

The annotated bibliography is a document that can grow as long as the teacher/writer continues to research and read about scholarly teaching practices. This document not only serves as a place to list texts that the teacher has read and reflected on; but, it is also a place to list areas and texts that the teacher would like to read in the future. This particular document emerged out of an independent study course and a requirement for the Preparing Future Faculty program. Bibliographies of texts on teaching are a great way to construct the proverbial filing cabinet full of articles that "make sense." An annotated bibliography is also useful in keeping track of quotes and passages that speak to you as a teacher.

---

## **Annotated Bibliography of Teaching Interests**

### **Introduction**

This annotated teaching bibliography is a growing document initiated by my participation in the Preparing Future Faculty program at Arizona State University. I use this to record most of the pedagogically-related texts I have read. This is a highly personalized document; I try to make the annotations meaningful to me and my future teaching wants, needs, and contexts.

### **Organizational Structure**

Since this document has started with my participation in a film teaching internship, I have blank spots left for more generalized pedagogical texts, teaching technologies, composition and writing, plus literature-related texts. Each general section is further subdivided into categories that work within that area. I've included an introductory blurb to sections that I think might need them.

### **General Pedagogy**

#### *Theory*

#### *Lessons/Activities*

Parsons, Les. *Response Journals*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1990.

Parsons shares who, when, where, how, and why students should keep learning journals.

Although this text is obviously for teachers of middle or high school, it is still extremely useful for ideas to use with students of any level. Parsons covers the issue of having to "grade" all of the journals. There are specific chapters on literature, media, conferences, and small-groups. He ends with a practical checklist on how to implement journals into one's pedagogy.

Wankat, Phillip, and Frank Oreovicz. "Class Preparation Time – How Much is Enough?" *ASEE Prism*. 10.1 (2000): 41. Tomorrow's Professor Msg.#257. ed. Rick Reis.

<http://cgi.stanford.edu/~dept-ctl/tomprof/posting.php?ID=257>. 12 December 2000.

Wankat and Oreovicz suggest that lesson planning be done in small chunks, spread out over time. First start by constructing a title and outline, lay it aside for a few days. Return to it, making sure you've covered all the points. Start filling-in examples. Use one example with lots of "what ifs," not a variety of examples. Lay the lesson aside again. For the third visit, fill-in the remaining details and plan for activity breaks (at least two for 50-80 minute sessions). Right before the lecture, review and mentally prep. You are ready to go.

I think that they leave out one major component that could take time: activity preparation. Many of my activities require different sorts of supplies that can take time. Otherwise, I think this is a good idea to follow, not allowing oneself to become wrapped up in a lesson.

## **Teaching Technologies**

*Computer Mediated Classrooms*

*Online Components*

Discussion Boards

Webpages

Horton, Sarah. *Web Teaching Guide: A Practical Approach to Creating Course Web Sites*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.

Horton discusses reasons and strategies for building a course web site that complements a face-to-face course. This is not a theoretical book, discussing the whys of using online learning environments. Instead, this book already assumes the teacher knows why s/he wants to incorporate online resources into her/his teaching, and gives detailed advice on how to succeed. The organizational pattern of the book acts as a checklist in developing a course web site, starting with research and planning and ending with evaluation. Horton gives detailed advice in the implementation sections, discussing highly technological (without being confusing) topics, such as the hows and whys of condensing multimedia materials for use on the web. Horton's text is not an all-in-one guide; however it is a great place to start.

*Distance Learning*

## **Composition and Writing**

*Theory*

*Practice*

## **Literature**

*Theory*

*Practice*

## **Film**

*Theory*

Carson, Diane. "Teaching for Learning: Do They Learn What You Teach?" *Cinema Journal* 36.2 (1997): 109-114.

Carson argues that we must be aware of our own learning practices and preferences since they shape and form our teaching practices. Carson reminds us that everyone does not learn the same way and we need to broaden our teaching methods to include as many learning styles as possible.

Hunt, Susan. "Film and Media Education, K-12." *Cinema Journal* 26.2 (1997): 106-109.

Hunt emphasizes a need for self exploration to help students understand their viewing practices. She gives examples of what she does, critiques her methods, and concludes that she is exploring more options.

Gallagher, Brian. "Film Study and the Teaching of English: Technology and the Future of Pedagogy." *English Journal* 77.7 (1988): 58-61.

Gallagher makes six predictions about the study of film and film related technologies in English studies. Keep in mind that this was written in 1988.

1. The new video technology, because it permits and so encourages a concentration on the

“micro-skills” of visual analysis, will bring the study of film and of literature closer together. (58)

2. Visual literacy and language literacy will increasingly reflect each other and so continue to provide a fruitful instructional way of moving from seeing/interpreting to learning/practicing the act of writing. (59)

3. The microcomputer will become an intermediary between visual and written texts and so help foster the connections between film and written language. (59)

4. Laser disk technology will, to some extent, supplant videocassette technology in the classroom. (60)

5. The new technology will, in many manifestations imitate its predecessors’ forms, whether efficiently or not. (60)

6. A new kind of hybrid text, written and graphic and perhaps even spoken, may come to replace, in part, the kind of traditional expository essay we now require of writing students. (61)

Kuhns, William, and John Carr. *Movies in America: Teaching in the Dark; Resource Guide for Movies in America*. Dayton: Pflaum/Standard, 1973. (PN 1993.7 K8)

As a guidebook to a textbook (that I do not have a copy of) this is very specifically situated. This text only gave me a few suggestions on actually teaching film. More importantly, it reminded me of a film/cinema canon that I still have huge “holes” in.

They suggest showing stuff more than once: shorts show twice and then (re)show clips from important parts in films. They claim that ideas “click” the second time around. They emphasize not talking about what students have not seen within the space of the course; in other words pick films that you can continue to return to in discussion. They suggest that you screen often, the class should take on a “rhythm” of screening, discussion, projects, etc.

Suggestions for discussion:

1. Respect discussions as a learning session; do not tell students what they “should have seen” in the film.

2. Make sure both the questions and the discussion itself is open and multi-directional.

3. Do not only talk about techniques of the film, but the rhetorical reasons why the specific techniques were used.

4. Begin with questions, but do not depend or control the discussion with them.

5. Consider having students write before discussing. Ideas for how to prepare students for viewing (but not “long” introductions): discuss/read about the genre and/or director; discuss/read about how this film is related to other films/genres/directors; before screening a “bad” film, have the students design their own film—to show the different ways it could have been done.

They discuss ways to fund film classes. Some suggestions include organizing film series. They also suggest that the film instructor should act as a funnel for local film information (events, TV guide of “classic” films, what films are in the public library, etc.) They suggest teaching commercials.

Landy, Marcia. “Film and English/American Studies: What Are We Doing in an English Department?” *Critical Quarterly* 39.1 (1997) 42-50.

Landy starts with demonstrating how postmodern theories, especially semiology and its deconstructionist descendants, have blurred definitions of the text and how to read it. These theories have also put into question concepts of authorship and representations of “reality.” She

discusses how cultural studies has helped blur everything, especially “English” departments. She argues that the “partnership of language, literature, and film can proceed in positive and ‘affirmative’ fashion, a testimony to the merging of cultural forms and the infusion of new textual methods of study” (47). She also argues that film studies helps for the breakdown of focus between production and consumption and/or the focus between popular, realist, and avant garde types of texts.

Lehman, Peter. “Pluralism versus the Correct Position.” *Cinema Journal* 36.2 (1997): 114-119. Simply put, Lehman argues that we should be both pluralistic film scholars and instructors. He argues that the variety of theories and criticisms give a depth and richness to film scholarship that would never occur if we settled on one “right” method or theory. Ironically, this piece tends to be more about the theory of scholarship in general, not necessarily teaching specifically. The following responses focus on the more scholarly/research related aspect of this essay.

Bordwell, David. "Dialogue: Preaching Pluralism; Pluralism, Truth, and Scholarly Inquiry in Film Studies." *Cinema Journal* 37.2 (1998): 84-90.

Within both his original text and afterword, Lehman does emphasize Bordwell as someone who does not appreciate pluralistic scholarship. Taking offence, Bordwell replies by defending himself as someone who is accepting of other methods and theories. Bordwell takes pains to closely analyze his own work for examples. He concludes that he actually participates in a more “robust” pluralism, and that Lehman’s is “flaccid” and “trivial” (90).

Lehman, Peter. “Reply to David Bordwell.” *Cinema Journal* 37.2 (1998): 90-92.

Lehman defends his approach to Bordwell’s texts within the contexts of his original paper’s reading at a conference, and as a brief piece in *Cinema Journal*. Lehman further takes up Bordwell’s comment on his notion of pluralism, emphasizing a supportive, non-competitive type of scholarship.

Minnis, Stuart. “A Response to Peter Lehman’s Essay ‘Pluralism versus the Correct Position.’” *Cinema Journal* 37.2 (1998): 92-95.

Minnis takes pains to demonstrate that Lehman does not understand cognitivism. He concludes that Lehman’s theory is over simplistic and unrealistic, since there are no monolithic departments as yet.

Lehman, Peter. “Reply to Stuart Minnis.” *Cinema Journal* 37.2 (1998): 95-97.

I think Lehman’s most important criticism of Minnis’s piece is in concern to Minnis’s misconception about what film departments are made up of. Obviously smaller departments, or singular faculty housed within different departments, might not necessarily have this breadth of personal and critical scholarship. If anything, this further supports Lehman’s pedagogical point, that we must teach a pluralism, especially if we are one of few, or the only, film instructor at the institution.

Masterman, Len. “Media Education in the 1980s.” *Journal of the University Film and Video Association* 35.3 (1983): 44-58.

Masterman is justifying the critical study of media in general, and film specifically. First he emphasizes that we do not support or condone the media, but critically study it to learn about

ourselves and our world. The media constructs sociological images and ideals. And as such, we must study:

- Who is responsible for the constructs?
- How are the ideological affects achieved?
- What values are implicit in the world so constructed?
- How are these constructs read by the audience? (45).

Although he does give suggestions on who to read to help answer these questions, he admits to a lack of methodology. These questions are useful to help structure different teaching objectives and methodologies to achieve them.

Miller, Toby. "Screening the Nation: Rethinking Options." *Cinema Journal* 38.4 (1999): 93-97.

Miller insists that the following are "key" areas for courses that focus on nationhood:

- Political and social history, plus social theory on the nation, nationalism, and national culture;
- The empirical nature of the filmgoing experience in the countries discussed;
- The role of television and video;
- The significance of cultural policy;
- The role of local bourgeoisies; and
- The condition of screen labor. (93).

He claims that instead we normally focus on:

- Benedict Anderson as theorist of "imagined community," sometimes supplemented with Edward Said's concept of "Orientalism;"
- Vague references to U.S. imports as a damned "other;"
- Textual analysis of films that may never or rarely have been seen as such in the countries under discussion;
- Dismissal of cultural bureaucrats in favor of heroic auteurs or collectives;
- Sketchy accounts of why cultural imperialism has been displaced by globalization as an explanatory framework; and
- Star studies. (93)

He concludes that we need to pedagogically focus on:

1. the relationship of nation to state;
2. the actual filmgoing experience of a nation's citizens;
3. interrogate what qualifies under the rubric of national cinema; and
4. the political demographics of those who inhabit the national audiovisual space. (97).

Rainwater, Catherine. "Comments on Course Syllabus: Identity and Otherness in Film and Fiction." *College Literature* 21.2 (1994) 132-142.

Although at first glance, and even second, this appears like it should be in my "syllabus/special topics" section of this annotated bibliography; I think it has more important points to make about the theory and practice of syllabus construction. Rainwater constructs a very detailed syllabus that includes questions for almost every reading/viewing assignment. This highly developed syllabus immediately set the tone for the course, and Rainwater said that her students were better prepared for class discussion. Although it would take a much longer time to develop this syllabus, it would also better layout and prepare the instructor for the weeks to come. In short, it is a practice in better preparation that benefits both the instructor and the students.

Sitney, P. Adams. "The Need for, and the Scandal of, Film in the Curriculum." *New England Review* 17.3 (1995): 89-96.

Sitney argues for the study of film since it is now a part of our cultural capital. He offers examples of how literature and film intertextually overlap. Although he makes his argument from a very canonically based position (still dismissing popular texts), his primary point is valid.

Thompson, Nancy S. "Media and Mind: Imaging as an Active Process." *English Journal* 77.7 (1988): 47-49.

Thompson discusses how many people learn visually. She comments on how many students have difficulty writing because they can not tap their visual memory. She suggests that instructors may want to have students produce videos as a form of critical expression. She suggests that this will help students to become more critically aware of their own visually related actions.

Wehmeyer, Jim. "Critical Media Studies and the North American Media Literacy Movement." *Cinema Journal* 39.4 (2000): 94-101.

Wehmeyer reflects on the connections between the media literacy movement and film studies. He was frustrated by the lack of critical inquiry used in the media literacy movement; their lack of attention to "ideology" (96). He claims that the media literacy movement is about individuals and capitalism, not groups and sociology. In other words, Wehmeyer demands that we keep film studies critical. I agree.

Worland, Rick. "Politics, Film Studies, and the Academy: A Commentary." *Journal of Film and Video* 46.4 (1995): 42-56.

This essay is not so much about teaching film, but the study of it, which always swings back around to teaching. Primarily, he is trying to balance the dichotomy between postmodernist/structuralist theorists and historical critics and researchers. Worland calls for a balance between the two practices, that they both need to be done. Obviously this is true for research, and it naturally follows in teaching.

#### *Lessons/Activities/Resources*

Augst, Bertrand, and Brian C. O'Connor. "No Longer a Shot in the Dark: Engineering a Robust Environment for Film Study." *Computers and the Humanities* 33 (1999): 345-363.

Augst and O'Connor advocate using specially developed CD-ROMs to study and teach film. They talk about how the films can be digitally constructed to run, stop, etc. They also mention comparing still, and maybe even running footage, side by side on the screen. The interesting thing about this essay is the technical manner in which it is written. This is not easy stuff to construct. Although it sounds great, most instructors would either need to get a second degree in computer science, get lots of help from it/is (information technology/instruction support) departments, or purchase prepackaged programs. How helpful is this...really?

Bates, Robin. "Connecting to Film History through Writing." *Cinema Journal* 39.4 (2000): 83-89.

Instead of forcing reading upon reading to try and get his students to learn about the history related to what they are viewing, Bates instead assigns a series of writing activities to get them to read and research on their own. The three assignments are as follows:

1. identify a film that had powerful resonance for the student and account for that response

historically;

2. choose a film that was an “even” for an audience in the past, figure out why; and
3. choose three films that have something in common, but the first and last must be separated by at least thirty years. (84).

First he demos the assignments, so the student have an idea of what they need to write. He finds that many “initially arrive at personal and psychological conclusions” (85); but he pushes them to consider the sociological. He briefly mentions that he uses writing groups so the students support one another.

Bates concludes that making the students aware of their own historicity helps the over all viewing habits of the student in the course. The one thing that Bates did not share was the details of the context of the course, size, level, etc.

Bell-Metereau, Rebecca. “How to Use Video in Large Film Classes (Read No Further if Your Students are All Future Godards or Professors of Film.” *Cinema Journal* 38.4 (1999): 102-108. Bell-Metereau assigns her large film and literature course students video production assignments. She uses Paulo Freire to pedagogically justify this group assignment:

The development of empowered and politicized learning that can occur in using video;  
Its value in the analysis of such issues of censorship, audience reception, and self-evaluation; and  
The connections it develops between the academy and the local community. (103).

Carson, Diane. “Helpful Teaching Tools for Film and Video Production Courses.” *Cinema Journal* 34.3 (1995): 83-96.

Carson talks about using a video program set called Lessons in Visual Language to cover such topics as: cover framing, shots sizes and framing faults, image and screen, the third dimension, lenses and perspective, movement and moving the camera, orientation of the camera, editing, rhythm, and music. She comments on how they are brief, and are easily worked into different types of activities.

Costanzo, William. “The American Cinema Project.” *Cinema Journal* 34.3 (1995): 77-80. Costanzo shares information about the American Cinema series produced by the New York Center for Visual History. He says the series focuses on the “aesthetic, economic, and cultural dimensions of American cinema” (78). It also includes printed materials by McGraw-Hill. The video series is made up of 10 one-hour tapes, including such topics as “the Hollywood style, the studio system, the star, major genres (comedy, the western, combat films, film noir), movies in the age of television, the film school generation, and contemporary independent filmmakers” (78).

Costanzo, William. “Teaching Film with Laserdiscs.” *Cinema Journal* 34.4 (1995): 78-83. Costanzo suggests using laserdiscs to show and lecture about films. His argument supports the continued use of DVDs, what have now replaced laserdiscs. He suggests stopping the image and allowing the soundtrack to continue along with other tips and tricks. His most important point is that programs get to purchase their films cheaper than what it costs to rent the reels.

Jennings, Caleen Sinnette. “America on Stage: the World in the Classroom.” *New Theatre Quarterly* 11.4 (1995): 66-71.

Jennings shares her experience of teaching foreign students about American cinema. She

emphasizes how group assignments, many of them writing, help the students to learn about difference and culture. They are able to share their various experience of viewing and understanding the film.

Restivo, Angelo. "Using Feature Film Clips to Illustrate Film Aesthetics." *Cinema Journal* 34.3 (1995): 80-83.

Restivo basically shares his list of titles that he uses to demonstrate editing; mise-en-scene: spatial design; and mise-en-scene: color.

Singer, Ben. "Hypermedia as a Scholarly Tool." *Cinema Journal* 34.3 (1995): 86-91.

Singer advocates creating CD-ROMS to help supplement film instruction. He claims that the cons are eye strain and image quality. The positives are volume and powerfully searching techniques. He then goes on to discuss the different types of technologies to help make instructional CD-ROMS.

Tomasulo, Frank P. "Teaching the Introductory Cinema Studies Courses: Some Strategies and Resources." *Cinema Journal* 34.4 (1995): 72-78,

Tomasulo gives suggestions for syllabi found in Erik S. Lunde and Douglas A. Noverr's *Film Studies* and *Film History*. He also suggests looking at the "Course Files" regularly found in the *Journal of Film and Video*. He suggests a couple writing related texts: a chapter in the Sobchacks' *An Introduction to Film*, or Timothy Corrigan's *A Short Guide to Writing about Film*. He also suggests handing out a "Dos and Don'ts" sheet. He discuss the Macmillan Film Study Extract series for film clips. He also suggests the Cinematic Eye and the Introduction to Film Studies educational video series. Finally, he suggests the use of slides in the classroom setting.

Welsch, Tricia. "Teaching Mise-en-Scene Analysis as a Critical Tool." *Cinema Journal* 36.2 (1997): 101-106.

Welsch suggests giving writing assignments that asks the student to analyze a single shot, or still, from a film. She suggests using Giannetti's system of mise-en-scene analysis: dominant, lighting key, shot and camera proxemics, angle, color values, lens/filter/stock, subsidiary contrasts, density, composition, form, framing, depth, character placement, staging position, and character proxemics. Welsch emphasizes a need to actually support the students during the writing process, not just assign it, and then grade it.

#### *Syllabi/Canon Construction/Special Topics Courses*

This section includes many texts that I have not necessarily read. I tracked down a bunch of "course guides" that are basically sample syllabi. These course guides will work as either future examples if I need to cover such topics and/or as canonical reminders of stuff I need to watch in my spare time. I've tried to bold type words in the titles to help me find what topics/themes each example covers.

Blumenberg, Richard M. "College Course File: **Film Planning and Scripting.**" *Journal of Film and Video* 37 (Summer 1984): 65-74.

Boruszkowski, Lilly Ann. "College Course File: **Experimental** Film." *Journal of Film and Video* 37 (Fall 1985): 53-62.

Carson, Diane. "**Chinese** Film: Sources and Resources." *Cinema Journal* 34.4 (1995): 83-88. She lists people and places to contact for Chinese films and other pertinent information and resources.

Casebier, Allan. "**Japanese** Film and Culture." *Journal of Film and Video* 39 (Winter 1987): 52-64.

Edgerton, Gary. "College Course Film: An Introduction to the **American Film Industry**." *Journal of Film and Video* 37 (Winter 1984): 42-55.

Ehrlich, Linda C. "Teaching The Scent of Green Papaya in Saigon: Cinema in **International Context**." *Cinema Journal* 39.4 (2000): 89-93.

Ehrlich shares her experience of teaching an international film course while teaching in the semester-at-sea program. I liked how she used small writing assignments to get students to inspect their personal beliefs, biases, and ideologies before seeing the film and/or visiting the location. I also like how she had students visit foreign theatres.

Ehrlich, Linda., and Ning Ma. "College Course File: **East Asian** Cinema." *Journal of Film and Video* 42.2 (1990): 53-70.

Faulkner, Christopher. "Teaching **French** National Cinema." *Cinema Journal* 38.4 (1999): 88-93.

Faulkner includes some theory of teaching national cinema (especially French) in his article. He discusses how nationality is something that is related to ideology and "history of consciousness" (88). This type of course demands close attention to the interactions between texts and context. Finally, he insists that this type of special topics course should be driven by the instructors own research and research interests.

Feuer, Jane. "College Course Film: The **Hollywood Musical**." *Journal of the University Film and Video* 35 (Fall 1983): 70-78.

Hank, Stephen. "College Course File: **Film Planning**." *Journal of the University Film and Video* 37 (Spring 1984): 50-55.

Heil, Douglas. "College Course File: **Film/Video Preproduction**." *Journal of Film and Video* 52.1 (2000): 18-32.

Hess, John "**Central America**: Film and Video." *Journal of Film and Video* 40.4 (1988): 37-57.

Hurwitz, Donald. "College Course File: **Broadcasting** and the **Audience**." *Journal of Film and Video* 38 (Summer 1985): 64-75.

Iordanova, Dina. "College Course File: **Eastern European** Cinema." *Journal of Film and Video* 51.1 (1999): 56-76.

Lev, Peter., and Barry Moore. "Introduction to Film—An Integrative Approach." *Journal of Film and Video* 38 (Spring 1986): 81-87.

Mangin, Daniel. "College Course File: The History of **Lesbians** and **Gays** on Film." *Journal of Film and Video* 41.3 (1989): 51-66.

Moeller, H-B. "College Course File: The New **German** Cinema." *Journal of Film and Video* 38 (Winter 1986): 78-92.

Orlson, Scott R. "College Course File: Studies in **Genre—Horror**." *Journal of Film and Video* 48.1-2 (1996): 67-79.

Peña, Richard. "College Course File: Film as **History**." *Journal of Film and Video* 38 (Winter 1985): 70-76.

Polan, Dana. "College Course File: **Film Noir**." *Journal of Film and Video* 37 (Spring 1985): 75-83.

Rabinovitz, Lauren. "History of American **Video Art**." *Journal of Film and Video* 38 (Summer/Fall 1986): 111-122.

Rush, Jeff. "Course File for '**Narrative** Film: Theory and Practice'." *Journal of Film and Video* 49.3 (1997): 48-67.

Stam, Robert. "College Course File: **Third World** Cinema." *Journal of Film and Video* 37 (Fall 1984): 50-61.

Teasley, Alan B., and Ann Wilder. *Reel Conversations: Reading Films with Young Adults*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1997.

Teasley and Wilder discuss their experiences in implementing a film program into a middle school environment. In the first part of the book they give detailed instructions about how to set up and implement this kind of program. The second part of the book is dedicated to discussing the types of themes, and specific films, that can (and should) be shown to middle school children. The themes include: Coming of Age, Families, Belonging, Dreams and Quests, and Love and Romance. They conclude with some logistical stuff about copyright along with recommended periodicals and a list of novels to read with the films as thematic units. I especially liked their method of teaching films that breaks the film into chunks and has the students respond in journals/worksheets. The book includes examples of the worksheet layouts.

Tomaselli, Keyan G., and Arnold Shepperson. "Course File for '**Documentary** Film, Visual **Anthropology**, and Visual **Sociology**.'" *Journal of Film and Video* 49.4 (1997): 44-57.

Welsch, Janice "**Feminist** Film Theory/Criticism in the United States." *Journal of Film and Video* 39 (Spring 1987): 66-82.

Welsch, Tricia. "Foreign Exchange: **German Expressionism** and Its Legacy." *Cinema Journal* 38.4 (1999): 102.

I like how Welsch starts the course with an extreme focus on readings, readings that debate the "parameters and definitions of 'Expressionism'" (98). She argues that the "labor-intensive" first few weeks pay off in the end. Not only do they focus on heavy theoretical readings, but the viewing load is heavier too. Finally, I like how this is a course that spans continents, focusing on Germany's influence on Hollywood's cinema.

Wexman, Virginia Wright. "The Critic as Consumer: Film Study in the University, *Vertigo*, and the **Film Canon**." *Film Quarterly* 39.3 (1986): 32-41.

This essay is just as guilty of canon construction as Bazin's essay(s) on *Citizen Kane*. Ironically, she makes a very important point about how films become canonized "even by those who argue against it" (33). She then continues with a critical reading of *Vertigo*.

Williams, Tony. "College Course File: Television Studies/Television Theories—**Series** and **Mini-Series**." *Journal of Film and Video* 46.1 (1994): 43-60.

Woodward, Katherine S.. "College Course File: American Film Comedy." *Journal of Film and Video* 42.2 (1990): 71-84.

Wyatt, Justin. "College Course File: Aids, The Mass Media, and Cultural Politics." *Journal of Film and Video* 45.2-3 (1993): 91-105.