in the future.<sup>9</sup> This is, again, connected to the notion of a degree between a television show and a film. Not all television shows are similar in structure and properties related to the canonical form of a television show, and the same goes for film as well. However, in our experience as viewers, films often deploy

---

<sup>8</sup> For more details about the hedonic function of the orbitofrontal cortex, see Berridge and Kringelbach 2015.

<sup>9</sup> One might compare this to the overall dissatisfaction of the public when a television show has been canceled, but the story has not been resolved in a satisfiable manner.

unresolved plots or cliffhangers and ambiguous endings. There is no hope for a payoff in the future, and human neurology urges us to get the reward by resolving the mystery in question. For example, forums, storyboards, and social media are often full of examples of explanations of various film endings, both for films and television shows.<sup>10</sup> Preis (1990, 18) has analyzed a vast number of films with *open endings*, emphasizing that they are often considered artistic cornerstones in the history of cinema or were very well received by the public. The open ending leaves us with an ambiguous or missing plot resolution, the story does not offer clues to the future of the main characters, and an open ending often fails to fulfill the viewer's emotional expectations by not offering a climax or other emotional relief (Preis 1990, 18).

Films do seem to often deploy ambiguous endings. In *Rashomon* (Akira Kurosawa, 1950), we see the same story from various different angles, not knowing which is the right one. In *Life of Pi* (Ang Lee, 2012), we are presented with two possible scenarios to choose from. *Blade Runner* (Ridley Scott, 1982) features various versions and leaves it to the viewer to decide whether Deckard was a replicant or not. John Carpenter's *The Thing* (1982) features a famously ambiguous ending where it is left up to us to decide whether the last two characters are infected or not. Paul Verhoeven's *Total Recall* (1990) might have an ending suggesting it was all a dream, and the same is with *Inception* (Christopher Nolan, 2010), *Birdman* (Alejandro Iñárritu, 2014) and many others. An ending of a television show might be unresolved or ambiguous as well, and one of the best examples is the case of *The Sopranos* (David Chase, 1999–2007). However, even though the ending itself might be unresolved, we are more often than not provided with at least other resolved loose ends from major and minor story lines. My point here is that watching, for example, five hours of television shows still provides enough neural rewards for us to carry on with the viewing, which is most often not the case with films. The storyline of a film will be over, and sequels, even if they do exist, are not that common and might feature other storylines connected to the first installment.

## **How I learned to stop worrying and love *Twin Peaks: The Return***

*Twin Peaks*, created by David Lynch and Mark Frost, in its original run<sup>11</sup> revolved around the murder of the homecoming queen and town's favorite sweetheart Laura Palmer. Special Agent Dale Cooper was called in to investigate, while the plot develops into a description of transcendental and paranormal phenomena, spiritual and dream worlds, and angelic and demonic beings. More than symbolic 25 years later,<sup>12</sup> mentioned in the original run as well, *Twin Peaks: The Return* was received with more questions than answers. Milton (2017) has analyzed the social-media reactions of the fans, stating that some believed that they had "spent several hours in a surrealist paradise", while others "wanted their four hours back". Even though imagery, metaphors and symbolism are a great source of analysis, for both philosophy and film

---

<sup>10</sup> There is even a series of articles *Ending Explained*, <https://filmschoolrejects.com/topics/ending-explained/>, accessed March 15, 2022.

<sup>11</sup> April 8, 1990 – June 10, 1991.

<sup>12</sup> May 21, 2017 – September 3, 2017.

studies, the purpose of this section is to talk about why *Twin Peaks: The Return* had the reactions that it had and connect it to the spectrum between television and film.

In its original run, *Twin Peaks* resembled a classical soap opera parody, interlaced with paranormal elements, the notion emphasized with a show-inside-a-show named *Invitation to Love*. According to Nugent, the show was a meta-exploration of the medium of TV itself, and this soap opera was adored by all its characters. This view was further emphasized by *Twin Perfect* (2019), pinpointing that one of the motifs of *Twin Peaks* was for the characters to slowly reveal they were not real, mostly exemplified by strange occurrences in the third season.<sup>13</sup> Books by Mark Frost (2016, 2017) aimed to provide additional realistic data or dossiers depicting the history of strange events unfolding in the town of Twin Peaks.

More often than not, we as the audience are not used to strange philosophical topics in television shows, which are often more typical of their genre. *Twin Peaks: The Return* is not the only television show jumping out of the boundaries of a genre, but it deals with topics of identity,<sup>14</sup> reality, and meta-analysis which television shows rarely tackle. It is no wonder that, returning to our starting point, the third season has been called an "18-hour film". I argue that the creators' choice of using a weekly schedule had two purposes. First, it is a classical television format, becoming rare in the world of on-demand streaming. In its structure, it begs the show in question to move closer to the television side of the spectrum. However, in its continuous narrative flow, without any standalone episodes,<sup>15</sup> the mystery opens up slowly as the series progresses. For both television shows and films, we are expecting to see the protagonist being the actual protagonist, not at the center of the attention at all times, but at least there. However, the main character Dale Cooper is trapped in Black Lodge, an extradimensional space, and we only see the vessel or tulpa Dougie Jones in a certain catatonic state. The waking of the protagonist Agent Cooper takes place in episode 16 out of 18. That is, the whole series unfolded without its main character, deconstructing the classical notion of television protagonists.

Even though the show was ending on a certain cliffhanger, there were no episode-end cliffhangers, and major storylines, unlike in the classical television-show manner, were left open ended, leaving us once again with more questions than answers. The weekly schedule was, I

---

<sup>13</sup> One example from the original run is Laura crying in the lodge, while her face is being lit as if she is on television. Other examples include the fact that Cooper and Diane switch identities while driving into a new reality, and that older Laura visits her family home, only to find unknown people there, who are, curiously, the real-life owners of the house. The implication might be that the house was merely a set, and that Cooper and Laura have crossed from the world of television to another reality. Such a realization might have been illustrated by Laura's scream at the end of *Twin Peaks: The Return*.

<sup>14</sup> For example, the same actor plays Good Cooper, Bad Cooper, and Dougie Jones. A similar identity-challenging situation happened in the original run, where both characters of Laura Palmer and Maddy Ferguson were played by Sheryl Lee.

<sup>15</sup> One might argue that Part 8, a black-and-white exploration of lengthy, surreal scenes, was a standalone episode, but one might consider it an explanation or a flashback depicting problems of *Twin Peaks: The Return* in the present world.

believe, carefully chosen to give careful doses of neural rewards to its viewers. The reason why some of the audience got frustrated might be tied to the fact that the show did not provide the wanted closure, and there were no loose-ends resolutions, tying back to the human innate need of resolving problems and mysteries (Oh et al. 2020). The weekly scheduling, as we have mentioned, conforms the audience to its rules, unlike the world of television shows today, and in the end, disabled binge-watching, leading to stronger memory formation (cf. Horvath et al. 2017). Combined with the extremely slow pace and the lack of a protagonist, this made the show even more distanced from an ideal concept of a television show even though it was following the standard pattern. However, in the standard ideal weekly schedule, episodes are usually standalone and most of the storylines are tied. Of course, after the initial run, the original intention might be devoid of its meaning since *Twin Peaks: The Return* can be binge-watched, but all other characteristics are still going to make it closer to a film-watching experience rather than a television-show-watching experience.

Without firm conclusions, with a continuous non-episodic narrative flow, along with its intriguing and terrifying themes and explorations, and with a protagonist present only at the last two episodes of the show, *Twin Peaks: The Return* is much closer to the film side of the spectrum in the opposition between a television show and a film, confirming the "18-hour film" reference. This is also exemplified by the fact that the original run of *Twin Peaks* was further developed into *Fire Walk with Me* (David Lynch, 1992), a psychological prequel to the television series.

If one watches *Twin Peaks: The Return*, all of these characteristics point out to less neural reward signals because of less unresolved story lines, especially with a cliffhanger ending. I hypothesise that a neural reward gained with the awakening of Agent Cooper after 16 episodes was greater than if it had happened in the first episode, emphasizing the happiness connected to the non-immediate gain. Kumar, Killingsworth and Gilovich (2014) found that people derive more happiness in various waiting experiences, and that waiting for experiences tends to be more positive than waiting for possessions. The concept of *delayed gratification*<sup>16</sup> was employed in *Twin Peaks: The Return*, in which immediate rewards such as Agent Cooper being present from the first moment of the new series were resisted in order to aim for a greater award later.

If you find yourself not ready to watch a couple of episodes *Twin Peaks: The Return*, but you are instead more eager to watch twice as more episodes of a more canonic television show, one of the reasons might be that *Twin Peaks: The Return* is closer to the concept of a film, rather than a television show, and one might not be ready to commit to viewing that is certainly devoid of a standard amount of neural award signals found in more classical television shows.

## Discussion

The purpose of this paper was to establish the difference between a television show and a film as a fuzzy interval. For the first main hypothesis of the paper, I am claiming that there is no

---

<sup>16</sup> For more details about different conceptualizations of this phenomenon, see Funder 1998.

fundamental ontological categorical difference between a peculiar television show and a specific film, rather than a matter of a degree of closeness to prototypical television show and film on two sides of the spectrum. One common difference between the two was the notion of seriality, which was inspected from a binge-watching-phenomenon point of view, common today with the advent of on-demand platforms. Recent psychological and neurological research shows that binge-watching gains the viewer immediate rewards but leads to a shorter and weaker memory formation and may lead to forms of depression. Weekly or daily schedules, commonly connected to the standard television-show prototypes, seem to increase neural awards with the viewers, but also establish stronger memories and overall pleasure. This notion was exemplified by *Twin Peaks: The Return*, which not only forced the nowadays rarer weekly schedule, but also was proclaimed an "18-hour film". By observing certain characteristics of both a television show and a film, we are exemplifying the fuzzy notion of belonging to either of those two prototypes.

The second main hypothesis was to claim that psychological expectations of the audience are necessarily linked to ideal prototypes of both television and film characteristics, which leads us to different feelings of time and viewing experience and might explain why sometimes it seems easier to binge-watch an entire series instead of committing to a single film experience.

To conclude, *seriality* is an important notion for both films and television shows and seems to contribute to the overall psychological expectations of the viewers since it is being seen as a prototypical property closer to television shows. Background knowledge of the prototypes, in this case, film and television, leads us as the audience to have preference in various situations depending on our watching expectations. For some cases, such as the mentioned *Twin Peaks: The Return*, the choice might not be easy, since I consider the film/television show a fuzzy opposition, employing not only ideal prototypical extremes but also works of art with characteristics of both prototypes.

## Bibliography

- Allen, Rob. 2014. "Pause You Who Read This': Disruption and the Victorian Serial Novel." In *Serialization in Popular Culture*, edited by Rob Allen & Thijs van den Berg, 33-46. New York: Routledge.
- Beardsley, Monroe and William K. Wimsatt. 1987. "The Intentional Fallacy." In *Philosophy Looks at the Arts*, edited by Joseph Margolis. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Berridge, Kent and Kringelbach, Morten. 2015. "Pleasure systems in the brain." *Neuron* 86, no. 3: 646-64. [doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2015.02.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2015.02.018).
- Carroll, Noël. 2001. TV and Film: A Philosophical Perspective. *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* 35, no. 1: 15-29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3333768>.
- Castleman, Harry and Podrazik, Walter. 2003. *Watching TV: Six decades of American television*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

Ebert, Roger. 2012. "The greatest films of all time." *RogerEbert.com*, April 26, 2012. <https://www.rogerebert.com/roger-ebert/the-greatest-films-of-all-time>.

Frost, Mark. 2016. *The Secret History of Twin Peaks*. London: Macmillan.

Frost, Mark. 2017. *The Final Dossier*. London: Macmillan.

Funder, David C. 1998. "On the Pros and Cons of Delay of Gratification." *Psychological Inquiry* 9, no. 3: 211-212. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0903\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0903_3).

Horvath, Jared et al. (2017). "The impact of binge watching on memory and perceived comprehension." *First Monday* 22, no. 9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5210/fm.v22i19.7729>.

Karmakar et al. (2015). "Viewing Patterns and Addiction to Television among Adults Who Self-Identify as Binge-Watchers." APHA. <https://apha.confex.com/apha/143am/webprogram/Paper335049.htm>.

Kumar, Amit, Killingsworth, Matthew and Gilovich, Thomas. 2014. "Waiting for Merlot: Anticipatory Consumption of Experiential and Material Purchases." *Psychological Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614546556>.

Lawson, Richard. 2012. "The Case for 'Breaking Bad' as Television's Best Show." *The Atlantic*, July 13, 2012. <https://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2012/07/case-breaking-bad-televisions-best-show/325927/>.

Livingston, Paisley. 1988. "Intentionalism in Aesthetics." *New Literary History* 39, no 4: 831-846. 10.1353/nlh.1998.0042.

Milton, Jamie (2017). "'Twin Peaks' is back, and nobody knows what's going on." *NME*, May 22, 2017. <https://www.nme.com/blogs/nme-blogs/twin-peaks-season-three-reactions-2076035>.

McLuhan, Marshall. 1964. *Understanding Media*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nugent, Addison. 2018. "A history of Invitation To Love, the soap opera within Twin Peaks." *Dazed*, May 29, 2018. <https://www.dazeddigital.com/film-tv/article/40177/1/invitation-to-love-soap-within-twin-peaks-david-lynch>.

Nussbaum, Emily. 2012. "Tune in next week: The curious staying power of the cliffhanger." *On Television*, July 30, 2012. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2012/07/30/tune-in-next-week>.

Oh et al. (2020): "An insight-related neural reward signal." *Neuroimage* 214. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053811920302445?via%3Dihub>. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.116757>.

Page, Danielle. 2017. "What happens to your brain when you binge-watch a TV series." *NBC News*. Nov 4, 2017. <https://www.nbcnews.com/better/health/what-happens-your-brain-when-you-binge-watch-tv-series-ncna816991>.

Pingree, Suzanne et al. 2001. "If College Students Are Appointment Television Viewers ...." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 45 no. 3: 446-463. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4503\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15506878jobem4503_5).

Preis, Eran. "Not such a happy ending: the ideology of the open ending." *Journal of Film and Video* 42, no. 3: 18-23.

Rosch, E. (1973). "Natural Categories." *Cognitive Psychology* 4: 328-350. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(73\)90017-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(73)90017-0).

Sharf, Zack. 2019. "Jim Jarmusch: 'Twin Peaks: The Return' Is 'the Best of American Cinema of the Last Decade'." *IndieWire*, Jun 17, 2019. <https://www.indiewire.com/2019/06/jim-jarmusch-twin-peaks-the-return-best-film-decade-1202150533>.

Spangler, Todd. 2013. "Netflix Survey: Binge-Watching Is Not Weird or Unusual." *Variety*, Dec 13, 2013. <https://variety.com/2013/digital/news/netflix-survey-binge-watching-is-not-weird-or-unusual-1200952292/>.

Silverstone, Roger Saul. 1980. "The television message as social object: A comparative study of the structure and content of television programmes in Britain." PhD Diss. London School of Economics and Political Science.

Tizard, Will. 2017. "David Lynch on 'Twin Peaks,' 'Arthouse' Television, 'Lynchian Fear'." *Yahoo! Entertainment*, November 15, 2017. <https://www.yahoo.com/entertainment/david-lynch-twin-peaks-arthouse-065107986.html>

"Top 10 2017 des Cahiers." *Cahiers du Cinéma*. December 5, 2017.

<https://www.cahiersducinema.com/produit/top-10-2017/>

"Twin Peaks ACTUALLY EXPLAINED (No, Really)." *Twin Perfect*, YouTube, Oct 21, 2019.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7AYnF5hOhuM>

Wilson, Steve. 2014. *The Making of Gone with the Wind*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Winkler, Martin M. 2007. "Introduction". In *Spartacus: Film and History*, edited by Martin M. Winkler, 1-13. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.