

Top Gear's Target Audience (Revision)

I have had a long-standing love of the BBC car show *Top Gear*, to the point where I can identify the episode number from a particular quote. Many of my friends feel similarly. The difference is that my friends don't like cars, while I live and breathe gasoline fumes. The love of *Top Gear* is universal; I've met people on airplanes, at bars, and walking down the street who immediately recognize the name and are able to remember specific scenes, quote the hosts, or otherwise demonstrate an intimate knowledge of the program. So why is the show so well loved? How has the BBC managed to get so many people so interested in my favorite hobby? Other documentaries and automotive programs hardly get any recognition – you never hear anyone talking about *Modern Marvels* or *Ultimate Car Build-Off*. I believe that the reason for *Top Gear's* mass appeal is that the BBC has done away with many of the genre's historic formalities and instead focused on delivering entertainment as effectively as possible. This paper analyzes the documentary (defined as such by the hosts themselves in Series 12 Episode 2) in an effort to determine how the show has broken with genre conventions in order to make car culture more accessible to the average person without alienating die-hard car aficionados.

The love of *Top Gear* is universal. One columnist states, “occasionally offensive and entirely environmentally unfriendly, who watches this stuff? Okay I admit it: me. I love Top Gear. And I've only driven 30 miles in my life...But as one pundit wrote recently, it's not a show about cars, it's a show about blokes talking about cars.”¹ Another writer states that “Top Gear is pure escapism, perfect Sunday night entertainment.”²

¹ Plunkett, John. "Organ Grinder Blog." *Top Gear: 0 to offensive in 6.5 seconds*. Guardian.co.uk, 26 Jul 2006. Web. 8 Oct 2010. <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/organgrinder/2006/jul/26/topgearnoughttooffensivei>>.

² Plunkett. *0 to Offensive*.

That *Top Gear* is well loved is easy to prove; why it is so is a bit more difficult. Much of the love is better understood after reviewing the history and the context of the show. In its 1977 iteration, the show launched with the intent of presenting a look at cars and related safety issues, but viewership was lacking and the producers wanted to target a wider audience. The following year, the program transferred networks and added a female host in order to broaden the program's appeal with women.³ This had its intended effect, but not until Jeremy Clarkson signed on as a presenter in 1988 did viewership really take off. Over the course of nearly three decades, Clarkson – and his on-screen persona – catapulted the show to greatness, attracting over six million regular viewers.⁴ Deciding he had taken the show as far as it could go, Clarkson left the show in 1999 and ratings plummeted. Viewership was in freefall in 2002, when the BBC managed to rehire the presenter and gave him license to do as he saw fit with a new, expanded 60 minute time slot. The result was a show focused more on entertainment than education, featuring races, celebrity appearances, and general mayhem – while avoiding the typical fluff necessary in ad-supported TV, thanks to the BBC's sequestration of the national television licensing fee.⁵

This is the format of the show today, which is now shown in more than 100 countries and has spawned the UK's best-selling car magazine.⁶ Viewership outside the UK is similarly massive – the magazine editor states that, “We know that the show is the most pirated TV show in the world, beating programmes like *Lost* and *Desperate Housewives*.”⁷ The following is so big that the show has an (unofficial) “Top Gear Syndrome” named after it!⁸

³ Savage, Mark. "Top Gear's Chequered Past." *BBC NEWS*. BBC, 21 Sep 2006. Web. 07 Oct 2010. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/5367516.stm>>.

⁴ Savage. “Top Gear’s Chequered Past.”

⁵ Savage. “Top Gear’s Chequered Past.”

⁶ Boehm, John. "The making of Top Gear and the fate of season 10." *Idents.TV*, 18 Apr 2007. Web. 09 Oct 2010. <<http://idents.tv/blog/2007/04/18/the-making-of-top-gear-and-the-fate-of-season-10/>>.

⁷ Savage. “Top Gear’s Chequered Past.”

⁸ Urry, John. "Automobility, Car Culture and Weightless Travel: A Discussion Paper." *Project SenSusTech/Department of Sociology At Lancaster University* (1999): n. pag. Web. 09 Oct 2010.

Before getting deep into the discussion of genre and how *Top Gear* fits and breaks the mold of typical documentaries, it would be helpful to first explore the definition of a documentary. According to Stella Bruizzi, the aim of a documentary is to serve as a representational medium and a film of record. A documentary should feature unadulterated truth and be filmed objectively.⁹ These films are the sum of facts, a compilation of images that record life as it is, not necessarily as we perceive it. In his *Introduction to Documentary*, Bill Nichols states that documentaries focus on the ability to convey to the viewer a feeling of authenticity, often to answer historical questions.¹⁰ Documentaries offer us a likeness of reality, represent the interests of others (filmmakers often act as public representatives), and lastly, they put the case for a particular point of view in front of the viewer, much as a lawyer tries to convince a jury using a preponderance of evidence.¹¹

Historically, that has meant dry, informative pieces that are often boring to view and could hardly be considered “entertainment.” Still, not all documentaries conform to such standards. Michael Moore, for example, has produced several satirical documentaries that have the look and feel of a documentary but which use comedy to mock the featured subject in a tongue-in-cheek manner. Nichols would argue that yes, this is a documentary, though not in the conventional sense (Nichols’ view should also be taken with a grain of salt, as he says that every film is a documentary, as it represents either desires or realities surrounding those involved with its creation).¹² Nichols and others are of the mindset that even “mockumentaries,” which use satire to portray fictional realities so convincingly that they can pass as a truthful documentary to

⁹ Bruzzi, Stella. *New documentary: a critical introduction*. Psychology Press, 2000. 11. Print.

¹⁰ Nichols, Bill. *Introduction to documentary*. Indiana Univ Pr, 2001. xiii.

¹¹ Nichols, 2-4.

¹² Nichols, xii-2.

many people, are a subgenre of the field.¹³ Regardless of whose camp you fall into, a documentary at a minimum is intended to reflect our daily life by presenting information as objectively as possible.

Now that we know what to look for, it would be wise to examine the structure of a typical *Top Gear* episode. These contain, at a minimum, “the news,” “power laps,” and “star in a reasonably priced car.” “The news” is a look at what’s hot in the world of cars, racing, and automobilia. “Power laps” features cars of all ilks being driven by the show’s professional racing driver, “The Stig,” and “star in a reasonably priced car” debases celebrities by forcing them behind the wheel of a compact, stick-shift car and pitting them against a record board of their colleagues’ best lap times. Beyond these basic segments, most episodes also feature “the cool wall,” “races,” “challenges,” or “unusual reviews” (there is no such thing as a typical review, by *Top Gear* standards). In particular, the races, challenges, and reviews epitomize *Top Gear*’s character. They range from basic car comparisons to racing cars against planes, speedboats, and bullet trains, all in the name of entertainment. These segments are edgy, fast-paced, and chock-full of humor and acerbic wit, making them appeal not only to car lovers, but to humor or thrill lovers as well.

From a first glance, *Top Gear* might appear to fit the classical definition of a documentary. Like many great documentaries, *Top Gear* strives to utilize beautiful camerawork and a well-paired soundtrack to create a realistic environment. The use of media is clearly important to the producers; the cinematography and soundtrack must be perfect before the editing team is happy, which is a struggle in many cases (Andy Willman, the Producer, often speaks of this struggle on his blog). As Jan Simons mentions, new media seems to be struggling

¹³ Brian, Greg. "25 Years After This is Spinal Tap: Has the Mockumentary Become Too Ironic?." *Associated Content*. N.p., 15 Apr 2009. Web. 1 Nov 2010.
<http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/1640994/25_years_after_this_is_spinal_tap_has.html?cat=40>.

to return to the ways of old, and in many cases, this fight is visible in the cameramen's work to capture the feel of motion, speed, and excitement on film.¹⁴ If they can capture it convincingly and successfully, much as the early films of trains heading towards a (more naïve) audience did, they can convey their message across cultures effectively. Simons states that "film is a language" that can unify people of very different backgrounds, and this is critical to *Top Gear's* mass approval.¹⁵ Especially in later episodes, the use of media – bringing the Internet into the news segments, referencing film and other TV shows, or citing the newspaper – demonstrates that the newer medium of "digital age TV" has been able to build, "combine, integrate, resolve or even transcend contradictions and oppositions manifest in those old media."¹⁶

Despite the early indications that *Top Gear* might be effectively viewed as a documentary, upon a second look, the show seems to cast aside all of the typical conventions of the genre. It is not dry, focuses on characters, and most importantly, is not intended to be informative. The script of the show appears aimed squarely at entertaining the audience, rather than informing them, almost as if the producers realize that there are other shows that do the "informing part" of the documentary more effectively. But, without informing the audience, what good is a documentary?

Horace Newcomb describes genre as being defined by "their conventions or repeated, expected, to-a-degree-predictable qualities."¹⁷ *Top Gear* spits in the face of their professed genre, taking what is supposedly "inherently conservative" and contorting it until the genre only defines what the show is not.¹⁸ Newcomb does have some good points, in that *Top Gear's* genre

¹⁴ Simons, Jan. "New Media as Old Media: Cinema." *The New Media Book*. 'Ed'. Dan Harries. London: BFI, 2002. Print. 235.

¹⁵ Simons. "New Media as Old Media." 239.

¹⁶ Simons. "New Media as Old Media." 236.

¹⁷ Newcomb, Horace. "Narrative and Genre." *Sage Handbook of Media Studies*. 'Ed'. John Downing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004. Print. 423.

¹⁸ Newcomb. "Narrative and Genre." 425.

is a bit of a formula or an assembly line, creating a sense of industrial efficiency felt in the episodes, allowing themes to be carried over with little work.¹⁹ This works well to the show's effect, as audiences do not seem to tire of the same pattern being rehashed day-in and day-out.²⁰ One positive review even stated, "So similar is each show that you're often halfway in before you realise [sic] you're watching a repeat."²¹

The beauty of breaking the typical genre structure of a documentary is mass appeal. Each viewer has his or her own preferred segments, each of which have enough entertainment value to instill the viewer with staying power capable of keeping the audience sitting down for the entire episode. For car buffs and comedians, the polarizing, satirical but still au courant news is the draw, the epic races draw in a wide audience of speed lovers, the challenges are for brand enthusiasts, and the stars might attract someone who isn't interested in cars at all, just to name a few examples.

Beyond entertaining segments, *Top Gear* is what Newcomb would describe as a cumulative narrative, in that each episode can be watched alone or as part of the larger series (for example, the news segments reference previous news items or the lap times board mentions previous guest stars). This rewards the viewers "with the pleasure of remembering these references, [and] understanding complexities rising from new character developments."²² This is especially evident in the "cool wall" segment of the show, where viewers are rewarded for their understanding, and aligning with, the views of a particular host. Similarly, these episodes are

¹⁹Newcomb. "Narrative and Genre." 424.

²⁰Newcomb. "Narrative and Genre." 424.

²¹ Plunkett. *0 to Offensive*.

²²Newcomb. "Narrative and Genre." 422.

broadcast semi-regularly, allowing programmers to promote the next series by “appealing to viewers to return months later to follow the exploits of characters...”^{23 24}

This is a critical point to note. *Top Gear* develops characters, in order to add “a layer of story and plot.”²⁵ Additionally, characters are critical to the success and mass appeal of the series. Hosts Jeremy Clarkson, James May, and Richard Hammond are the personalities behind the show, and so well defined are their characters that episodes at times feel like a sitcom. Each one has his own traits and the script plays to these preconceived personas – Clarkson is recently quoted as having said that, should any of the presenters die, they could quickly be replaced by anyone else who is “slow and pedantic, short and irritating, [or] big and bombastic.”²⁶ Even their fashion style (or lack thereof) is unique to each character across seasons, though the most unique thing about the presenters is their interaction, saying “one secret to the show’s success is their often toxic relationship.”²⁷ They are so well renowned and integral to the show that some videos of Clarkson on YouTube had over 938,000 views before the BBC managed to take it down.²⁸

While each host has a unique flair, this is especially true of the show’s only truly fictional character, “The Stig.” “The Stig” is the show’s professional racing driver, an impartial judge of a car’s performance ability on the racetrack and the fact that he is not based on reality lends itself to the belief that *Top Gear* is actually a mockumentary. The entire cachet of the Stig is that supposedly nobody, not even the other hosts of the show, knows the true identity of the driver (this changed recently, in a tremendously scandalous lawsuit – I will be interested to see how this changes peoples’ response to the show). He speaks only in Morse code and his face is always

²³Newcomb. "Narrative and Genre." 422.

²⁴"The Boys Are Back." Web. 10 Oct 2010. <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z1h1PrjUImE>>.

²⁵Newcomb. "Narrative and Genre." 422.

²⁶"Top Gear." *60 Minutes*. CBS: 24 OCT 2010. Television. 1 Nov 2010.

<<http://www.finalgear.com/news/2010/10/25/the-full-top-gear-uk-segment-from-60-minutes/>>.

²⁷"Top Gear." *60 Minutes*.

²⁸Savage. "Top Gear’s Chequered Past."

obscured beneath a racing helmet's tinted visor. This brings in an element of mystery to the show, again defying the typical conventions of the documentary genre – and providing the show with ample funding to continue production. The Stig is “the perfect marketing tool, and his image helps sell the brand across the globe – subsidizing one of the biggest budgets on the BBC,” says *60 Minutes* producer Steve Kroft.²⁹



*Top Gear uses viral media to keep the mystique of The Stig alive after the most recent driver revealed his identity in a tell-all book.*³⁰

© BBC Worldwide. All rights reserved. This content is excluded from our Creative Commons license. For more information, see <http://ocw.mit.edu/fairuse>.

While every episode seems to defy the “old” documentary genre in favor of a unique *Top Gear* classification, some episodes are better at identifying this disparity than others. One such example is season 12 episode 6, version with edited soundtrack available on iTunes (the US has

²⁹ “Top Gear.” *60 Minutes*.

³⁰ “Intrepid Reporters Stumble Upon ‘Stig Farm.’” *TopGear.Com*. BBC, 29 OCT 2010. Web. 1 Nov 2010. <<http://transmission.blogs.topgear.com/2010/10/29/stig-farm/>>.

far stricter licensing requirements for music than the UK), which detracts somewhat from the overall presence of the episode.

The episode opens to a shot of the studio filled with two of the hosts, May and Hammond, providing a quick bit of banter before diving into typecasting Hammond by playing to his small size and having him drive a lightweight car around a racetrack for one of the show's more "serious" reviews. The topic of the review is anything but standard, focusing more on the speed of the car than its relevance to any members of the audience, and the camerawork is more typical of an action movie than a documentary. The quick camera cuts, unique angles, and combination of performance statistics with a bellowing soundtrack and dominating action shots combine to form a very real sense of speed that is not present in other shows, automotive or otherwise. Also atypical of automotive shows is the break midway through the review to show a graph plotting how "good" a car is versus how embarrassing it is to be in. It is informative but not in the sense that it reflects reality directly, as most old-fashioned documentaries would.

The review remains artistic and turns into a comparison through a series of artistic balloon breaking shots filmed on a high-speed camera, something only possible with the BBC's tremendous resources. The artistry of the segment becomes more pronounced as the segment wears on, when the viewer is shown a clip of a car driving at high speed along a race track and the frames are timed perfectly to ensure the wheels appear as though they are standing still. This would be over the top camerawork for most shows, but combines to convey a feeling of excitement when the technique is used in *Top Gear*.

The next segment is a typical "power lap," designed to compare the two reviewed vehicles. Hammond transitions into the clip by introducing the Stig in the usual way, making a typical "some say..." comment, the second half being "that I haven't done one of these in a long

time and I've forgotten to make up a second thing.” This breaks the third wall a bit by demonstrating the Stig's importance as a character, and Hammond's comment illustrates Newcomb's point that viewers familiar with the series find comfort in repeated themes. A quick segment determining which car is faster follows, ending by returning the viewer to the studio once more.

Next is the news segment, which begins, as it often does, by poking fun at the presenters. Everything from the hosts' winning surveys about “oddest crushes” to synthetic saliva is a topic fit for discussion, and the more it embarrasses a host or demonstrates the camaraderie among them, the bigger a hit it is. No documentary would ever dare to speak this much about its characters, instead favoring a detailed discussion of the nuances of their topics. *Top Gear* is clearly about people as much as it is about cars.

Finally, the presenters make their way to the subject of automotive news. They live out their stereotypes – Clarkson as the loud, brash host, May as the thinker, and Hammond as the pretty boy – through their discussion of particular makes and models of vehicles. They manage the discussion in such a way that their hyperbole and satire make the viewer laugh, even if they do not know anything about the cars being referenced. Similar to a sitcom, the news also has running gags (not in this episode, but May's “Dacia Sandero” production news comes to mind) and often short skits to liven up the only somewhat dry bit left in the show.

In this episode, the news gives way to a bit of a mashup between a challenge and a comparison. Clarkson and May are tasked with finding a “good” communist car. Wearing costumes to fit the theme (something most documentaries would shy away from), the two fight to locate the worst car ever produced by a communist country. In a bit of political satire, they even have a British car on the show as part of the running.

The challenge has lively bits involving drag races between two Russian cars, a Ford, and a dog (the dog comes in second), a Polish car being dropped from a crane (a reference to a previous episode), and another Russian car set ablaze (a very *Top Gear* sendoff for any vehicle). Throughout, the rivalry between May and Clarkson is present, with the two presenters crashing into one another and Clarkson even joking that he “accidentally killed May” before moving quickly to another segment. The scene ends with the testing of an SUV, where Clarkson accidentally sprays May in the face with mud (though any viewers who have been watching long enough to get a sense of his character know Clarkson did it on purpose) and the pair declaring, together, that communism has never turned out a good vehicle.

Back in the studio, this episode featured Boris Johnson, the Mayor of London, as the “star in a reasonably priced car” (SRPC). It is clear from the get-go that, unlike other documentaries, *Top Gear* is a massively important PR venue to capture. Just by showing up, Johnson gained credibility among car people and other, more casual *Top Gear* viewers – even if he does lose the arguments on his environmental agenda to Clarkson’s imposing self. As usual, SRPC pokes fun at celebrities and debases them in an effort to bring them closer to the viewership. Much as the show brings Lamborghinis into the living room, they similarly bring Tom Cruise to the kitchen table. In this case, the Mayor is embarrassed by his own performance, spinning out on every corner and making funny noises – something that is not at all atypical for a *Top Gear* interview.

The show ends on what should be a serious note, with Clarkson reading an obviously faked letter from a concerned viewer. He asks, “Why do you not test cars properly anymore? Have you forgotten how?” Of course, Clarkson’s response is typically over the top in what is my favorite segment in the show’s 34-year history.

He begins the review of a Ford Fiesta normally, and the music and camerawork are stunning, as is typical of the show's review segments, but it quickly devolves into something far less relevant and a whole lot funnier. It starts with basic questions, like, "is the car practical?" which gets a considered response before Clarkson goes on to demonstrate that, yes, you can fit a Zebra's head in the trunk, or how the back seat is perfect for your 2.2 kids (complete with a shot of a sliced mannequin). The segments alternate between the absurd and the ironically mundane, with Clarkson reviewing the performance of a non-performance car using such gems as "it'll easily do 70, which is the maximum you can do in Britain, so that's good" (clearly a response to wide criticism that Clarkson encourages driving excessively fast). This appears to be poking fun at typical, dry documentaries, as well.

The best part of the episode comes next, when Clarkson asks "what if I'm being chased by baddies in a Corvette?" This scene epitomizes the *Top Gear* experience. Unlike most documentaries, the show has a tremendous budget and leverage to its advantage and was able to rent out a shopping mall to actually live out this ridiculous scenario. It begins with Clarkson driving inside a shopping mall with a Corvette immediately on his tail. Clarkson is quick to point out that "I'm breaking the speed limit in a shopping center!" alluding to his previous quote about the 70 MPH speed limit and shattering any semblance of sanity he might have had. The camera cuts that follow are dramatic, and the thumping bass of the music cultivate a feel of excitement.

The last segment is another absurd one, which answers "What if the British Royal Marines ask me to take part in a beach assault?" We see Clarkson on a boat that is holding his car and several Marines, charging toward the shore. The review tries to be serious throughout this, showing that the cup holders are the "perfect size for a smoke grenade" and finishing on the note that the "carpets are excellent! No mud stains from the Marine's boots!"

The context for these scenes makes them all the more amusing. Clarkson is being ironic in attempting to answer criticism that the show is no longer “serious” about cars. These scenes manage to tackle that fallacy while still being hilariously entertaining – in essence, demonstrating what the entire show is about.

So, having examined a typical episode of *Top Gear*, is it a documentary? This episode is not the stereotypical dry, informative and boring documentary of old, but at least by some accounts it meets the definition. It is a film of record – yes, the hosts did actually drive the cars they were seen reviewing – but at the same time, it breaks some of the most basic definitions. *Top Gear* is often scripted and makes use of the tricks available in cinema to present a reality that may not really be there. It is certainly not unadulterated, and while the reviews are sometimes objective, at other times they are entirely subjective – the Tesla Roadster review is the perfect example of this (Clarkson claimed the car had failed early during testing to prove the point that electric cars are not the future, while in fact it had performed perfectly well). Other segments, like “the cool wall,” are based entirely on the premise of subjectivity. Despite all this, the show does reflect one aspect of society well: the desire for wealth, power, and speed.

As with any good documentary, the segments are not merely the sum of facts (accuracy aside) – they are much more than that. They can create feelings of passion or excitement, and give depth to something that might otherwise go overlooked. For these reasons, *Top Gear*, while unconventional, can be classified as a satirical documentary rather than the more fictional mockumentary. The show reflects aspects of reality using humor and pop culture to increase relevance and understanding, with satire and tongue-in-cheek humor revealing the highlights of the world around us. 60 Minutes seem onboard with the idea that *Top Gear* is a faux-

documentary, stating that “many of their segments are vaguely disguised as pieces of consumer journalism” – though they don’t seem to mind, either.³¹

Ultimately, *Top Gear* defies being typecast. Instead, it draws from several popular genres and mashes them together while providing characters who manage to pull them together in a coherent fashion. In doing so, the BBC has taken the notion of car culture, a concept once foreign to the majority of the world, and given it mass appeal. One critic put it best, saying, “there is nothing on television that comes close to *Top Gear*, it is the most unique and engaging hour on television, it transcends whatever genre its considered to exist in, and presents cinematography that rivals that of any movie, along with storylines vastly more compelling then [sic] most traditionally scripted stuff on television, it’s simply brilliant.”³² The show has incredible viewership and the hosts and their antics have made loving Lamborghinis cool again, and for that, I thank them. Jeremy Clarkson, the man who broke *Top Gear* out of its shell, had this to say about the show’s massive reach: “[our viewership] puts us on level terms with *Eastenders*. It means we are, give or take, the most watched show on the BBC. And that’s just in Britain. Factor in the rest of the world, and TG is effing massive.”³³ Excellent.

³¹ “*Top Gear*.” *60 Minutes*.

³² Beohm, John. "Masterpiece Theatre: The Return of Top Gear" *Idents.TV*, 9 Oct 2007. Web. 09 Oct 2010. <<http://idents.tv/blog/2007/10/09/masterpiece-theatre-the-return-of-top-gear/>>.

³³ Beohm. "The making of *Top Gear* and the fate of season 10."

WORKS CITED

- Beohm, John. "The making of Top Gear and the fate of season 10." Idents.TV, 18 Apr 2007. Web. 09 Oct 2010. <<http://idents.tv/blog/2007/04/18/the-making-of-top-gear-and-the-fate-of-season-10/>>.
- Beohm, John. "Masterpiece Theatre: The Return of Top Gear" Idents.TV, 9 Oct 2007. Web. 09 Oct 2010. <<http://idents.tv/blog/2007/10/09/masterpiece-theatre-the-return-of-top-gear/>>.
- Brian, Greg. "25 Years After This is Spinal Tap: Has the Mockumentary Become Too Ironic?." *Associated Content*. N.p., 15 Apr 2009. Web. 1 Nov 2010. <http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/1640994/25_years_after_this_is_spinal_tap_has.html?cat=40>.
- Bruzzi, Stella. *New documentary: a critical introduction*. Psychology Press, 2000. 11. Print.
- FinalGear.Com Forums
- "Intrepid Reporters Stumble Upon 'Stig Farm'." *TopGear.Com*. BBC, 29 OCT 2010. Web. 1 Nov 2010. <<http://transmission.blogs.topgear.com/2010/10/29/stig-farm/>>.
- Newcomb, Horace. "Narrative and Genre." *Sage Handbook of Media Studies*. 'Ed'. John Downing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004. Print.
- Nichols, Bill. *Introduction to documentary*. Indiana Univ Pr, 2001. xiii.
- Plunkett, John. "Organ Grinder Blog." *Top Gear: 0 to offensive in 6.5 seconds*. Guardian.co.uk, 26 Jul 2006. Web. 8 Oct 2010. <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/organgrinder/2006/jul/26/topgearnoughttooffensivei>>
- Savage, Mark. "Top Gear's Chequered Past." *BBC NEWS*. BBC, 21 Sep 2006. Web. 07 Oct 2010. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/5367516.stm>>.
- "Series 12/Episode 2." *Top Gear*. BBC Two: 09 Nov 2008. Television. 08 Oct 2010.
- "Series 12/Episode 2." *Top Gear*. BBC Two: 07 Dec 2008. Television. 07 Oct 2010.
- Simons, Jan. "New Media as Old Media: Cinema." *The New Media Book*. 'Ed'. Dan Harries. London: BFI, 2002. Print.
- "Top Gear." *60 Minutes*. CBS: 24 Oct 2010. Television. 1 Nov 2010. <<http://www.finalgear.com/news/2010/10/25/the-full-top-gear-uk-segment-from-60-minutes/>>.
- "The Boys Are Back." Web. 10 Oct 2010. <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z1h1PrjUImE>>.
- Urry, John. "Automobility, Car Culture and Weightless Travel: A Discussion Paper." *Project SenSusTech/Department of Sociology At Lancaster University* (1999): n. pag. Web. 09 Oct 2010.

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

CMS.100 Introduction to Media Studies
Fall 2010

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.