

Marshall University

Marshall Digital Scholar

Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

2020

Slasher Films and Self-Harm: A Relationship of Self-Hatred and Trauma

Stevie Lee Steers

steviesteers51@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://mds.marshall.edu/etd>



Part of the [Child Psychology Commons](#), [Film and Media Studies Commons](#), and the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Steers, Stevie Lee, "Slasher Films and Self-Harm: A Relationship of Self-Hatred and Trauma" (2020). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. 1315.
<https://mds.marshall.edu/etd/1315>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu, beachgr@marshall.edu.

**SLASHER FILMS AND SELF-HARM: A RELATIONSHIP OF SELF-HATRED AND
TRUAMA**

A thesis submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

In
English

by

Stevie Lee Steers

Approved by

Dr. John K. Young, Committee Chairperson

Dr. Margaret Sullivan


Professor Ian Nolte

Marshall University
August 2020

APPROVAL OF THESIS

We, the faculty supervising the work of Stevie Lee Steers, affirm that the thesis, *Slasher Films and Self-Harm: A Relationship of Self-Hatred and Trauma*, meets the high academic standards for original scholarship and creative work established by the Department of English and the College of Liberal Arts. This work also conforms to the editorial standards of our discipline and the Graduate College of Marshall University. With our signatures, we approve the manuscript for publication.


Dr. John K Young, Department of English Committee Chairperson Date 11/13/19


Dr. Margaret Sullivan, Department of English Committee Member Date 11/13/19


Professor Ian Nolte, Department of English Committee Member Date 11/13/2019

© 2020 Stevie Lee Steers
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my father, Clyde Steers for showing me horror films as a child and inspiring a lifetime obsession with them. My sister also deserves my thanks for unwillingly listening to my late night discussions of the movies with dad to remember all the small details. I also want to thank Dr. John K. Young for supporting this project and working to ensure that I remembered where to place a comma. Finally, I would like to thank Jimmie Lawrence Vaughan and Mike “The Drifter” Flanigin for being great friends during the blues and the highs in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	vii
Abstract	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter 1	4
THE FILMS	4
What Is A Slasher Film and What Is So Important About The Subgenre?	4
Trauma and Self-Hatred in Slasher Films	7
<i>A Nightmare on Elm Street</i> Series	7
<i>Friday the 13th</i> Series	11
<i>Hellraiser</i> Series	13
CHAPTER 2	20
LITERARY THEORIES	20
Gender Studies	20
Psychoanalytic Theory	29
Narratology	34
Trauma Theory	37
CHAPTER 3	39
THE FILMS AND THEORY	39
<i>ANOES</i> Theories	39
Gender Studies	39
Psychoanalytic Theory	45
Narratology	47

Trauma Theory.....	48
<i>Friday the 13th</i> Theories.....	49
Gender Studies	49
Psychoanalytic theory	52
Narratology	52
Trauma Theory.....	54
<i>Hellraiser</i> Theories	55
Gender Studies	55
Psychoanalytic theory	58
Narratology	59
Trauma Theory.....	59
CHAPTER 4	60
CONCLUSIONS.....	61
Self-Harm Connections.....	61
What does the Female Viewer Connection (FVC) mean for Slasher Films?	65
The Future of Slasher Films, The Female Viewer Connection, and Further Research.....	66
Works Cited	67
Appendix A: Letter from IRB.....	70

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Jason's POV of Doug, as Doug is murdered.....	22
Figure 2: Jason's POV of Crystal Lake.....	23
Figure 3: Freddy's Chest of Souls.....	44

ABSTRACT

This paper's purpose is to look at slasher films and the potential relationship of trauma and self-hatred that these films hold to adolescents aged 14-20 who commit self-harm. The type of self-harm examined in this paper is cutting and the films that will be studied will have to be from 1979 to 1989, which is the "golden age" for slasher films. The films that will be studied are *The Nightmare on Elm Street* series, *Hellraiser* series, and *Friday the 13th* series. This paper will be using multiple literary lenses to discuss how slasher films convey trauma and self-hatred and how the slasher films share a relationship with girls aged 14-20 who self-harm by cutting due to trauma and self-hatred. The lens that will be used to look at the horror films includes narratology, gender studies, and trauma theory.

INTRODUCTION

The images of blood darken the movie screen as the killer slashes his way through the unlucky teens, and not too long afterward that same night, blood begins to drip down the arms of another female teen who has committed self-harm. The average age of a slasher horror film viewer was “15-24 year[s] old and male; an audience is seeking thrills as a rite-of-passage, seeking to prove that they have strong enough stomachs to sit through whatever the film-makers may throw at them” (Wilson 5). Melissa C. Mercado, Kirstin Holland, and Ruth Leemis, who work for the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, state that the average age for those who commit self-harm is the highest with females aged 15-19. Females who commit self-harm is at 63 percent versus the 10 percent rate of males that are the same age (2).

What constitutes self-harm varies as it can range from chewing on the insides of your cheek or biting your lips when nervous to taking a razor or other similar blade to cut your flesh. While self-harm is usually related to suicidal thoughts, it can also be an attempt to relieve, control, or express distressing feelings, according to Justin Healey, who is the author of *Self-Harm and Young People*. Currently, no one studies the link between slasher films and self-harm, although both have a similar audience in age and viewership of the films.

The reasons for self-harm have remained the same since the slasher films began in 1980 and can be complicated, but “most self-harm is in response to intense pain, distress, or overwhelming negative feelings, thoughts, or memories” (Healey, 5). The slasher film uses both tropes regularly for their main characters as the films were marketed and intended for teenagers in emerging malls and drive-ins. In looking at *The Nightmare on Elm Street*, *Hellraiser*, and *Friday the 13th* series, it shows how every one of the protagonists faces their self-hatred and traumatic events before the slasher even begins to step foot on the camera. The reason for

choosing these three film franchises is because each defined and redefined the formula for the slasher subgenre that started in 1973's *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* and 1979's *Halloween*. *Friday the 13th* established the familiar group of teens in a comfortable setting, a summer camp, that are being killed one by one by an unknown and unstoppable killer as they engage in normal teen activities of sex, drugs, and minor crimes. *A Nightmare On Elm Street* would redefine the formula by using dreams and turning the setting from a summer camp to the person's psyche. The teens in *A Nightmare On Elm Street* have to rely on themselves since adults fail them at every turn in the films instead of being absent as in other slasher films. *Hellraiser* redefined the subgenre by looking at how slasher films used sex and nudity as a punishment by reversing it and showing the dangers of exploring the inner mind's desire for pleasure and taking the need for pleasure too far. *Hellraiser* would also make the familiar monster that hunted down the teens and change it by adding a supernatural element of hell and the need to call the beast to the teen versus the monster chasing the teen.

Altogether each of these films was popular not because teens were more likely to see them but because they were films that kept changing a subgenre that was being produced almost monthly for drive-ins and theaters. These films also have the most literary studies conducted about them since they have come to represent the slasher genre due to how each defined the subgenre. The theories applied to *A Nightmare On Elm Street*, *Hellraiser*, and *Friday The 13th* series include narratology, psychoanalytic criticism, gender studies, and trauma theory. The theories attempt to show the relationship that exists with the self-hatred and trauma of the characters and self-harm in women aged 14-20. These theories appear because each answer the larger question of the connection that women, in this portion of the viewers, want to see themselves mutilated. This desire is an unconscious one and as a result of this desire of self-

mutilation, the viewers identify with the killer and the victim equally at the same time in the film.

CHAPTER 1

THE FILMS

What Is A Slasher Film and What Is So Important About The Subgenre?

To better understand how a horror film and self-harm use trauma and self-hatred to connect with teenagers, it is essential to understand the difference between a slasher film and a modern horror film. The quickest mistake is to assume that slasher films died in the 1980s and that no horror film has fit the subgenre since then. Even in 2018, the slasher film subgenre lives on in theaters, but it is the second generation of slasher film that still uses many of the same tropes. Carol J. Clover was the first in 1992 to begin to write about slasher films and to attempt to create a working definition for the subgenre. She described the slasher film as a film:

the killer [being] the product of a sick family, but still recognizably human; the victim is a beautiful, sexually active woman; the location is not-home, at a Terrible Place; the weapon is something other than a gun; the attack is registered from the victim's point of view and comes with shocking suddenness (pg. 6).

Clover would also lay out a new theory idea that she dubbed the “final girl.” The practical idea of a final girl is someone who is boyish, a virgin, and a nerd who forsakes the other teenagers so that she will be the one who survives the killer. Her theory is a method to push her ideas about gender and slasher films, but by itself is a method to explain a part of the slasher formula that repeated the most. The discussions of why the final girl theory is helpful to understand the audience's identification with the onscreen killer and victim, will be discussed later in this dissertation as will what the more significant issues are with this semi-helpful theory.

The working definition of the slasher that Richard Nowell expanded by focusing on the teen slasher film, which helps to better understand the characters in *A Nightmare on Elm Street*, *Hellraiser*, and *Friday the 13th*, also falls under the criticism and study of slasher films. The

working definition of a slasher that Nowell provides is the series of films has “a distinct setting, a shadowy killer, and a group of youths. The killer is a shadowy prowler who monitors young targets before... dispatching instant death, although little suffering” (pg. 10). The formula is key in knowing how to tell two similar subgenres apart from a slasher film. It is also important to note that the “golden age” of the slasher film runs from 1980-1989 because of the number of slasher films produced which roughly tripled any other period for the slasher films after 1989. The decade was also when the subgenre defining movies of *A Nightmare On Elm Street*, *Hellraiser*, and *Friday The 13th* hit the movie screens and found great success.

The first similar subgenre is the splatter film out of 1960 to 1974 with *Psycho*, *Blood Feast*, and *I Spit on Your Grave*. These films are close to slasher films but do lack the group of youths and a shadowy killer. The other key differences are the definition of the dead for the victims in these films. As Nowell noted, the idea that the film does not linger on the torture of the victim is crucial. This idea that the victims do not suffer on screen is different from a splatter film that focuses on death while also leaving audiences to wonder if the victims are dead. The slasher films show the gore without lingering on the torture of the victim. Most of the victims have no real way of surviving the slasher as he moves from victim to victim.

The distinction of torture is what also separates the second close subgenre of torture porn from slasher films. This category of films started briefly in 1985 but really saw its creation in 2001 and is still currently being produced to this day. The favorite films in this category are *Saw*, *Cannibal Holocaust*, and *Hostel*. All three films focus on the extreme torture of the victims, and most of the plot of these types of films are just to advance various tortures of the victims with little to no real plot beyond that.

The reason that I chose the slasher film subgenre is that to this day this subgenre stands out among the other subgenres of horror films such as ghosts, splatter, possessions, demons, black comedy, a rite of passage, torture porn, and creature features. When the first slasher films began to hit the drive-ins and theaters, people were shocked by how much gore and nudity was in the films. The films appear only to be made to appeal to the baser and darker parts of the human brain. Slasher films are also the first movie subgenre that, upon further study, draws more females to it than males. The films also stand out because fans tend to identify with and enjoy seeing the killers more than the heroes. Most of the movies, at first glance, had no plot other than showing young and good-looking teen girls slaughtered for two hours. However, as time went on these films grew in popularity, and the critics and scholars were forced to see the films differently. The slasher film is what began the concentrated study on horror films and put horror films into a new film criticism that began in 1992 with Carol Clover. It was with Clover's research that other literary critics came to realize that slasher films could be studied under just about any literary lens and hold merit if the critic knew enough about the film in question.

After Clover's groundbreaking research, the discovery that she lacked information on slasher films and that she had not bothered to see any of the movies that she tried to discuss in her book slowly emerged as other horror critics began to publish further research on slasher films. In my opinion, Clover's work prompted much of the further research that has come after her to focus on detangling the claims that she made. The current research has also tried to answer the two key questions that have hounded scholars and film critics since slasher films have become popular, which are why do teens watch slasher films and why are the killers as popular, or sometimes more popular, than the heroes? Overall, the current state of the scholarship is

trying to answer these two questions about why slasher movies are popular and the killers are so beloved even 40 years later.

TRAUMA AND SELF-HATRED IN SLASHER FILMS

A Nightmare on Elm Street Series

The first *A Nightmare on Elm Street (ANOES)* premiered in theaters in November of 1984. The premiere would be four years after the *Friday the 13th* series began, and three years before the first *Hellraiser* film would premiere. This series would prove to be a difficult movie to put in the slasher subgenre as it only features the killer in 7 minutes of the 1 hour and 41-minute run time. The critics could not agree with what made the film a slasher film beyond the gore and killing of the four central teenagers in the film.

The first film opens with four friends who are also teens and attend the local high school in the town of Springwood. The teens are the all-American couple Nancy Thompson and Glen Lantz, who live across from each other on Elm Street, and Tina Gray and her bad boy boyfriend Rod Lane, who does not live on Elm Street. Tina is set to be the “final girl” or the one girl who will survive the mayhem as she is the first character that the audience sees in a dream sequence with Freddy Krueger. The audience quickly learns that Tina does not have a beautiful home life as her mother appears to be bringing a different man home every night to sleep with while Tina hides in her bedroom from her mother and the men. The twist of setting up one final girl for her only to die and leave an unsuspecting character to take the role of “final girl” is one of the writing techniques that sets *ANOES* apart from other early slasher pictures.

It is not long after the opening dream sequence that the audience learns that Nancy, Glen, and Rod, who are all friends with Tina. Tina is dating Rod, who never is shown to have interactions with his friends and is known by the local police to be a troublemaker. Nancy is

shown to be living with her divorced mother, a drunk, and who does not have contact with her ex-husband, who is a Lieutenant in the local police force. Glen is the only one of the four teens who is shown to have a nuclear family.

The trauma is from the perspective of Nancy as she is the unsuspecting second “final girl” who must kill Freddy to save her family after Tina dies midway through the film. She suffers from seeing her friends killed brutally and later her mother, but she also suffers the trauma of her loss of innocence at the hands of Freddy. She did not know that her parents had set Freddy on fire as a vigilante mob when she was a child, nor did she know that adults could fail to truly protect her as both her mother and father fail to keep her from Freddy’s deadly claws. Nancy is forced to learn to fight Freddy by setting booby traps and facing death head-on as she confronts her fear of him to kill him after every adult has failed her.

The characters of Tina and Nancy both express subtle signs of self-hatred as they progress throughout the film. Nancy tries to get Freddy to kill her because she cannot deal with her mother, Marge, who will not stop drinking and has got a bad name in the town as being a lush. Tina shows how little she cares for herself when she brings Rod over to sleep with her when she knows that he has a bad reputation and is known as a thug in the neighborhood.

In the second film, a new batch of teenagers, and a new storyline emerges. The second film, known as *A Nightmare on Elm Street 2: Freddy’s Revenge*, is also the only ANOES film that has obvious and blatant sexuality and homosexuality in its storyline. It centers not on a female but on a closeted gay teenage boy named Jesse, who Freddy is trying to possess. The trauma he faces is having the ultimate evil try to possess him, and he must watch as he, under the power of Freddy, kills his friends and attempts to kill his cover girlfriend, Lisa, all while he tries to hide his sexuality that Freddy uses against him. Jesse seems to also experience attempted rape

from adults and his classmates several times in this film, which only serve to worsen how easily Freddy can possess him because he quits fighting from the trauma of abuse at his high school.

Next in the series is part three known as *A Nightmare on Elm Street 3: Dream Warriors* that shows the audience a return of Nancy and a more in-depth look at the psychological damage that Freddy can and does inflict. This time the movie's setting is a psychiatric hospital with each patient having experienced some issues from attempted suicide, self-harm, past physical and sexual abuse, and drug addiction. The audience views the familiar form of having a teen girl as the hero this time featuring a character named Kristen, who is committed against her will due to self-inflicted slash marks on her wrists. Kristen is the main one whom the audience focuses on and is shown to have self-hatred along with another girl who also possesses self-hatred, Jennifer, and who also is committing self-harm inside the hospital by burning her arms.

Both Jennifer and Kristen are not just victims of Freddy's, but also parent's actions have forced them to develop self-hatred for Freddy to exploit. Another two characters, Kincaid and Joey, both suffer from past traumas. Joey is too traumatized to speak in the film as he was a victim of childhood trauma, and Kincaid has been a victim of foster home abuse, which makes him prone to violence. The other interesting character to be introduced is Taryn, who is a drug addict to escape the sexual abuse she suffered at the hands of her step-father. Freddy uses her addiction to kill her after mocking her for suffering sexual abuse at the hands of her step-father. This movie shows Freddy using the teens' past trauma and what they dislike or hate about themselves to full effect.

Finally, *A Nightmare on Elm Street 4: Dream Master* introduces the audience to Alice, who is a bullied and misunderstood young teen. This film carries on with Kristen, Kincaid, and Joey for a while before killing them off. It is interesting to note that everyone, including Alice,

treats these three survivors as freaks until their deaths. Alice has self-hatred as she thinks that she is ugly and unable to handle simple tasks. Her father and brother reinforce her opinion of herself, which leads to her self-destruction with an eating disorder, self-harm of cutting herself, and risky behavior.

Alice's friends commit a form of self-harm because of past trauma, explored in the film, and all hate themselves for some perceived flaw on their bodies. An example is Debbie, who feels that she needs to be tough and lift weights to avoid getting herself hurt, to prevent another sexual assault from happening to her. Another of Alice's friends is Shelia, who, despite having the intelligence of a genius, still hates herself for being a nerd, black, and having asthma. Freddy can exploit all this self-hatred, as shown in previous films, to kill them all.

One of the main aspects to Freddy Krueger himself as a slasher in his overall arc of films is that he is smarter than the other juggernauts such as the voiceless Jason and Michael Myers, who are tank-like in their destruction. Freddy may be out for revenge, but he does study each of his victims to exploit their past traumas as he tortures and toys with them, feeding off their fear to grow strong enough to kill them. One of the issues that Freddy has as a dream demon is that he requires fear to be strong enough to cross over from the dream world into the waking world to kill the teens, which is his preference. There are too many variables and risks for Freddy to attempt to kill the teens in their dreams because they may be lucid dreamers who can fight him and awake from the nightmare. It is much easier for him to cross into the waking world and stalk them until he can kill them or corner the teens in their dreams while they feel helpless to kill them with no pushback.

The best way for Freddy to make the teens feel helpless is the fact that he tends to exploit their past traumas. One of the many examples is that he figures out that Nancy's dad has

abandoned her, and she fears that Glen will do the same. Freddy manipulates her dreams to send a chilling phone call where the bottom part of his mouth appears on her phone, and his tongue French kisses her while telling her that he, Freddy, is her new boyfriend. Throughout the series, Freddy watches the teens dreams and gleans information from them and their parents by watching, and then exploits their past traumas against them to aid in killing them after feeding off their fear.

Friday the 13th Series

These films are the series that most audiences and critics think of when asked about slasher films as the movies started in May 1980 and managed to have seven sequels produced before the end of the decade and the end of the “golden age” of the slasher film. Not all the eight films produced during this time are of use to this paper nor to any study as some were made just for the annual release date needed to retain rights for the movie studio. The movies that will be studied will be the fourth film, sixth, and the seventh film.

By the time that *ANOES* had reached the theaters, the fourth *Friday* film was also hitting the theaters, promising to be the last one with the title of *Friday the 13th: The Final Chapter*. This film takes the familiar formula for these films of an almost unknown and forgettable group of teens getting slaughtered and turns it into something where some characters have a plot development to be fully fleshed out characters. The characters that are the most focused on in the film are Tommy, who is a twelve-year-old child, and older sister Trish. Tommy is the one who will survive this movie, which breaks from the “final girl” formula and sets the series up for more of this character. The films shows the idea that Tommy fits the idea of an abused and self-hating character because he has no friends, prefers to make monster masks, and witnesses the death of his mother at the hands of Jason, who represents the loss of innocence of Tommy.

An exciting turn was for parts six and seven of this series as part six is the first *Friday* film that uses a pop music soundtrack rather than musical scores that the first five showcased. This film also shows the return of Tommy, who is grown up and much more traumatized than before. He has been in a mental health facility, and he has not dealt with his mother's death well over the years as hallucinations plague him. Tommy has already begun to drink and engage in dangerous activities, which lead him to the next group of teenagers that this film was waiting for Jason to slaughter. Tommy, at this point, begins to act out and even attempts to assault one of the teens in the movie sexually. He is only redeemed as a character when he almost lets Jason kill him in the form of assisted suicide before one of the teens rescues him.

The seventh *Friday* film took an even more supernatural element with psychics and a super rotten Jason Voorhees. The film opens with Tina, as a child, witnessing her abusive father hurt her mother. The trauma of her father's death unlocks her psychic abilities, and she causes her father to fly to Camp Crystal Lake, where he drowns. As the film progresses, Tina finds out that her doctor has been manipulating her, and so has her mother, so she begins to act out and in the act of self-harm, and little thought, calls Jason back to life. Jason returns from the bottom of the lake and starts his killing spree as usual with these films.

What sets this film apart from the six so far was the fact that one teen, and it was not Tommy, but rather the female character who already had trauma and self-hatred was the central character. Tina was a workable formula that had been good for *ANOES*, which is why it presents here. The film also begins to look at Jason not being the main villain in his movies but rather a side force of evil to a human evil named Dr. Crews.

Hellraiser Series

The last series is the *Hellraiser* series that premiered September 1987, which was on the tail end of the slasher “golden age” but still provided a rich addition to the subgenre run-on. The film is an adaptation of a short novel and screenplay hybrid of Clive Barker’s entitled “The Hellbound Heart,” which he would use as his running script when he directed the film. The series quickly derailed after the third part, which is why only the first two films I will study, as they are the only ones to stay on track with the franchise and story as part three premiered after the “golden age.”

The first film, known as *Hellraiser*, starts by breaking the mold of teenagers being chased by a stalker as it focuses on Frank, who is a sexual deviant who opens a box and is looking for the ultimate pleasure. He finds a group of Hell-based theologians known as the Order of the Gash, who promise him the pleasure he craves. He can summon them by opening a fancy puzzle box, known as the Lemarchand Configuration, where they ripped him to shreds and take him back to Hell for pleasures for them and torture for him. The film then moves to introduce the audience to Julia, Kristy, and Rory, who is Frank’s brother. The teen in this film is Kristy, and she already has issues with her stepmother Julia. Julia is working to piece Frank back together by feeding him victims that he devours to regrow skin to become human again.

The novel, which also serves as a screenplay for the film, portrays Kristy as wanting to have a sexual relationship with her father and how she is jealous of her stepmother having married her father four years ago. It describes Kristy as “the girl with the pale handshake, whose eyes were only ever as bright as Julia’s before or after tears. She had long ago decided that life was unfair” (Barker, 25). She was someone who already had low self-esteem in the novel and

compared her natural looks to Julia quite a bit to understand why her father found Julia attractive instead of her.

The movie changed this info as Barker felt that American audiences would not understand the complexness of the characters and to fit the film into the subgenre of slasher films better. Kristy in the movie has a boyfriend and is still shy but not so overtly self-hating as the novel points her out. The sexual attraction to her father changes to her Uncle Frank, who desires her for the taboo factor. This detail was present in the novel but not as detailed as the film. Kristy is the only person who truly makes the mistake of opening the puzzle box and summoning the cenobites from Hell. She can negotiate with them to get Frank back to Hell and to save herself from damnation after encountering them while being in a mental health facility.

The novel and the book both detail that, while Kristy did not know that the box would summon the demons, she still wants them to destroy her because she is so unhappy with her life. She is a virgin in the film, and her presence in the novel is due to her incestual desire toward her father, which makes her crave the attention the lead cenobite, Pinhead, gives her. The deal that they work out with her has never happened in their business, and no mortal has ever opened the box and not suffered at their hands. It would seem strange that unless Kristy was looking to cause herself self-harm, that she would want to “find the thing that had torn her and tormented her and make him feel the powerlessness that she had suffered. She would watch him squirm. More, she would enjoy it” (Barker, 144). These thoughts are dangerous to have around cenobites as they feed off these kinds of feelings, and it was no surprise when the puzzle box returns to Kristy in the novel. The cenobites from the novel to movie stay the same for the most part except for Pinhead and Female Cenobite. In the novel, the leader, Pinhead, is a female, and Female Cenobite was absent. The change between the characters plays an essential role in this series, and

so does the removal of the boss of the cenobites known as the Engineer who is also a female, which will be discussed more in chapter 2.

The second film, *Hellbound: Hellraiser 2*, is where the audience begins to see how Kristy's self-hatred has grown since her last encounter with Pinhead because she is back in a mental hospital with a young girl named Tiffany. Tiffany's mother is the reason she is in the hospital as she witnessed her mother being raped and killed by the hospital doctor years earlier through a failed lobotomy. Tiffany does not speak anymore due to the trauma that she saw happen to her mother and the sexual abuse she has experienced in the hospital. Kristy soon learns that the lead doctor, Dr. Channard is abusing and torturing patients to bring Julia back from Hell to summon the cenobites to take over Hell.

This film is one of the few in the series to explain some of the cenobite's backstory as the audience learns that Pinhead was a human in World War one named Captain Elliot Spencer, who opened the box for pleasure after having trouble dealing with PTSD from the war. He transformed, as all the cenobites have, into a demon-like creature who serves the leader and god of Hell known as Leviathan. The cenobites are to bring souls, much like Julia is now tasked with, to Hell for pleasure and torture using the puzzle box. The puzzle box serves as an opening between Hell and the living world. Both Kristy and Tiffany must face off with the original four cenobites, and now Dr. Channard has been transformed into a cenobite, to save themselves from Hell and escape, which they do at the end of the film.

The trauma of what happened to Kristy is some of what leads her to decide to have Tiffany open the puzzle box, not knowing what will happen. Kristy also has the desire to speak with Pinhead again because of her past trauma with him. She chooses to have Tiffany, who has no idea what the puzzle box will do, solve it as a game so she can sacrifice her to Pinhead, and

she speaks with him. Kristy does know that this plan will not work as the box can tell who wants to open it, and Pinhead will ultimately take her as well to Hell, which is what she wants. Tiffany seems to want to stay in Hell at the end of the film because it is better to her than what trauma she has experienced so far, which leads to Pinhead being more forgiving to her than he is to anyone else. Both girls use Pinhead to fuel their self-harm due to pre-existing trauma and self-hatred.

While all the characters out of the three franchises have experienced self-hatred and trauma, it is not without note that each of the slashers has too. This quality is the missing piece to how girls can turn their backs on the relatable female heroes of this subgenre that often have experienced similar trauma and thoughts of self-hatred that causes them to identify with the slashers more. This thought of why audiences related for the first time in horror films with the killer has been explored using literary lenses, such as gender studies by Carol J. Clover and narratology by Richard Nowell. Not one critic has looked at the fans themselves and their kinship to self-harm and the self-harm of the slashers themselves. The trauma that the girls face is what draws the female self-harmers into the movie, but what makes them relate to the film is the trauma and self-hatred of the slashers themselves, which is why the females who self-harm seek out these types of films more.

This thesis offers not only to show this connection that other critics mention but also to develop the why behind the connection by showing that previous theories have explained this connection without realizing it. The main point of establishing the connection of female viewership that connects with the killer and victim because of unconscious desires to mutilate themselves is to answer why slasher films are popular with young women. The other question that this connection seeks to answer is why the killers such as Freddy and Jason tend to be just as

popular as the heroines such as Nancy and Alice. Carol Clover, for example, was onto the connection when she tried to apply gender studies and created the final girl theory. She did not provide enough research on the sadism/masochism of the viewers because her criticism focused on proving the popularity of slasher films using gender based theories. Clover also chooses to ignore the female viewer almost entirely by focusing on how males react to the films rather than the females' reactions. She committed many mistakes in her criticism that has spawned many other writers who have tried to correct her theories. However, she did lay some groundwork to answer the two questions of why females watch slasher films and why the villain is so popular with female fans.

Richard Nowell does a better job of focusing on the female viewer in his criticism, *Blood Money*, but he approaches why the slasher film appealed to women from the commercial side of the choices that the filmmaker has made, such as the lack of nudity and gore. He does not look at the previous research but disputes it all and turns the bulk of his research into marketing and economic reasons for the focus on the female viewer.

The previous research on psychoanalytic criticism does link how the viewer is sadistically viewing the film through the killer's eyes and is masochistically enjoying the death of the female body. Other research also focuses on identification using the Oedipal desires and castration complex. The castration complex has forced the male viewer to identify with the killer and female viewers to identify with the helpless female victim. Those such as Gaylyn Studlar, Linda Williams, Stephen Vaughn, and Aaron Anderson have all touched upon these topics with some success, but none have linked the idea of the female viewer connecting with both the killer and victim successfully.

A large amount of research concerning narratology and slasher films is to show the usage of Freud's Uncanny as evidence shows by James Kenrick's *Razors in The Dreamscape: Revisiting A Nightmare On Elm Street and The Slasher Film*. The issue with discussing the Uncanny is that critics forget to discuss why the films, particularly *ANOES* and *Hellraiser*, invoke the Uncanny. The reason that the Uncanny is essential to the connection of female viewers and the unconscious desire to self-mutilate is that it allows them to identify with the killer and victim at the same time. The main bulk of the published research on the usage of the Uncanny was to work with either psychoanalytic theory or to disprove Carol Clover's research and final girl theory. Some research, such as James Kendrick's *Razors in The Dreamscape: Revisiting A Nightmare on Elm Street and The Slasher Film*, discusses how the movies are using the Uncanny but not the why in very much detail.

It is essential to the films to use this theory for suspense as pointed out by Kendrick and others, but it also allows for the female viewer to better connect with the villain because it connects to their often-unstable mental states. The usage of alternative worlds that overlap with the "real" or "waking" world of the female character with no indication leaves the female viewer confused and more vulnerable to their emotions. The viewer tries to sort out what is happening to them in their "real" world versus what is a dream.

Critics such as Barbara Brickman have come the closest for using the Uncanny in the female viewer connection, but she falls short as she uses the Uncanny to discuss the double or absent self and uses the sibling conflict theory.

Finally, the trauma theory is not a critical theory that has been applied to slasher films when thinking about what the possible connection could be that causes female viewers to connect to the killer and the victim at the same time. The theory of the crying wound, as

discussed by Cathy Caruth, is the most applicable but has not yet been applied by other established horror critics, besides me, to a horror film. The theory would be perfect for applying as each of the killers repeat a trauma that was done to them and covered up without being discussed. The theory is present in how each of the female, and the male lead in Jesse from *ANOE 2*, is doomed to face the same trauma because none of them ever deal with their previous traumas from the killers or what they have experienced.

CHAPTER 2

LITERARY THEORIES

Gender Studies

The reason that gender studies discuss Carol Clover and Richard Nowell's work is that Clover was the first scholar to write about slasher films, and Richard Nowell took a non-theory researched approach to his work on slasher films. The argument of Clover was why the final girl, who is the one that is often the last remaining girl and is the one who kills the slasher, exists and why the male viewer can identify with the slasher at the same time as the female victims. She also points out that the shifting identification does not fool the male viewer that they are seeing a manipulated gender, and the final girl's character is less about being a woman and more about being a male stand-in for the emasculated male killer. Finally, she wraps up her thoughts on why the final girl is the character to allow for the male viewer to sadistically and masochistically view the films.

The final girl theory is a different approach than what Richard Nowell took for his research. He looked at the profit and business side of slasher films to find the decisions that led to the final girl theory, why females were watching slasher films, and why the killer was such a strong character. He did not look at the identification of the viewers beyond the fact to understand that movie studios saw an uptick in ticket sales with movies featuring female leads such as in *Alien* and *Halloween*. He also studied the group who were seeing slasher films from the ticket and VHS rentals and concluded that it was a mix with females seeing them more. His research looked at how profitable it would be for Paramount to allow for Alice to be the final girl in *Friday the 13th* which he concludes is the leading reason for final girls. His research through the economics and profit-led decisions of the studios is that females wanted to see more of

themselves represented in the films, so they continued to watch the slasher films despite the gore and nudity for the male audiences.

Carol Clover was the first scholar who chose to write about slasher films when she wrote *Men, Women, and Chainsaws* in 1992. Her book laid out the final girl theory to explain why a lone female was the person who killed the slasher in almost every film and discussed Point of View (POV) shots that established a sadistic/masochistic identification of male viewers that allowed the viewers to identify with the killer and victim at the same time.

The first issue with this book is that only a chapter was dedicated to slasher films, while the other sections focused on other subgenres of horror films that were not slasher films. She also tried to create the final girl theory, which is useful in parts, but the main issue was that she made assumptions about the movies she was researching without watching them nor looking up basic facts about the films and viewers. While this mistake of attempting to write research without watching the source material has created a wealth of other scholars who have chosen to write about how wrong her book has been, Glover did hint at the connection about female viewers, but she got a lot wrong trying to shoehorn in her thoughts on gender and slasher films that were not factually accurate to the characters.

First, it is important to note what Clover was trying to accomplish in her criticism and what it has to do with the overall questions of why slasher films are viewed and why are the killers so famous, while also working on what she did to hint at the female victim and killer connection. The ultimate goal for Clover was to use slasher films and horror films broadly under the lens of gender studies, and she took many assumptions about the slasher films from a lack of viewing and looking at facts about the films themselves. While her work is not without issue, she

did bring to light some critical features of the slasher films that are useful and have been expanded upon by other literary critics.

Clover mentions a set of point of view (POV) shots that are only found in slasher films, starting with *Halloween* in 1979 and followed by *Friday The 13th* in 1980. These POV shots are ones looking through the killer's eyes and seeing what they would be seeing (see figure 1 and figure 2). The camera only flips to what the victim would see, which is the killer at the moment of their violent deaths. This POV, Clover figured, led the audience to be put in the shoes of the killer to watch them kill helpless female victims.



Figure 1: Jason's POV of Doug, as Doug is murdered. Still image pulled from the *Friday the 13th The Final Chapter* DVD produced in 2000, original movie released by Paramount Studios, April 13, 1984.



Figure 2: Jason’s POV of Crystal Lake. Still image pulled from the *Friday the 13th* 1999 DVD, originally released on May 9, 1980 by Paramount Studios.

Clover points out that point of view using the camerawork is a tool for the:

male viewer [that is] seeking a male character, even a vicious one, with whom to identify in a sustained way has little to hang onto in the standard example. The killer is often unseen or barely glimpsed, during the first part of the film, and what do we see, when we finally get a good look, hardly invites immediate or conscious empathy. (44)

The lack of male characters and the rarely seen killer allows for Clover’s famous theory on the final girl because the camera angles support her theory in her claims. She states that where the camera follows what the killer sees is that as an audience “we are linked, in this way, with the killer in the early part of the film, usually before we have seen directly and before we have come to know the Final Girl in any detail. Our closeness to him wanes as our closeness to the Final Girl waxes- a shift underwritten by the storyline as well as camera position” (45).

The POV shots used to go a lot deeper than what was initially assumed by Clover and other movie critics, and represent an idea not fully discussed by Clover about identification and sadistically and masochistically viewing of the slasher films. Clover tries to work out the identification of the viewer through the POV shots, but she latches onto an idea that is factually wrong based on the movies that she tried to use as examples. Out of all of her false assumptions, the one that began the trouble with her work was that the audience was “largely young and largely male-conspicuously groups of boys who cheer the killer on as he assaults his victims, then reverse their sympathies to cheer the survivor on as she assaults the killer” (23). This idea of what males want would be combined with the POV shots to form the basis of her final girl theory and her theory on slasher films and what they did for male audiences. Clover forgets about the female and insists that only males wanted to watch slasher films, which was the assumption that made her work be voided by other scholars since 1992.

The main body of her work is that the killer is an effeminate male who is deformed and has mother issues and the final girl is needed to complete the castration complex to become the mother figure, whom the males in the audience are forced to take sides with and thus the final girl loses her femininity. The killer and victim also represent the child and the other figure, or so Clover tries to show in her theory. Looking at the final girl, she is “a male surrogate in things oedipal, a homoerotic stand-in, the audience incorporates; to the extent she means ‘girl’ at all, it is only for purposes of signifying the male lack, and even that meaning is nullified in the final scenes” (53). She mentions that the final girl is not a “girl” at all, but rather a character for males in the audience to side with since the killer is too effeminate, but Clover was not done with her analysis since she brings Freud into her theory and his Uncanny to further explain why males would watch the films.

She points out in her argument that the killer is “female/feminine in aspects of character but male in anatomy” (55). The reasoning is because most of the killers are not the traditional masculine image. While they may use phallic methods of killing their female victims, such as thrusting knives or drills into the woman’s body, they themselves are lacking in some physical manner. Their masculinity “is severely qualified: he ranges from the virginal or sexually inert to the transvestite or transsexual and is spiritedly divided (“the mother half of his mind”) or even equipped with vulva and vagina” (47). This femininity of the killer is why the male audience identifies with not only the killer but the final girl because she is a masculine stand-in for the feminine killer.

The femininity of the killer coincides with how the killer is also the “phallic mother of the transformed boy (the Final Girl) ...” (55). The final girl must take on masculine traits, in her argument, to survive the killer. The other more feminine women are killed because of their feminine qualities. The final girl herself is a stand-in for male audiences to allow them to identify with someone who is more masculine than the killer. The final point of her argument of why the final girl and gender identification is important in the slasher film is that the:

male gaze, the feminine constitution of abject terror, the value of the male viewer of emotional distance from the taboos in question, the special that may inhere, for the male audience, in phallic lack, the homoerotic deflection-go a long way in explaining why it is we have a Pauline rather than a Paul as our victim-hero, they do not finally account for our strong sense that gender is simply being fooled with, and that part of the thrill lies precisely in the resulting “intellectual uncertainty” of sexual identity. (56)

This ‘intellectual uncertainty’ is derived, from her argument, of the POV shots that are used from the killer’s viewpoint. She cites the opening scene in *Halloween* and the first *Friday the 13th* as examples of this. In “*Halloween I*, “we” are belatedly revealed to ourselves, after committing a murder in the cinematic first person, as a six-year-old boy” (56). The uncertainty is that the

viewer suspects, due to horror conventions, that the killer must be a fully grown male, not a small male child. The other example is of Pamela Voorhees, the killer, in *Friday the 13th* “in which “we” stalk and kill a number of teenagers over the course of an hour of movie time without even knowing who “we” are....” (56). She points out that the POV is being used to not only have the male viewer identify with the killer and victim, but it is what enables the gender play to create confusion in the male viewer.

Her argument is wrapped up with her last thoughts on the final girl theory and that is the final girl is a character to represent the fact that “slasher film speak deeply and obsessively to male anxieties and desires seems clear- if nothing else from the maleness of the majority audience” (61). She goes on to state how the male view has a “willingness and even eagerness (so we judge from these film’s enormous popularity) of the male viewer to throw in his emotional lot, if only temporarily, with not only a woman but a woman in fear and pain, at least in the first instance, would seem to suggest that has a vicarious take in that fear and pain” (62). This stake is used in the feminine viewing experience of the horror to explain why the male has the desire to watch the sadistic killer and identify with the final girl to finish the film with a shift in identification “back and forth with ease” (62). She wraps it by saying the final girl is both male and female in quality and that they were key to successfully pushing the slasher film into popularity with male viewers.

All she does accomplish is highlight the fact that the movies do have a formula for a girl surviving to the end of the film and that the POV shots do represent an identification that is important to the audience members that will be discussed in greater detail in chapter three. Clover does not work through the idea that while the killers can be deformed or less masculine than other male characters, they themselves are still more masculine than the final girls. Clover

also does not explain but in a footnote on page 63 about the final boys that were present in slasher films. The best example of that is Jesse from *ANOE 2*, which she does reference, but it is just to say that he could not be a “real” final boy because he does not play the role according to her. The idea that Jesse is not a “real” final boy is not true because Jesse was made to be the gay version of the final girl and was meant to be the final girl in the film along with his girlfriend Lisa, which will be discussed in chapter three.

The critical part of her research was the fact that she did briefly mention that viewers did connect with the killer and the victim at the same time. She did not link that it was the woman who had the connection with the killer and the victim, but she did lay some groundwork for the connection, and she did mention the Uncanny concerning *Halloween*, which would be more useful in other scholar’s work.

The next scholar who made an impact on coming closer to realizing the connection with female viewers and killers and victims is Richard Nowell. He wrote the literary criticism *Blood Money* in 2011, focusing on why the first round of slasher films was successful. He chose to take a unique route to find out why *Friday The 13th* and *Halloween* could make so much money by taking an economics and business approach to his research. He was compelled to take this approach because of his business economics background. His work looks at the reasons why the studios allowed Sean S. Cunningham and John Carpenter to make the two slasher films. The work he writes about is often used to condemn Clover’s because he discusses why *Friday The 13th* and *Halloween* both have a final girl who made them successful without relying on gender studies such as Clover did, but he still does not reach the connection that the thesis is focused on. He also does not answer the question of why viewers would watch a slasher film properly

because he states that it was just the right type of film for the young audiences that year based on choices such as casting, lighting, special effects, and market trends.

Nowell understands that the studios knew that females were watching the films just as much as males and in that recent successes such as *Halloween* and *Alien* featuring strong females the:

shift to younger and to heroic female horror protagonists suggested that it was commercially viable for the filmmakers behind *Friday the 13th* to counterbalance the male bias of the film's youth group by transforming *Halloween's* last girl standing from a traumatized wreck rescued by a valiant male into a self-sufficient young woman who disposes of the killer single-handily (129).

The shift to having a strong female lead was the best explanation in a non-theoretical lens as to why females were watching horror films because of the number of rental and theater viewings that were popular with females. What Nowell did not analyze mostly due to his work featuring economic statistics and theories was that he was wrong about the female lead in both *Halloween* and *Friday the 13th*.

While Laurie is the lead survivor and final girl, played by Jamie Lee Curtis, she still needs a man's help to survive the film and so does the hero, Alice, from *Friday The 13th*. As the film ends, Jason almost pulls Alice into the lake and flips her canoe, and if the male sheriff had not pulled her out, she would have drowned at the hands of Jason. She may have killed Pamela Voorhees, the killer in the first *Friday*, but she does not stop Jason as he emerges from the lake, so Nowell was a little off on his assumption, but at least he pointed out that female viewers were watching slasher films as much as the males were in the height of the slasher film era.

Most critics in the areas of gender studies and slasher films either side with Clover or Nowell, but both are close to the female viewer connection. Clover came to the conclusion that the POV shots were meant to represent identification that allows viewers, more than just males,

to connect with the killer and the victim. Nowell connected the fact that female viewers were the intended audience of the slasher films due to the increasing usage of female heroes, which Clover had discussed was the final girl. One of the critics who has sided with Clover is Kaja Silverman. She wrote in detail about how the “victim- the figure who occupies the passive position -who is really the focus of attention, and whose subjugation the subject (whether male or female) experiences as a pleasurable repetition of his/her own story” (5). This idea that the final girl is a stand-in for the audience is also echoed by other critics who follow the premise that Clover laid out in her theory.

Psychoanalytic Theory

Authors of psychoanalytic criticism have outlined how the killer and the victims in the movies work as identification for the viewers. The earliest scholar to connect how the characters in the film relate to identification, Gaylyn Studlar, worked during the last part of the slasher era of the 1980s, and while she did not work primarily with slasher films, she did discuss snuff films, which do have similar elements to slasher films. The work she looked at explained different ways for the viewer to identify with the characters in the snuff film, which could bring either pleasure or pain to the viewer through identification. Gaylyn observes, this “shifting identification” – both male and female viewers moving between different viewing positions that are gendered differently than the viewer him/herself – brings with it an experience of “freedom and pleasure” (35). The freedom from the shifting identification is that viewers are not tied to watching the film from one character’s perspective, which allows them to begin to identify with other characters. What research had been done before Clover was the fact that the identification of characters in films that use massive violence and gore does not stay intact for the viewer as the film progresses.

The main issue with Studlar's work was that she never transferred her thoughts on the shifting identification to slasher films but instead worked with the genre of snuff films. She should have taken her work to look at slasher films since they are a successor to the snuff film of the 1970s and even played a part in revitalizing the snuff film subgenre in the 1980s. Both subgenres are so closely related that it is easy for scholars to confuse the two types of films.

Linda Williams would look at horror films in a more general sense to discuss the masochism and sadism that were present in the movie. Her work expanded on Studlar's by showing how the identification of the viewers was important to horror films. She, much like Studlar, did not choose to work with slasher films, but her thoughts can be applied to the subgenre. Williams thought that the violence that was over-the-top in horror films "is enjoyed by male and female spectators alike who, for very different reasons owing to their different gendered identifications and object choices, find both power and pleasure in identifying not only with a sadist's control but also with a masochist's abandon" (216-17). What Williams pointed out was that viewers, for some reason, were able to connect with the sadists who committed the violence and the victims who abandon themselves to the pain from the sadists. This connection to the violence in the horror films was the first that any film scholar had spoken about and would be forgotten afterward as the original source material, the slasher film's cousin known as snuff films, lost popularity and the slasher films rose to popularity. The snuff film was one of the predecessors to the slasher film in the early 1970s along with splatter films that were both popular in drive-ins and for episodes of local late night horror hosts pre-Elvira, Mistress of The Dark years. The other critics after Williams looked at slasher films using different theories and recognized them as a new subgenre of horror films, forgetting the violence of splatter and snuff films a few years prior due to their forgotten popularity as late night drive-in favorites.

Williams does also mention that in the horror film “[like] the person who engages in sadomasochism, the viewer has made a kind of contract with the film to undergo a certain uneasy identification with a character experiencing terror or pain, at the end of which is the great pleasure of its relief” (211). She was onto the fact that violence, often shown in POV shots, was how the viewer was able to identify with the male and the female character. She works through the idea of the killer, offering a sadistic pleasure for viewers who watch him kill the female figure. She also worked out how the viewer was able in a masochistic manner to enjoy the pain and brutal death of the female at the hands of the male killer.

The basis for Williams’s view on audience identification comes from a cross-study of snuff films and slasher films focusing on the 1976 movie *Snuff*, and to a very lesser degree, the 1980’s *Friday The 13th*. What both of these movies have in common and why they were chosen by Williams is because both were low-budget films that attracted large groups of girls to their showings in drive-ins and theaters. The difference and reason she came upon the idea that filmgoers of slasher films receive sadistic pleasure from watching the killing of women was because the violence in slasher films is different from snuff films. She mentions how a snuff film is closer to pornography due to the hyper-realness of the nudity and violence present in the subgenre. She clarifies the difference in the two genres is that “violent hardcore” pornography as well as the violence in simulated yet realistic (and less plot-driven) horror such as 1976’s notorious *Snuff*, have a much different effect on viewers than “the special-effects violence of the slasher horror film” (201). The film *Snuff* was marketed much like 1973’s *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* as a documentary film rather than a fictional movie. The “real life” aspect of the violence would be different from the violence in *Friday The 13th* which she notes is more geared

to the special-effects of grossing out audiences and was meant to be discussed after the film ended rather than scare the audience such as the violence in *Snuff*.

The biggest issue with Williams's work was she never applied to slasher films beyond the discussion on how the violence is different to snuff films; instead, she just opted to discuss snuff films that are not similar. She and Studlar most likely served as preexisting research for Clover's 1992 work, where she did briefly touch on POV shots being used as identification, but she used the POV shots as identification to stand in for the male viewers. Clover never mentions in her work that the identification of the POV shots may have been used as a substitute for the female viewer to experience the movie through the male killer's eyes.

After Clover's work in 1992, Dennis Giles and Stephen Vaughn would start in 2004 and 2006 work on the same issue of identification in the POV shots in slasher films. Both would miss the female viewer connection but would focus on pleasure and establish the thoughts of identification for sadist and masochist viewing. Giles's main point in *Conditions of Pleasure in Horror Cinema* was "the pleasure in not seeing" that is a crucial aspect of the horror film generally and a characteristic feature of the slasher film (particularly after *Friday the 13th*) (39). The idea that horror films brought pleasure to the viewers by what was not seen was not much different from Vaughn's point of *Friday The 13th* in *Freedom and Entertainment: Rating the Movies in an Age of New Media* to give:

viewers the illusion that they were seeing the scene through the eyes of a stalker as he chased his victim. [The] camera seemed to invite viewers to accompany the 146 murderers and to participate in their elaborate rituals. [Critics] argued that this technique aroused those viewers already prone to sadism and was morally inexcusable (101).

Both of these men were able to see some of the female viewer connection but did not follow through with the idea of identification being more than just about the film being a sadist and masochist viewing experience.

The last big written piece about POV shots and identification was Aaron Anderson in 2010. He wrote the dissertation *Rethinking the Slasher Film: Violated Bodies and Spectators in Halloween, Friday The 13, and A Nightmare On Elm Street*, where he came the closest to writing about the female viewer connection. Anderson early on notes that “the use of the POV from the villain’s perspective seems to align us with the sadistic gaze of the monster, the result is actually the opposite as we largely identify with the film and the film’s characters masochistically (albeit a masochism that still possesses sadistically controlling elements of the gaze” (126). Anderson also notes very early on that:

on the surface, *Friday the 13th* seems to invite some identification with the villain (like similar to *Halloween*), we are ultimately more fully aligned with the perspectives and subjectivities of Mrs. Voorhees’ victim. Contrary to what many popular and some academic critics have suggested, it is far too simplistic to simply say that because POV shots from the villain’s perspective tilt the whole structure of identification toward identifying with the villain (144).

He, like myself, realized that slasher films use the POV shot to align the viewer with the killer’s sights, but it has the effect not only of inducing a sadistic and masochistic view, but that victim is usually the most identified. This viewpoint does seem to run counter to what most critics, scholars, and fans would believe due to the popularity of the killers, such as Freddy, but the POV shot does align the viewer more with the victim than the killer. The reason is that viewers see through the killer’s eyes but are drawn to see violence, which is only conducted by the killer, so the viewer can connect to the killer. However, this theory was complicated, and even Anderson mentions the complication of the violence of the killer and the alignment of the viewer with the

victim. The slasher film, particularly *Friday The 13th*, “as a whole, actually refuses to embrace this violent, sadistic subjectivity fully, ultimately positioning the viewer alongside the attacked while still tugging on the viewer’s sadistic desire for violence” (153). This uncertain take on violence is a part of the female viewer connection but also the role of women in the films themselves. He notes that “women do not function merely as a spectacle in Friday the 13th. Instead, they (at least partially) possess the look and invite viewers [to] masochistically identify with them” (32). Anderson had come to the same conclusion as others that women were the principal characters to identify with and were the ones that possessed the look despite the POV shots being from the killer.

All of the psychoanalytic criticism has worked with identification, but other elements of the criticism can be found in narratology and gender studies. The critical part that Studlar’s work that Anderson was able to connect was the POV shots make a viewer, in a sadistic and masochistic manner, identify with the killer and the victim at the same time. In most of the movies, the women hold the most power and are the characters that invoke the masochist viewing response in the audience.

Narratology

Most of the narratological criticism published has focused on *A Nightmare On Elm Street* and somewhat on *Friday The 13th* in comparison to *Halloween*. The main bulk of the research by scholars such as James Kendrick has focused on the Uncanny in the diegetic space of the film. Some scholars like Carol Clover do mention the double self but do not elaborate enough on it; others such as Barbara Brickman did work with the double self in the movies.

James Kendrick focuses on writing about the Uncanny that is present in *ANOES* and how the fantastical elements in the diegetic space create a more mature and visually different horror

film that was able to attract the audience. Some of his work discusses how the use of what was familiar but unfamiliar was accomplished by Freddy's ability to reside in every character's dreams and enter their "waking" world as well. The result of Freddy's ability to invoke the Uncanny also results in a disruption of gender and the identification of these roles. As noted by Barbara Creed, what Freddy, and by extension Pinhead, does is play with the "concept of inside/outside [which] suggests two surfaces that fold in on each other; the task of separating inside from outside seems impossible as each surface contributes to the 'other' side of its opposite" (49). The doubling effect is what makes what Freddy does seem familiar and unfamiliar at the same time. This two-surface idea is also what creates a double effect in the movie as well because Freddy can seemingly be in Tina's dream and Rod's waking reality at the same time if need be.

Later *Hellraiser* would also follow this example of not using the POV shots to shift the identification between the killer and the victim. Kendrick makes a note of "no shifting of identification because to identify with the killer is, in a way, to identify simultaneously with the heroine and vice versa" (25). While the POV shots are not used to shift the identification between the killer and the victim, gender and what the audience identifies is still shifted as in *Friday The 13th*. What Kendrick takes from Freddy's ability to be inside two surfaces is that he makes it impossible not "to identify with one is to identify with the other because Freddy is Nancy..." (25). Freddy can get into Nancy's subconscious, and this makes him a part of her and her a part of him in a way, so it forces the audience to identify with both and want to see Freddy harm Nancy and the other teens.

Kendrick would not be the only one to touch on the usage of the Uncanny to discuss what made slasher films so popular and why audiences could identify with the killers as much as the

victims. He would neglect to take the issue of female viewers and how they identify beyond Nancy having Freddy in her subconscious, which might have led him to the female viewer connection. What he was able to publish about the films and the Uncanny is useful for the female viewer connection even if he did not write about himself.

Another scholar, Barbara Brickman, looks at the double and how it shapes the horror film. She notes that the double of the slasher or its absent self as she calls it is what forms the basis for identification in horror films. Brickman uses the sibling conflict theory to explain the identification viewers have toward the killer and the victim. The sibling conflict theory is a new examination of the Oedipus Conflict. In the sibling conflict theory, it is important to “recognize of sibling, peer, or lateral relationships and their connection to foundational fears of self-annihilation and lack of identity.” (Brickman, 178). Brickman goes on to explain that the principle of the sibling conflict is that the fears of self-annihilation can become “acute during adolescence, which is the emblematic developmental period for experimentation with and final formation of identity and can renew those wishes to kill the sibling (or often in adolescence, one’s peers) in order to stave off annihilation” (178). These fears of the sibling coming to take over your own identity and replace you combined with the desire to get rid of the sibling to avoid the loss of your identity is what Brickman believes creates the sibling conflict that makes slasher films successful.

She does not so much believe that gender is what played a big part in making the films successful but rather that the young age of the viewers played a role. Brickman does point out that Clover was factually incorrect about the viewing audience because it was a mix of both sexes and that younger crowds than what Clover wrote about were the ones attending the premieres of the movies. The sibling conflict theory does explain the female viewer connection

in a roundabout way. The theory does explain why the viewer wants to see something, that is, a psychological resemblance to them harmed on the screen because they want to avoid self-annihilation. The sibling conflict also explains why the audience sees themselves in the killer because they want to destroy the peer that looks like them to save themselves.

What Brickman does not do is focus on the gender of the viewers, mostly because she wanted her work to discuss the importance of the sibling conflict theory and not be taken as a critical piece on Clover and those that follow her thinking of gender in slasher films. Brickman chose to focus on establishing the motif of the brother and sister conflict in slasher films when the majority of the films do not have clear siblings. She was able to connect in *A Nightmare On Elm Street* that “Nancy and Glen, who never consummate their relationship despite plenty of opportunities, can be better understood as brother and sister rather than boyfriend and girlfriend” (200). If Brickman had focused on gender rather than just trying to establish the sibling conflict motif in slasher films, she would have been able to use the sibling conflict theory to look at how female audience members reacted and made the slasher film one of the most popular and profitable subgenres of horror films.

Trauma Theory

Finally, while no other scholar has looked at trauma theory through the lens of Cathy Caruth, it holds information when applied to the slasher film which can explain how the female viewer connection was able to form. The idea is that the trauma is not processed by the conscious and is doomed to be repeated by the victim until it is mentally processed. The lack of trauma being processed is what happens to each of the killers and victims in the movies. The female viewers who have the subconscious desire to self-mutilate themselves also are not consciously

working through their trauma, and that is why they need to see themselves self-mutilated. Caruth works through the trauma of vets and people with PTSD, but her theory applies to slasher films.

What every theory alludes to is how the female viewer connection formed and why it can answer the questions of what made slasher films so popular and why the killer was the favorite character, sometimes more than the hero, and why slasher films can still work post-golden age. Each of the scholars was able to link pieces of the connection together and form the basis of the theory using various literary criticism. While no scholar to date has completed the puzzle to the female viewer connection, all have created the background to analyze the films to prove the connection. Each of these franchises offers many examples of the female viewer connection that can be applied with the theories mentioned above to lay the groundwork for the connection. Looking at the movies is key to not only verbally discussing the connection but to provide concrete examples in the films themselves to prove without assumptions that the connection is there and has been overlooked since film criticism began in 1992 for slasher films.

CHAPTER 3

THE FILMS AND THEORY

ANOES THEORIES

Gender Studies

The *ANOES* series did have scenes that highlight what Clover and Nowell outlined in their argument in slasher films and gender criticism. The main bulk of Clover's case is the final girl and the type of character that the killer represents in the film, but she forgets that the character traits are not what made the movies successful by themselves. The first film is a different type of slasher film because it does not rely on the POV shots, nor does the film worry about showing Freddy very much; he only appears in seven minutes of the film. The idea of the final girl, the shifting identification of the characters, sadistic and masochistic viewing of the characters, and marketability of the characters are present in the film but not to the full degree that either mention.

The first film introduces the audience to four teens, and within the first five minutes of the opening scene lays out the character who will be the final girl, which is Tina. The other three teens are introduced shortly after Tina's first nightmare, which completes the formula of a group of teens and a monster who is after them. This final girl formula setup is disrupted as Tina dies within the first twenty minutes of the film. She was set up by Wes Craven to be the final girl, but he intentionally disrupted the formula because he made two final girls for this film. Both Nancy and Tina were final girls, and the only difference in the two was Rod and Glen's actions. The fact that Tina allows Rod to have sex with her is what separated her from Nancy. Nancy herself does not share enough of the traits to have been deemed a final girl without Tina and her death's trauma on Nancy.

During the 1984 year that Freddy premiered, no critic was thinking about the final girl theory, but a pattern had already emerged due to *Friday the 13th*, *Texas Chainsaw Massacre*, and *Halloween*. Wes Craven wanted a different horror film than the standard horror film had become and wanted to play with the themes that each of the previous franchises were using. Craven was quoted as “A lot of the killers were wearing masks: Leatherface, Michael Myers, Jason. I wanted my villain to have a “mask,” but be able to talk and taunt and threaten. Many of the horror villains used knives as weapons, and I didn’t want to duplicate that” (vulture.com, 2014). The formula that was present and spoken about by film critics was the fact that all the slashers themselves were using knives, silent, very tall and bulky, and the films were being led by a group of teens usually with a lone survivor being a female.

The female usually showed up in a sequel and was killed in some fashion in the second movie. Some of the behaviors that would land a teen in trouble with the slasher were sex, drugs, or violence because the films seemed to be working on the action/consequence formula of older “monster” movies such as *Dracula* and *Frankenstein*. This formula of doing something that was considered wrong by polite society and facing the consequences, usually death, was the formula that slasher films followed. In previous films, the wrong action often was something along the lines of murder, desecration of a corpse, or trying to play God with the living, but the wrong action in a slasher film changed to minor actions such as underage drinking and drug taking but the consequence remained the same.

The usage of the final girl in *ANOEES* is not a part of the formula since Nancy is not a true final girl since, much like Laurie from *Halloween*, she also needs the help of the men in her life, such as her father and boyfriend Glen. Beyond Nancy needing help, she also keeps encountering Tina’s corpse who taunts her throughout the film, which also keeps Tina in the film, thus keeping

both final girls in the film. The idea of Nancy being a final girl is not well thought out either because she does not match the traits of what a final girl should be, according to Clover.

The idea of a final girl, as discussed in chapter two, is a character that must give up her femininity to become a stand-in for a male character, but Nancy does not. She maintains her femininity, unlike the lead female role in *Alien* and many other slasher films. Clover points out that:

Unfemininity is signaled clearly by her exercise of the “active investigating gaze” normally reserved for males and punished in females when they assume it themselves, tentatively at first and then aggressively, the Final Girl looks for the killer, even tracking him to his forest hut or his underground labyrinth, and then at him, therewith bringing him, often for the first time, into our vision as well. When, in the final scene, she stops screaming, faces the killer, and reaches for the knife (sledgehammer, scalpel, gun, machete, hanger, knitting needle, chain saw), she addresses the monster on his own terms. (48)

The usage of boobytraps means, according to Clover, that she was transforming to a male, but I argue that she did not since she ran from Freddy; she never faced him head-on, nor did she fight him head-on like a male would have. She did set booby traps, but she did it in a manner that a woman would have, letting the traps be staggered, which allowed for her to run and keep Freddy occupied so that her father and the other male police officers could reach her and save her in time. Nancy never intended to do anything but drag Freddy out of her dream and into her waking world so that the cops could arrest him. The only reason that she tries to fight Freddy is that he has killed her mother, but she even turns her back on Freddy and takes his power instead of fighting with physical violence. She outwits Freddy using intellect rather than physical abuse, which was not taking on male traits.

Nancy would not be the only character that does not fit the final girl in the *ANOES* series, as none of the main leads do. Jesse in part two is even mentioned in a footnote by Clover to be

the only 'final boy,' but she does not realize that while she lists him as a final boy, she neglects to expand upon what that could mean for her final girl theory. Clover decides to mention that he is a final boy in the movie, but she works with the idea of Jesse being a non-final girl to end Freddy. She does not make mention that Jesse is the only final boy to exist in the slasher film genre. The final girl does exist in part two and she fights right with the final boy. This final girl is Jesse's girlfriend, Lisa, who helps Jesse destroy Freddy when he possesses him by letting and helping Jesse set himself on fire. Jesse himself is not a good example of what a final boy could be due to the character traits he has.

Jesse was designed to be a stereotype of the gay male intended to make fans hate the sequel. The reason for the gay bashing and mockery in the film is that the replacement director did not like the actor Mark Patton who played Jesse and wanted to out him as a gay actor which would have gotten him blackballed out of Hollywood at this point of the gay hysteria of the 1980s (*Never Sleep Again*, 2010). Jesse, as a character, does not show the needed male traits that a final girl showcases as he only showcases the feminine characteristics that a final girl is supposed to give up. He also does not show the needed traits to be a typical male failed hero that slasher films are known for.

Two examples of Jesse's failing masculinity are when he is the target of Ron's bullying at the gym class baseball game. He gets into a physical fight with Ron and cannot win the fight, so he ends up with his pants down, exposing his underwear to the girls in the class. Jesse is also unable to defend himself against his gym teacher, who decides to make him run laps while throwing basketballs for the fight earlier in the class. He gets hit by the basketballs but does not hit his teacher because he cannot win the fight. The character also is not a big hit with fans, which would mean the male viewers do not throw their emotional lot and back him, but instead,

they cheer on Lisa in hopes that she will be the one to get away and leave Jesse to become Freddy in the waking world. Since the male viewers have never identified with Jesse, he does not fit the mold of a final girl, which leaves him in a new category not discussed by Clover as the final boy.

Lisa does fit the image better of a final girl but she is upstaged with the ongoing presence of the final boy. Lisa is the one who decides to challenge Freddy head-on when she attempts to fistfight him as he emerges out of the pool at her party even though Freddy injures her. She also, at the end of the film, decides to kill Freddy by allowing him to harm her so she can set him on fire. She does take on both male and female traits, but she is not sexually innocent, so she could not by the list of required features be a final girl either. Part two does not know a Clover defined final boy or girl, but it does in a way continue to create a new version of each, and it takes both Jesse and Lisa to kill Freddy just as it took both Nancy and Glen to kill Freddy in part one.

Both parts three and four also break the mold of a final girl because Kristen was supposed to be the final girl, but she still needs the help of Nancy to finish Freddy off, and she dies early on in part four, leaving Alice to be the final girl for that movie. Alice herself does not count as a final girl because while she does take on masculine and feminine traits, she also absorbs the souls of her dead friends to kill Freddy, which is what allows her to become a 'dream master.' The traits from her dead friends allow her to take on a different form of masculinity, for example, in the scene when she realizes through the absorption of Rick's karate skills or Kincaid's temper that she is now a changed woman. The absorption of souls and the fact that her friends are not dead since they pop out of Freddy's chest (see figure 3), and later fly as disembodied essences into Alice does not mean she is truly the last living girl so she could not be the final girl.



Figure 3: Freddy's Chest of Souls. Still Image taken from *A Nightmare On Elm Street Part 4: Dream Master*. DVD produced in 2008. Movie was made by New Line Cinema in August 19, 1988.

The subject of the final girl is not the only formula that is not followed by *ANOES*. Clover discusses what makes the killers not able to be appealing to the male audiences, and that is that “they are female/feminine in aspects of character and place (the “intrauterine” locale) but male in anatomy” (55). The theory is not the case for Freddy, as he does not possess any characteristics at any time during movies as being effeminate. He was a married man before his murder by the parents of Springwood. Freddy was not impotent nor was he deformed but rather like Michael Myers; he was a psychopath who wanted to hurt children. The idea that Freddy was something that male audiences could not relate is off because Freddy was created to be the monster within the community because he was a man who fit into his community and held a stable job while spending his spare time hunting and killing small children for his pleasure. It is a bit of misinformation that Freddy was a child molester because it is only implied that he was throughout the first four movies.

The only part of what Clover worked into her theory on slasher films was the fact that Freddy did allow for the viewers to have a shifting sense of sadism and masochism. Freddy does not appear much in the first film but does in part two because he attempts to possess a living soul

to enter the waking world permanently. His presence does cause the viewer, particularly the female, to be forced through a few POV shots to see Freddy's worldview and are forced to see through the eyes of the victim as they are being killed. The audience witnesses Tina's death through the eyes of Freddy, but flips when the death of Rod happens in the first film because the audience sees the death through the eyes of Nancy. The most shifts in identification happen in part two because Freddy slowly takes control over Jesse, which allows for the viewer to see not only the sight of the victim through Jesse's vision but also Freddy's since he is inside of Jesse making him kill.

Nowell did get the theory of using female leads correct with *ANOES* because of the release date of the series hitting after *Alien*, *Halloween*, and four *Friday the 13ths*. The usage of female leads over male counterparts was the trend at this point in the 1980s when *ANOES* was in theaters.

Psychoanalytic Theory

The shifting identification of the psychoanalytic theory is present in all four of the *ANOES*, but it does not always rely on the POV shots as *Friday the 13th* did. The POV shots that are used in the series usually also use gender in them or play off the elements of the dream universe that Freddy controls. Studlar, Williams, Anderson, Giles, and Vaughn all looked in some form to the identification of the viewer to the film through POV shots and did get the identification of the viewers of *ANOES* correct. The main issue with all their work is that they did not take the shifting identification of the viewer and connect it with the reason so many females were attending the violent franchise that focuses on Freddy killing and torturing teen girls.

ANOES does not use the POV shot in the same way that *Friday the 13th* did or *Halloween* but instead uses it to force the viewer to watch murders through a soon-to-be often next victim's eyes that are not the same gender. The POV that is present in the first film is where the viewer is forced to watch Rod's death through the eyes of Nancy. Freddy is invisible in this sequence, so the viewer is put in the shoes of Nancy, who is watching the tough guy die. The POV shots in part two also like to use gender as well as Lisa must watch Jesse attempt to kill others when Freddy possesses him. By the time that parts three and four came out, the franchise did not rely so much on POV shots but rather the dream universe to switch identification. Amanda and Nancy sequences in the dream universe are where the identification happens in the film. Freddy controls the world, so the camera angle focuses on his view, but the audience is forced to identify with Nancy and Amanda because of the trauma that Freddy is inflicting upon them.

The fourth film with Alice mainly focuses on her, and the camera angle is on her, but the parts with Freddy and her fighting for her to become the dream master forces the audience to take a look at her. All switching identification gives the female viewers of the film a chance to see themselves in a position of power that Anderson discussed because they are the ones that face Freddy the most and are usually the characters that can kill Freddy temporarily. The women from Nancy to Alice in part four can take power from Freddy in his dream universe, which enables them to give control over not only their lives but the camera angle. The focus of the camera angle is vital since POV shots are not being used as much in this series. The control that the women have of the viewer as they fight and defeat Freddy is the only control these characters usually have in the film as they have been victimized often by the males, Freddy or others, throughout the movie. The power of the dream universe itself is crucial because it is what also affects the identification of the viewer as well.

Narratology

All four films mess with the diegetic space to some extent as Freddy plays with the control of the waking, and the dreaming world as discussed by Kendrick. Kendrick was able to see the confusion of the waking and dreaming worlds that were caused by Freddy's dream powers, and how it could affect the identification of the viewer. The Uncanny is an essential tool that is also at play in the films because it changes the viewership and identification. The best example is how Freddy enters the mind and body of Jesse in part two, which forces the viewer to root for Jesse to kill Freddy but also for Freddy to finish his mission and enter the waking world. As Freddy possesses Jesse, he switches between being seen outside of Jesse's body in dreams and being inside the mind of Jesse in the waking world. Freddy is seen inside Jesse's body and in the waking world as himself, thus creating the double effect and creating the feeling of the Uncanny as he resembles Jesse but has his evil actions that he performs in Jesse's body.

The inability for the audience in each film to tell if Freddy is controlling a dream or making his presence known in the waking world is what forced the viewer in part to identify with both him and his victim, which is what Kendrick discussed. Nancy and the other females are used to offset Freddy, who is controlling the diegetic space. It would be easier for the audience to identify with the male characters if they are shown to be the ones fighting the nightmares, but the usage of the female characters is what forces a change of identification. The fact that having dreams is seen as something that boys do not talk about, as discussed by Rod and Glen in part one, is what throws the viewer into a shifted identification when the women must be the ones to kill Freddy, not the male characters.

Nancy was one of the few characters who acted as a buffer to the Uncanny in two different parts. The switching of the diegetic space is present in the first movie where she spends

her time in Freddy's dream universe and fighting him in the waking world; it is at the end of the film that she makes it clear that she brought Freddy out of her dream and into the waking world. The switching where Freddy doubles himself in the dreaming and waking world invokes the Uncanny and creates a sense of déjà vu that does not go away due to the switching of dreams to waking that is unclear. She would also be the one to drag him into the waking world in part three as well as she tried to help the others master their dream warrior powers. She was the first character that despite her feminine traits, is the one that must kill Freddy with her own hands.

When Brickman applied the sibling conflict theory to slasher films, she was correct about the desire to see the sibling destroyed since it represents the self-annihilation that one feels from the birth of a younger sibling. This conflict plays out in all four films, particularly the first film, as the teens watch each of themselves being slowly murdered, and as each member of their friend group is killed, they feel closer to dying. Freddy himself represents death and the older sibling who is attempting to kill the younger sibling, which is the teens.

Trauma Theory

As discussed in chapter one, not only did each of the four teens in every movie cycle face the trauma of Freddy, but each also suffered unique trauma such as child abuse, implied molestation, neglect from parents, and more. Freddy himself suffered the trauma of being the son of a nun who was raped by a hundred maniacs and then being placed in an abusive foster home. Freddy's trauma would continue as he was an adult and committed more trauma against children.

Looking at the evidence and theory from Caruth, the trauma that Freddy endured as a child was doomed to be repeated on others since he had not been able to process the trauma from his childhood. Freddy can often be seen in the franchise with children's toys in his room and has a group of little girls that accompany him to sing a children's rhyme. Freddy's humor, while

dark, is more childlike than other slashers because he is stuck repeating his childhood trauma. Even the methods that Freddy employs in later films such as parts three and four are more childlike than Jason's and Hellraiser's kills.

Each of the teens also is doomed to repeat their traumas because Freddy keeps causing trauma in their dreams which also translates to him being able to be brought into the waking world to cause even more trauma. Freddy's dream demons' powers limit him to the dreaming earth, but the fear of the teens is what allows him to cross over into the waking world. He cannot enter the waking world on his own accord because he lacks the full power to do it, but the teens do have the ability to pull him into the waking world. The teens are the ones that could choose to keep him trapped in their dreams, but instead, they are forced from the fear and trauma that Freddy has caused in their dreams, to bring him to the waking world. The teens, in part, do so because they are repeating the trauma but also to deal with and solve the trauma of Freddy.

FRIDAY THE 13TH THEORIES

Gender Studies

Friday the 13th is one of the first slasher franchises that many critics and fans recognized as an early slasher film franchise besides the *Halloween* franchise. Many scholars now, such as Richard Nowell, have found that Sean S. Cunningham aimed to create a successful dupe for *Halloween* with *Friday*, which is why the POV shots and teens were elements of the movies (Nowell, 19). What was different from this franchise is the usage of Pamela Voorhees in the first two films and the later influence she has on Jason throughout the series. Pamela Voorhees, the POV shots, and Jason himself are what destroy the theory of the "final girl" formula, identification of the viewer, and the reason that marketing cannot explain the appeal of the franchise as suggested by Clover and Nowell.

The killer in the first film was not Jason but rather his mother, who causes her own death and the resurrection of Jason by the end of the film. The mother's death and Jason's resurrection kill the idea of the "final girl" in the first film because the killer is not dead due to Jason's resurrection. Alice herself is killed in the first few minutes of the second film, so she was not able to be the final girl for the second film either. The issue with Pamela Voorhees being the killer in the first film is that no killer is deformed or sexually immature because Pamela, aside from being insane, is none of those things. The appearance of Jason emerging out of the lake in the dream sequence disputes Alice's status of being the final girl because it is alluded to that he is the killer who was resurrected by his mother's death.

Jason himself is disruption to the formula of the final girl because Jason is not a natural slasher to put in a category. He is a resurrected zombie who rapidly ages and then is killed in part three to which he is then resurrected for each of the subsequent sequels with electricity. His body does keep rotting throughout each film and is restored to his childhood form by part eight due to toxic waste. Jason is hard to describe because he is only living for parts two and three and then becomes a zombie. He also is close to a ghost because he haunts Camp Crystal Lake and does not leave the campgrounds. The fact that Jason falls under not only the subgenre of zombie, supernatural, spirit, and slasher is the reason that he does not fit the definition of a slasher, so there is no need to have a final girl present in any of the films because there is no need for her to transform to satisfy the male viewer.

The viewer identification in this film is not so black and white as Clover makes it out to be in her chapter references to the franchise either. The POV shots in the movie are different than the POV shots used in the other slasher films because the shots do not focus on one teen. The group of teens is the focus of each film until part six with Tommy and part seven with Tina. The

difference of the POV shots meant that since the early films did not focus on a specific teen as Clover alluded to so the POV shots focus less on the violence but instead focuses on the teen. As seen in figure 1, one of the key POV shots was Pamela looking at the empty lake at the beginning of the film. Another key POV shot of Pamela was not of a teen but rather of the councilor who organized the teens and sent them to the camp to work to get it reopened.

This different focus on POV shots is the final element that disrupts Clover's argument on the final girl and POV being used for identification, but Nowell's viewpoint on using the female characters for the franchise is not quite so easy to agree with either. While Nowell does his research with Sean S. Cunningham, he forgets to do his research with the director and original writer, which was Victor Miller. At no point did Miller address the information to confirm that *Friday* was meant to be a dupe for *Halloween*. Instead, he commented that he intended to make a film that was a drama and suited for the Lifetime Network. He was so angry that he gave the rights for the movie to Cunningham because he did not want his name associated with a horror film.

Since Miller did not want to make a horror film, he was not looking at the emerging trend in 1980 to use female characters as the leads. Nowell's theory that he was following the pattern to make a female-led horror film to profit off *Alien's* and *Halloween's* success is wrong since he was intending to make a drama featuring a female killer and hero much in the style of a Hitchcock drama. Nowell was correct with the sequels that Cunningham made because he was trying to bank off the success of the *Halloween* franchise, but the groundwork for the film was not a cash grab as Cunningham led Nowell to believe.

Psychoanalytic theory

The shifting identification is less present in this franchise based on the usage of the POV shots. The main bulk of each of the film uses wide shots and does not focus on a single character until they are killed. The focus is then on the one teen but also to the action of Jason killing the teen as the POV shots are only used in the first couple parts to show the action of the film. Since the first movie is set up to be an unknown killer stalking the teens, the killer is not revealed such as the wide shots in *Halloween*, where Michael Myers is shown standing on street corners watching Laurie.

The main issue that all the previous scholars have made with this movie is by focusing on the first parts of the franchise, which do not have the shifting identification on the viewer. The later parts of the franchise have a different take on the POV shot where they are mostly from Jason's view but again lack the focus on a particular character leaving the audience to identify more with the group of teens more than a specific role as *Halloween*, *Alien*, *ANOES*, and even *Hellraiser* did.

Narratology

Kendrick was correct in focusing on *ANOES* and leaving other slasher films out of the discussion on the Uncanny, particularly the *Friday*, franchise because the franchise does not use the Uncanny throughout the movies but instead only uses long shots to view the campers from Jason's POV. The series was to be successful, according to movie critics, for the number of kills that Jason provided, the endless teens that he seemed to be able to find, and the simple murder/revenge plot. The series did use a simple murder/revenge plot, but it added to it as the franchise continued and focused more on the individual teen, preferably the group, as it did in the first parts.

It is only in parts four and seven that the films present with Kendrick's narratology theory using the double and Uncanny. It is unique how this franchise uses the Uncanny and the double since the movies do tend to focus on the group rather than the individual teen. The Uncanny is not so much for the audience as it is used to confuse and keep him from his murder plans of wiping out the teens who are in Crystal Lake. It was in part seven that Tina and her fight with her physic abilities that provoked the Uncanny and the double on herself and Jason. Tommy created the Uncanny for Jason himself. Tina has dreams that are not clearly labeled as such and spends time causing disruptions in the dreams only for her and by extension, the audience, to find the dreams are sometimes dreams and that she has destroyed her waking world with her powers.

Jason, in this movie, is bought back from the dead with her psychic abilities and is acting as some agent of protection for her. His protection is explained as he is also affected by the double effect that Tina has created with her powers. It is noted in the movie that she can almost create monsters, such as the rotten zombie Jason, and that only she can kill them when they are brought to life. She has this back accident as she fights with Dr. Crews, the real villain of this movie, and Jason is left attempting to kill both the creature of her creation and Tina herself. Jason played the role of the audience in this movie in the aspect that he tried to make sense, as much as a zombie can of what was real and what was the doubling effect.

The sibling conflict is mostly non-existent in this series as Jason was only eleven when he drowns in the lake, so he is not the older sibling attempting to murder the younger sibling but rather a younger sibling following his mother's orders. The only part of the series that the sibling conflict applies to is part four, where Jason is attempting to kill Tommy, who was a child rather than the usual teens that Jason targeted. Jason was not able to kill Tommy because he saw

himself in Tommy and did not want to destroy what he perceived was himself at the end of the film.

Trauma Theory

The trauma that Jason faced dying and then being resurrected by his mother's death and then the multiple times with electricity is one of the reasons that he kept repeating the trauma that he endured. Jason was made fun of as a child for having facial deformities and being mentally challenged. He was drowned after being forced into the lake by some bullies and still retains the mental state of the bullied eleven-year old boy that he used to be. It is also of note that Jason keeps getting killed only to have to endure the trauma of resurrection many more times after his death in the 1950s.

Jason is not just subjected to his trauma but rather the trauma that he carries from his mother. She was the original killer in part one and vowed for Jason to continue her mission to kill the teens that she blames for his death. Jason's mother, Pamela, was the one who set out right out after Jason's death to kill the counselors responsible for his death and to make sure the camp stayed closed to ensure that no one would die as Jason did.

When Jason is resurrected at the end of part one, he hears his mother's voice from the dead, urging him to keep killing because she wanted him to keep her mission going. Pamela herself never was able to deal with the trauma of losing Jason to accidental drowning and set out to cause trauma to others because of the undiscussed trauma she faced. In her death, she sent Jason out to repeat the same trauma that she caused because he was not mentally capable of dealing with her death and his resurrection from the lake.

HELLRAISER THEORIES

Gender Studies

Hellraiser is a hard slasher franchise to discuss within the boundaries of gender studies, and it is not surprising that Clover skips this franchise in her discussion because it does not fit the traditional idea of gender. The franchise has never featured a final girl and does not use POV shots at all, so the film does not have the same shift in viewer identification because of the lack of POV shots. Instead, the film uses no final girl and has a different kind of slasher that does not fit into the formula that Clover discussed for the killer to help with the shifting identification. Lastly, this movie also did not rely on the female marketing that other slasher movies had because it came at the end of the 1980s and only needed to be shocking rather than following trends as Nowell attempted to discuss.

The film is set up to be based on the novel *The Hellbound Heart* and in that novel, a female engineer is the lead villain, and Hellraiser (Pinhead) is also a female (Barker, 1986). The movie had to cut the female engineer out not because of a lack of wanting the character but because it would have been impossible to include that character due to her appearance. She had an elaborately branded and scarred pubis mount that she enjoyed showing off to the male victims that she would take as sexual slaves before killing them.

Since the female engineer had to be scrapped, the script had to change to include more S&M features to make up for the lack of gore and shock that the female engineer would provide. The reason that Barker needed the shock and the gore was that that Dimension Films needed a horror film that could compete with the later 1980s gorier horror films that were trying to top each other in shock and violence. He would change his mind, to suit the studio, change Hellraiser to male and add a female cenobite to include the original female leader that he wanted. Oddly,

the male character of Frank was not changed nor was the character of Kristy other than to erase the fact she was in love with her father, which would not have gotten by the film censors. Since Kristy nor Frank was changed to accommodate the now male cenobite, the gender lines in the film are blurred, and the main subplot of the film was to focus on pain and pleasure.

Kristy is not a final girl because she does change to become masculine and she does not defeat the cenobites, but instead makes a deal with them to give them Frank who has escaped them. She even allows for the death of her stepmother, Julia, because she wants to save herself. The cenobites only kill Frank, and Julia, Frank, and Kristy commit the rest of the deaths in part one. Julia would have come the closest to be a final girl, but she is not only too old to be a final girl but also was a killer who was helping Frank use blood and the life force of the victims to regrow his body. It was through the act of trying to help Frank that Julia came the closest to transforming and taking on masculine traits, but she is not the one that did the gruesome destruction of the bodies but instead used her femininity to lure the men into the attic for Frank to kill.

Even in part two, Kristy is not a final girl because then it is up to Tiffany to save the day and she would have been the final girl, but Kristy does not die but instead is a hindrance to Tiffany who should have been the final girl. Julia is also the central villain rather than Hellraiser himself, so the idea of a deformed killer is not right to this part either because Julia is a resurrected dead woman who is trying to reform her humanity rather than a deformed human.

The cenobites themselves also do not fit the mold of the deformed killer who is a part of the final girl formula either since every one of them are creatures of Hell who were once living but have not been able to recover their missing humanity in a long time. None of the cenobites can do what they want as they are just members of the Theologians of the Gash and must serve

the ruler of Hell known as the Leviathan. Since they are not really able to freely think and make their own choices, they are just servants following orders to bring ultimate pleasure (torture) to whoever opens the puzzle box, Lament Configuration, no matter if they are a child, innocent such as Kristy was, or someone seeking the box such as Frank. While they made a deal with Kristy in part one, it was only to save their jobs and ensure they did not get killed for allowing a soul to escape Hell.

Overall, both movies do not use POV shots because it focuses on a tight shot to focus on the gore. The film was supposed to shock and awe audiences, which it did, but it was not a murder mystery such as *Friday the 13th* nor was it meant to confuse and keep the audience in suspense such as *ANOE* was. The purpose of this film was to explore those that are on a quest to find the ultimate pleasure that is beyond this world and the consequences of seeking to live a life based solely on pleasure. The film was not concerned with POV shots since the characters had to open the puzzle box to call the cenobites from Hell, so it was not a mystery, such as in part one of *Friday the 13th*. The Cenobites always are side characters to their movies, so they do not cause the shift of identification for the viewer but instead, the living female characters are the reason for the shifting identification of the viewer.

Clover never researched this franchise to see that with no final girl, no Norman Bates style killer, and multiple human villains how the audience would identify. It turns out that viewers picked the two strong female leads in Julia and Kristy in part one and Tiffany and Kristy in part two. The reason for the shift is that both Julia and Kristy start as innocent heroes, and Julia ends up being the villain after Kristy at Frank's request. Kristy starts innocently as well and ends up trading Julia's life for her own to avoid the cenobites. The viewer can identify with the anti-hero that Kristy becomes and the fallen hero that Julia becomes. The character of Frank was

designed to showcase the disgust of a society toward someone who lives a life solely for their pleasure. It was almost the same in part two with Julia now taking the place of Frank and Kristy becoming the fallen hero with Tiffany remaining the innocent hero.

Nowell did not discuss *Hellraiser* mostly due to the nature of the film being later in the cycle of slasher films. The film was Dimensions Films' answer to needing a shocking movie to compete with the emerging trend of torture-porn films that were being disguised as slasher films during the late 1980s. It was a trend by then to include young characters as the lead to the many dupe movies of *Friday the 13th* and *Halloween* and even the *ANOE*S series. Barker had initially written in *Hellbound Heart* for Kristy to be older, somewhere in her mid-20s, but it was changed for the film due to difficulty finding a cheap actress willing to do the movie. It was not a business decision to include a female lead as Nowell concludes but rather demand needed to create shock and gore.

Psychoanalytic theory

The shifting viewing of identification is missing in this series since the movie focuses itself on pleasure, pain, sadism, and masochism. The only shift in identification the viewer experiences is the shift in identifying with Julia as a hero to villain, Kristy as the hero to anti-hero, Kristy again as anti-hero to well-meaning villain, and Tiffany as an innocent hero to traumatized hero. None of the scholars mention how a slasher film can operate without the identification between the viewer and the sadistic/masochistic viewing, but *Hellraiser* included the shift in the main plot of the story with Frank and later Julia in part two.

The sibling conflict theory is present in the two parts of the series, though because Julia is more like an older sibling than a stepmother. Kristy is also like an older sibling to Tiffany in part two, and both women are willing to allow the younger sibling to die to save themselves. The

cenobites are so far removed from their humanity that they are not able to be older siblings but rather just creatures following orders. It does bear mentioning that Frank and Julia's husband are brothers, and Frank, the older sibling, does end up killing his younger brother. He does not do it to erase his younger brother but rather because he needs his skin to become fully resurrected.

Narratology

Kendrick would have been disappointed to study *Hellraiser* because the narrative is straightforward with minimal usage of the diegetic space being messed with. The moments that the Uncanny appear are often moments to foreshadow within the plot itself. A mention of the doubling is when Julia looks at Frank in his bloody bandages and no longer fears him or is disgusted by him but instead sees him as her former and now current lover. This doubling back to his humanity would be repeated in part two, with Julia herself now being the one in the bloody bandages and being a lover to the doctor who is trying to take over Hell. Kristy is also a moment of the Uncanny as she is the only person who has gone to Hell, made a deal with the cenobites, and then resumed her healthy life as if she did not discover the puzzle box that opens Hell and calls the cenobites for someone. The dragon that appears at the end of part one and two is also a bit of the Uncanny as the creature seems to be a member from Hell who is serving the masters of Hell to save and move the puzzle box. The odd being from Hell who hands the puzzle box over to the next victim is also Uncanny. The dragon, much like the creature, seems to be operating in both the real world and in Hell as if they both belong in Hell and on Earth.

Trauma Theory

The trauma of the main characters has already been discussed in chapter one, but the trauma of *Hellraiser* himself has not. The cenobites were all living beings at one point who were chosen by the puzzle box to become cenobites and serve Hell. The female cenobite was shown to

be a beautiful lawyer who was changed into a bald scarred cenobite, Hellraiser was transformed from a World War I Army Captain to a cenobite with pins in his head, chattering teeth cenobite was a 12-year-old boy, and slob cenobite was a fat man beforehand.

The trauma that they experience transforming into soulless creatures of Hell is repeated as they torture the people who open the puzzle box, but they were also people who open the box for pleasure. They all lack the pleasure they sought out initially as they are now servants, so none of the cenobites were able to process what drove them to the point of opening the box; they could not handle the transformation into cenobites, nor the forever denial of their pleasure as they serve Hell. Therefore, not only do the cenobites serve Hell, but they like to personalize the torture that the victims of the puzzle box receive. An example is when they destroy Frank's beauty and tempt him with beautiful women that turn to stone and burn before his eyes since he was known to be vain and lustful in life.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS

Self-Harm Connections

Now that the connection to female viewers and their love of both the killer and victim has been established, what about the connection to self-harm? The statistics introduced at the beginning of the paper point to an overwhelming chance that most of the females who are viewing slasher films are also committing self-harm. This paper will not attempt to state for sure whether the female audience is or is not committing self-harm conclusively due to a needed human study testing and the need for self-disclosure that often victims of self-harm avoid. The paper will draw the connection to self-harm and female viewers based on 67% of young women who do commit self-harm at the same ages that are the same years for high attendance to slasher films.

It is not a coincidence that all three of the slasher franchises that have been studied in this paper feature moments of self-harm in every sequel that is discussed. For example, Nancy has her wrists cut by Freddy, but has it blamed on her in part one, Kristen is almost burned alive and has slashed wrists at the beginning of part three or even the fact that Freddy drowns Joey in section four and it looks like he committed suicide. Rod's death in part one is blamed on self-harm that went too far and caused his hanging. *Friday the 13th* also features self-harm of Tina in part seven as Dr. Crews accuses, rightly so, her of harming herself to deal with her psychic powers. Jason does not cause any harm that others view as self-harm, such as Freddy does, but he is exposed to the self-harm that the teens are doing to themselves. Tommy, in chapter four, harms himself to get Jason's attention, and even in parts one and two, Alice and other teens harm themselves to try to avoid Jason and Pamela.

Even *Hellraiser* features self-harm of Kristy and Amanda as both have breakdowns from their past traumas and the current trauma of fighting the cenobites. Julia's quick marriage to Frank's brother is also a form of self-harm, and so is the need for Frank to chase pleasure to the point of opening the puzzle box.

The puzzle box and the avoidance of Jason, along with Freddy, all point to each of the films having a major point of self-harm being connected to the main characters. These three slasher franchises have two elements in common with each other. The first element is that each of the films would redesign and inspire dozens of copycat slasher films trying to cash in on the success of these franchises. The second common element to the franchises is the fact that the writers/directors are different from most of the writers who made slasher films during this period. Clive Barker is an author first then a playwright, Wes Craven was an English professor then a director, and Sean S. Cunningham was a producer turned writer and director.

Each of the directors of these franchises was after a way to draw in the crowds, and the studies on self-harm were beginning to be reported in the 1980s along with dangerous behaviors that the teens were engaging in and the lack of parental support the teens had. It is accurate to say that Wes Craven, Sean S. Cunningham, and Clive Barker all worked in the element of self-harm to draw in more females to the audience. It was no secret to the directors and writers of the slasher films that females were attending the movie premieres in large groups and that self-harm was higher in females either. The director Wes Craven was a former English professor and more importantly, was also a father who consulted with his then teen daughter for decisions while making the first *ANOEES* (*Never Sleep Again: The Legacy of a Nightmare On Elm Street*, 2010). It was quickly proven not only by the production studios that teens were the biggest audience, as discussed in the introduction of this paper, but that Blockbuster was also concerned that horror

movies made the bulk of teen rentals each month as they were interested in the sales predictions of upcoming movies coming to VHS for rentals. Craven wanted to make sure he could make a movie that was not only intelligent but would be able to appeal to young teens without boring them. He had a big reason to make sure *ANOES* appealed to teens rather than adults, and that was because he needed the movie to sell well in the theaters and VHS rental as he had already bankrupted one movie studio, Smart Egg Productions, trying to film *ANOES* and he was in danger of bankrupting New Line Cinema.

Sean S. Cunningham was trying to cash in on the success of *Halloween*, and that meant he was following John Carpenter's work prior to 1979. Carpenter himself was also a father but a director who studied psychology as he enjoyed incorporating any psychology theories he could in his films. The film *Halloween* plays heavily on the psychology of the mind of teens and has the plot of a true sociopath who is just out to kill. Cunningham attempting to make *Friday the 13th* a dupe for *Halloween* meant he was incorporating the psychology of self-harm and trauma to mimic *Halloween*. Cunningham needed part two to do well because it was his first chance to write and direct a movie after being handed over the rights to the film from Victor Miller, so he needed to make sure Paramount Studios was able to sell to the audience that had to watch part one the most. The biggest audience of part one was teens as Blockbuster and Neilson had tracked it. He was not able to stray too far from the minimal gore used in part one because Paramount wanted it to be as close to the minimal gore used in *Halloween* which meant the scenes of violence were directed toward the teens and how they were mishandling the stress of Jason.

Barker himself studied sadism and masochism and Freud's theories to use in his novels and then screenplays. He was also concerned about making a horror film that could shock in the beginning era of torture-porn and over-the-top slasher films. Dimension Films wanted Barker to

focus less on erotic violence and more on gore, which he fought but compromised some of the more key scenes to keep his message of self-pleasure intact. The message also portrays the self-harming nature of the characters because they all make decisions to harm themselves to find pleasure which even includes the decision of Kristy to let Julia die at the end of part one. Kristy made a choice knowing Frank had killed her father and she still could have allowed Hellraiser to take her, which was what he had been told to do as a servant to the box, but she sacrificed Julia as not only a chance to live but a chance to have a pleasurable life with her boyfriend. When she went back on her deal and the contract of the puzzle box, she marked herself for future harm because no human can escape the cenobites if they open the box.

Finally, each of the dozens and dozens of slasher films that occurred between 1980 with the premiere of *Friday the 13th* to 1984's premiere of *ANOE* to the 1987 premiere of *Hellraiser*, were following the formula of these franchises for one reason. The top grossing slasher films out of the 1980s are: *Friday the 13th* with \$380.6 million as a franchise and part one making 39 million, *A Nightmare on Elm Street* making \$370.5 million as a franchise and part one making 25.5 million, *Halloween* making \$308.5 million as a franchise and the first film making 47 million, *Texas Chainsaw Massacre* \$199.3 million as a franchise and *Hellraiser* making \$48.5 million as a franchise with part one making 14 million (*Imdb*, 2019). Each of the many dupes for these movies also inspired successful slasher franchises with *Friday the 13th* inspiring the most such as *Summer Camp Nightmare*, *Madman*, *Cheerleader Camp*, *Twisted Nightmare*, *The Burning*, and most notably the *Sleepaway Camp* franchise. *ANOE* inspired many dupes as well, such as the *House* and *Basket Case* franchises. *Hellraiser* may have happened late in the 1980s for slasher films but did inspire the *Puppet Master* franchise, which even made a puppet character that is an almost copy of Hellraiser himself. All the dupes and knockoff films followed

the formulas of the three franchises to cash in on the teen audience, which meant all the dupes were including some form of self-harm into their movies as well.

Overall, the conclusion that can be made with the limited scope of this paper is that slasher films did include self-harm, the three franchises were used as inspiration for other slasher films to incorporate self-harm into their movies, teens were the biggest consumers of slasher films, and girls were the highest number of teens who were watching slasher films. It is also known that 67% of teens also committed some form of self-harm while at the slasher movie viewing age, and all three directors/writers were aware of the emerging studies on self-harm and the popularity of teens watching slasher films.

What does the Female Viewer Connection (FVC) mean for Slasher Films?

The female viewer connection, as proposed by me, is an important part of slasher films because it is a theory that can be used to answer the question that haunts slasher films, which is why someone would watch them. This theory works to complete the research that Clover, Nowell, Brickman, and others started but did not fully answer the question as to why movie viewers would continue to watch the movies.

The theory also shines a light on the fact that females are often ignored when discussing the horror genre as a whole because of the preconceived notion that women do not like violence, nudity, and gore. In addition to the fact that females are often ignored, this theory also helps to shine a better light on those films that are still banned for their violence and gore to show the movies are more than just blood and violence toward women.

The FVC also validates the subgenre's writers, actors, and directors as more than those that just enjoyed a quick shock and scare and brought these films alongside more praised horror films such as *Psycho* or *The Birds*. The connection is also essential when being applied to the

movie to clear the notion that slasher films hate women because of the massive amounts of female deaths that occur.

The Future of Slasher Films, The Female Viewer Connection, and Further Research

Slasher films seem to be making a comeback with new movies and remakes of the established franchises, but all are still not only following the formula of the subgenre but are also including the FVC theory as well. The FVC theory has a great future not only when applied to these three franchises but also other well-known and lesser-known slasher subgenres. It can be applied to many films, but most importantly, it can be used to clear the air with the ineffectual and damning research that does currently exist on slasher films by those such as Clover. The FVC theory can be used to reverse some of the myths and preconceptions of slasher films that paint the subgenre in a negative light. The most important part of the theory's future is that it can be used to bring the subgenre from the movie screen to the academic setting with the change of future research by other students of horror studies. The future for further analysis using FVC theory is only as endless as the many slasher films that can be dug from the grave of VHS hell and studied.

WORKS CITED

- A Nightmare On Elm Street*. Directed by Wes Craven. New Line Cinema, 1984.
- A Nightmare On Elm Street Part 2: Freddy's Revenge*. Directed by Jack Sholder. New Line Cinema, 1985.
- A Nightmare On Elm Street Part 3: Dream Warriors*. Directed by Chuck Russell. New Line Cinema, 1987.
- A Nightmare On Elm Street Part 4: Dream Master*. Directed by Renny Harlin. New Line Cinema, 1988.
- Anderson, Aaron. *Rethinking the Slasher Film: Violated Bodies and Spectators in Halloween, Friday the 13th, and A Nightmare on Elm Street*. 2013.
<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8021w3p5>. Accessed 1 May 2019.
- Barker, Clive. *The Hellbound Heart*. Harper, 1986.
- Brickman, Barbara Jane. "Brothers, Sisters, and Chainsaws: The Slasher Film as Locus for Sibling Rivalry." *Quarterly Review of Film & Video*, vol. 28, no. 2, Mar. 2011, pp. 135–154. *EBSCOhost*, doi:10.1080/10509200802530155. Accessed 15 November 2018.
- Carter, Sue. "Final Girls a Horror Trope Worth Revisiting." *Proquest*, July 21 2017, <https://search-proquest-com.marshall.idm.oclc.org/docview/1920644622?pq-origsite=summon>. Accessed 26 October 2019.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience*. John Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Creed, Barbara. *The Monstrous Feminine: Film, Feminism, Psychoanalysis*. Routledge, 1993.
- Clover, Carol J. *Men, Women, and Chainsaws*. Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Friday The 13th IV: The Final Chapter*. Directed by Joseph Zito. Paramount Pictures, 1984.
- Friday The 13th VI: Jason Lives*. Directed by Tom McLoughlin. Paramount Pictures, 1986.
- Friday The 13th VII: The New Blood*. Directed by John Carl Buechlar. Paramount Pictures, 1988.
- Giles, Dennis. "Conditions of Pleasure in Horror Cinema." *Planks of Reason: Essays on the Horror Film*. Revised Edition. Eds. Barry Keith Grant and Christopher Sharrett. Scarecrow, 2004.

- Healey, Justin. *Self-Harm and Young People*. Spinney Press, 2012. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx? direct=true&ab=nleb&AN=419838&site=ehost. live. Accessed 9 November 2018.
- Hellraiser*. Directed by Clive Barker. Film Futures, 1987.
- Hellbound: Hellraiser II*. Directed by Tony Randel. Film Futures, 1988.
- IMDB.com. *Top Horror Films of the 1980s*. 2019, <https://www.imdb.com/list/ls025745541/mediaviewer/rm1625668096>. Accessed 15 June 2019.
- Kendrick, James. "Razors in the Dreamscape: Revisiting A Nightmare on Elm Street and the Slasher Film." *Film Criticism*, vol. 33, no. 3, Spring 2009, pp. 17–33. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx? direct=true&db=aph&AN=47966996&site=ehost-live. Accessed 4 June 2019.
- Mercado, MC, Holland, K, Leemis, RW, Stone, DM, and Wang, J. Trends in Emergency Department Visits for Nonfatal Self-inflicted Injuries Among Young Aged 10 to 24 in the United States, 2001-2015. *JAMA*. 2017;318(19):1931-1933. doi:10.1001/jama.2017.13317. Accessed on 8 November 2018.
- Never Sleep Again: The Legacy of a Nightmare On Elm Street*. Directed by Andrew Kasch, 2010.
- Nowell, Richard. *Blood Money: A History of the First Teen Slasher Film Cycle*. Continuum, 2011. *EBSCOhost*, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx? direct=true&d. Accessed 8 July 2019.
- Silverman, Kaja. "Masochism and Subjectivity." *Framework*, vol 12, 1979, pp 5. www.blue-sunshine.com/tl_files/images/Week4-Clover-HerBodyHimself.pdf.
- Studlar, Gaylyn. *In the Realm of Pleasure: Von Sternberg, Dietrich, and the Masochistic Aesthetic*. Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Vaughn, Stephen. *Freedom and Entertainment: Rating the Movies in an Age of New Media*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Vulture*. Freddy Lives: An Oral History of A Nightmare On Elm Street, 2014, www.vulture.com/2014/10/nightmare-on-elm-street-oral-history.html. Accessed 12 May 2019.
- Williams, Linda. *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure, and the "Frenzy of the Visible."* University of California Press, 1989.

Wilson, Karina. 1980's Horror Films- Inside Out: Body Horror, *HorrorFilmHistory*, 2019, <http://www.horrorfilmhistory.com/index.php?pageID=1980s>. Accessed 15 June 2019.

APPENDIX A: LETTER FROM IRB



Office of Research Integrity

October 14, 2019

Stevie Steers
1200 E. 52nd Street, Apt. 101A
Austin, TX 78723

Dear Mr. Steers:

This letter is in response to the submitted thesis abstract entitled "*Slasher Films and Self-Harm: A Relationship of Self-Hatred and Trauma.*" After assessing the abstract, it has been deemed not to be human subject research and therefore exempt from oversight of the Marshall University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The Code of Federal Regulations (45CFR46) has set forth the criteria utilized in making this determination. Since the information in this study does not involve human subjects as defined in the above referenced instruction, it is not considered human subject research. If there are any changes to the abstract you provided then you would need to resubmit that information to the Office of Research Integrity for review and a determination.

I appreciate your willingness to submit the abstract for determination. Please feel free to contact the Office of Research Integrity if you have any questions regarding future protocols that may require IRB review.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Bruce F. Day'. The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped 'D' at the end.

Bruce F. Day, ThD, CIP
Director

WE ARE... MARSHALL.

One John Marshall Drive • Huntington, West Virginia 25755 • Tel 304/696-4303
A State University of West Virginia • An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer