

**UCLA**  
**CSW Update Newsletter**

**Title**

Where Theory Meets Practice

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7qz1x1x7>

**Author**

Hammer, Rhonda

**Publication Date**

2010-10-01

# Where Theory Meets Practice

BY RHONDA HAMMER

# Where Theory Meets Practice

**BY RHONDA HAMMER**

**B**ECAUSE our society is immersed in media 24/7, it is essential that students learn how to understand, interpret, and criticize the meaning and messages of media culture. My undergraduate/graduate course on “Critical Media Literacy and the Politics of Representation: Theory and Production,” which is cosponsored by the Departments of Women’s Studies and Education at UCLA and which was introduced in 2002, is designed to meet this challenge through the study of scholarly writings, media analysis, and the creation of media texts. This course is a response to what has been described as a literacy crisis, especially with regard to the diversity of media forums, which mediate our everyday lives. The success of this course is best expressed by the students themselves, in the articles in this special issue and in their media projects (which are accessible at <http://women.ucla.edu/faculty/hammer/cm178/>).

In more than twenty-five years of teaching, some of my greatest pleasures have been the demonstrations of critical thinking and creative

**The greatest digital divide is  
between those who can read  
and write with media  
and those who can’t.**

**– Elizabeth M. Daley, Dean,  
USC School of Cinematic Arts**

talents of my students. This has been especially rewarding given how many of them have been able to express themselves regarding their abilities to think outside of the box, which can be articulated through media productions (and is hardly exclusive to written papers). It is an honor and a privilege to be able to do for a living what one enjoys, and in this sense I am especially fortunate. In fact, I continue to keep in touch with some students who have taken various incarnations of my media and production courses over the last fifteen years and am delighted to report that their achievements, in media and academia, are impressive. Moreover, it is heartening to hear from so many that the media literacy courses empowered them to pursue their dreams and find employment that allows them to use their creativity.

Hence, teaching critical media literacy can be, as the eminent scholar and insurgent pedagogue, bell hooks (1994) describes it, a liberatory experience for both teacher and student. Yet, the scarcity of culturally critical media literacy classes, especially those that involve media production, owes much to the general lack of credibility afforded such courses. This dearth is also owing to limited technological support afforded such courses. As noted media and cultural studies scholar David Buckingham puts it:

I am frustrated by the fact that teachers of media education still seem to be insufficiently recognized and supported. Despite the generally inhospitable climate, there is

a great deal of excellent work being done in the field by highly dedicated teachers and committed students. Media education generates a degree of enthusiasm and enjoyment that is all too rare in contemporary schooling; and it offers a form of educational practice that is not just engaging for students, but also intellectually rigorous, challenging and relevant to their everyday lives.

Without being at all uncritical of what goes on, I believe this is something we should affirm and celebrate. (2003)

In this introductory essay, I will argue for the necessity of these types of courses at all levels of education and briefly describe the history and format of my course.

## **CRITICAL MEDIA LITERACY AND PARTICIPATORY DEMOCRACY**

The founding fathers and unsung mothers of the American Revolution—one of the first successful emancipations from colonial imperialism—instituted a system of participatory democracy and government by and for the people. Indeed, the very nature of our democracy is dependent upon education that produces, what Thomas Jefferson described as, an “informed citizenry.” Although the U.S. was built in part upon the genocide of indigenous peoples and although citizenship was initially reserved for a privileged few, it is through education and belief in the justice of a true democracy that many radical reforms have been provoked and instituted by “the people.”

This has included the kinds of coalition politics between members of those who held some degree of power with Othered, enslaved, and marginalized people, which is the basis of the kind of democratic tradition that was envisioned by many who were characterized as revolutionaries in their own time. It is also essential to note that it was often students who were part of the vanguard of these social and political movements. Unfortunately, as many experts argue, our participatory democracy is in danger of being replaced by a neoliberal “plutocratic” one which Donald Lazere—a leading cultural critic—defines as a capitalist economy which is ruled by the rich under an undemocratic government (2009: 277). Hence the need for engaged pedagogy and critical thinking within our educational systems is crucial:

As bell hooks astutely reminds us:

“Educational systems have been the primary place where free speech, dissent, and pluralistic opinions are valued in theory and practice.”

William Boyer, another progressive scholar expands upon the importance of “citizen education” in which “people in and out of school have information that will help them regain control over government and laws affecting the economy” ((2003: xiii). Yet, contemporary “democratic education is being undermined as the interests of big business and corporate capitalism encourage students to see education solely as a means to achieve material success” (hooks, 2010: 16). hooks, goes on to warn that such thinking is at odds with engaged, progressive pedagogy and

that much of contemporary so-called education “makes acquiring information more important than gaining knowledge or learning how to think critically” (hooks, 2010: 16).

The future of democratic education will be determined by the extent to which democratic values can triumph over the spirit of oligarchy that seeks to silence diverse voices, prohibit free speech, and deny citizens access to education. (hooks, 2010: 17)

Hence we must transcend the blinders of anti-democratic, neoliberal, supercapitalistic ideological myths in which money and power rather than human rights, social justice, and the common good are the most important measure of social worth. It is therefore the responsibility of progressive educators, students and citizens:

...to honor education as the practice of freedom because we understand that democracy thrives in an environment where learning is valued, where the ability to think is the mark of responsible citizenship, where free speech and the will to dissent is accepted and encouraged. (hooks, 2010: 17)

In fact, escalating illiteracy, the deterioration and privatization of education, as well as the prohibitive costs of opportunities for postsecondary learning, further ensures that a participatory democracy is under siege. For example in a “2006 study supported by the Pew Charitable Trust found that 50% of college seniors scored below ‘proficient’ levels on a test that required them to do such basic tasks as understand the arguments of newspaper editorials or

compare credit-card offers” (Nemko, 2008). Furthermore, according to the same study only 20% had basic quantitative skills, while a 2006 federally commissioned report found that: “Over the past decade, literacy among college graduates has actually declined....According to the most recent National Assessment of Adult Literacy, for instance, the percentage of college graduates deemed proficient in prose literacy has actually declined from 40 percent to 31 percent in the past decade.”

Yet this is not surprising if one considers that it is the corporate mass media, which has been elevated to the leading hegemonic source of educator in this country. Hence it would seem to be only common sense that we learn to critically engage media. Indeed, given the nature of our contemporary society and global world, it is crucial that all citizens become literate in media culture, emergent new media, and developing technology. Many argue that universities have a responsibility to provide students with such pedagogical skills. Critical media literacy courses should be a part of required curricula within all levels of educational institutions. The need for such courses is especially urgent in view of the escalating amount of time students engage with multiple forms of media.

For example, according to a 2005 study, many 8 to 18 year olds are devoting 8½ hours per day to media-related activity, while college students ages 18 to 24 spend “an average of 11 hours a day involved in some sort of media or digital communications” (Rideout et al, 2005). A more recent 2010 study, by

the nonprofit Kaiser Family Foundation, reports that media consumption by 8 to 18 year olds has radically increased to the equivalent of 10 hours and 45 minutes per day because of media multi-tasking. Given that members of an entire generation are dedicating more time to entertainment media/digital interaction than to that required of a full-time job, it would seem to make sense that schools develop curricula to assist students to better understand and navigate what is considered to be the most powerful and influential ideological institution mediating our everyday experiences and perceptions of the world.

Henry Giroux (2010) argues that young people are under assault by “a global market economy that punishes all youth by treating them as markets and commodities,” which, in turn, “commercializes every aspect of kid’s lives.” He adds:

Corporations have hit gold with the new media and can inundate young people directly with their market-driven values, desires and identities, all for which are removed from the mediation and watchful eyes of parents and other adults.

Yet in the U.S. not only do teachers not receive adequate training in media literacy but many parents, administrators, and government officials consider media education—especially since the “no child left behind” edict—as unnecessary and define it as a “frill,” which is hardly the case such in countries as Britain, Canada, and Australia (Beach, 2007: 1). Thus, within most schools and postsecondary institutions in the United States, it is generally afforded little if any credibility.

Furthermore, recent cutbacks at many colleges and universities have affected those courses and workshops where students learn the necessary rudimentary technological skills they need for pursuing critical media literacy projects.

The failure to teach students these necessary skills is often justified through undocumented highly inflated assumptions concerning students' alleged digital abilities:

While popular rhetoric would have us believe that young users are generally savvy with digital media, data...clearly shows that considerable variation exists among fully wired college students when it comes to various Internet use (Hargittai, 2010: 108).

Hence, we cannot assume that students are already literate in even the most basic technological and digital skills. Indeed, the myths about this competency can prove particularly problematic, as Siva Vaidhy Anathan (2008) asserts:

As a professor, I am in the constant company of 18-23 year olds. I have taught at both public and private, and I have to report that levels of comfort with, understanding of, and dexterity with digital technology, varies greatly within every class. Yet it has not changed in the aggregate in more than 10 years...Every class has a handful of people with amazing skills and a large number who can't deal with computers at all.

She goes on to argue that dominant myths concerning students' media and digital literacy skills are elitist and even bigoted, in that they presume that all students have access to and/or experi-

ences with digital technology. In fact, there are numerous reliable studies, and progressive pedagogical experts, that demonstrate an escalating racial, ethnic, gender, and class divide, or digital inequality, in relation to new technological literacies, including computer science, especially between disenfranchised and affluent youth. This is associated with, but not exclusive to, the schools they attend, and their family's educational background, class, and lifestyle.

In fact, sociologist Eszter Hargittai found that a majority of college freshmen lack technological fluency and basic web-related skills, which is related, in large part, to socioeconomic status. Demographically speaking, her study demonstrated that women, "students of Hispanic origin, African American students, and students who had lower levels of education were lacking in these abilities" (see Rampell, 2008). This is also not surprising given that generally marginalized students (especially Latino/a and African Americans, as well as many women) are not encouraged in their high schools to pursue postsecondary studies in computer science or fields that emphasize digital "knowledge-intensive abilities" (Margolis, 2008; Hargittai, 2008). Anathan asserts:

Talk of a "digital generation" or people who are "born digital" willfully ignores the vast range of skills, knowledge, and experience of many segments of society. It ignores the needs and perspectives of those young people who are not socially or financially privileged. It presumes a level playing field and equal access to time, knowledge, skills, and technologies. The ethnic,

national, gender, and class biases of any sort of generation talk are troubling. And they could not be more obvious than when discussing assumptions about digital media.

For those students who are seemingly literate in new media, study reveals that what they are familiar with is entertainment, gaming, gambling, and other interactive dimensions. These same students often lack the abilities to critically assess the media that occupies so much of their lives and relationships and to make informed decisions regarding the credibility of the information that they access. David Parry, a Professor of Emerging Media and Communications, argues that "students are not digital natives who possess some unique set of skills whereby they can magically manipulate the network and gadgets to do whatever they want with outstanding acumen...but rather they are;

...for the large part unreflective about the way they use these network technologies, and what is more are unreflective about the ways in which their use (or our use) has already been historically determined and shaped, an unreflective response which gives up power and control over to these systems.

Although it is essential that all citizens become literate in the employment of new media technology, this kind of knowledge is not necessarily empowering or characteristic of a more democratic participatory education, as is demonstrated by—what many believe to be—an overabundance of boring, uncritical PowerPoint presentations. Rather it is imperative that we

distinguish between media literacy, which can tend to celebrate the institutions of commercial media, in contrast to critical media literacy and alternative modes of production, which provoke critical thinking and practical applications to contextual relations. It is this distinction that characterizes this course and the critical media literacies that so many students manage to employ in not only their class assignments but in many dimensions of their everyday lives.

It is in this sense that proficiencies in critical media literacy must be no different from those required of critical thinking and inquiry in any academic, popular, or political pursuits. Doing so necessarily includes the engagement of “the politics of representation,” which is loosely described as the manner in which dominant and marginalized people are represented in the media. Indeed, many of the students in my course are particularly interested in diversities and differences and or exclusions of representation, as well as social justice issues. Given that my own background and experiences are within the educational documentary domain, most students produce such montage-style video projects (although some have also produced websites or powerpoint presentations).

Hence, I argue for the importance of teaching critical media literacy from a perspective that seeks to empower students by giving them abilities to read, critique, and produce media, which teaches them to become active participants rather than “sophisticated consumers” in a highly hypermediated culture and society (Jhally and Lewis, 2006: 225). Given the power

of the contemporary media and consciousness industry in that it shapes “virtually every sphere of public and political life” (ibid. 244), it is more important than ever—as Marshall McLuhan coined the phrase almost 50 years ago—to “understand media” (1965).

Teaching critical media literacy through production constitutes a new form of pedagogy in which students become more aware of how media is constructed, conveys dominant ideologies, and is an often unrecognized but nonetheless powerful source of education. These critical skills not only make students aware of how their own views of the world are mediated by media but also enable them to learn how to critically read, engage, and decode media culture. This further empowers them to give voice to their ideas and visions in a diversity of ways and invests them with the communications skills and abilities to both work cooperatively and assert their own individuality. And given the context of the brave new world in which we live—one recently transformed by the corporate neoliberal, economic meltdown of 2008, in which the employment opportunities of the past are hardly as plentiful, and entrance to graduate and professional programs are highly restricted, expensive, and no longer guarantee a successful career—critical media literacies become a mandatory requirement for understanding and engagement within this complex sociopolitical economic system. It is within this context that I will briefly describe the development and structure of my course, “Critical Media Literacy and the Politics of Representation: Theory and Production.”

## DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE

The course is comprised of a 3-hour seminar and 90-minute weekly lab (although the bulk of the production work takes place outside of the scheduled periods). Students are required to complete three technical assignments, a group final media production, and a final paper that describes key concepts of critical media literacy, from readings, lectures, and media presented in the seminar (and available on reserve) in relation to their group project.

Since this class is one of the only classes, outside the film department, to incorporate the teaching of hands-on production skills, the course depends upon a multiplicity of UCLA resource centers and a variety of computer and technical experts. Indeed, contrary to popular myth, students’ abilities to master these skills are dependent not only on the technology itself but on information technology professionals who teach the students appropriate use of the equipment (often in conjunction with websites). And although some universities and colleges have one central onstructional media center to provide such resources, UCLA does not. It has taken years to develop an infrastructure to support the course. The technical needs of the class are met through various on-campus units: OID/AV (Office of Instructional Development, Audio Visual), which provides some of the video cameras; CLICC (Computer Library Instructional Computing Commons), which provides a state-of-the-art classroom for lab sections, computers, and training specialists, who assist students with use of the equipment; ETU (Education

Technology Unit for School of Education, which makes available a media classroom for the seminar section of course, camcorders, computer lab, and two technicians to teach students iMovie and web page production in the labs. In addition Women's Studies purchased four camera kits (which include camcorders, microphones, tripods, and accessories), two through an OID equipment grant, and two from their own funds, as well as a computer for editing (also through an OID grant) for use by this class; SSC (Social Science Computing), which helped design and hosts the course website and a website for streaming the student projects. (Given this cornucopia of technical resources, on which the course depends, it is not surprising that students must become immediately fluent in this discourse of corporate-style acronyms, and what each one symbolizes). Indeed, students are provided with a chart so that they can become fluent in this specialized discourse: for example, "pick up the JVC from WS and wireless mic from ETU and bring it to CLICC lab, for editing workshop with Heath."

The course also requires a teaching assistant (TA) with production experience, which OID funded for a nonrenewable, three-year period. Since then, Women's Studies has sometimes provided teaching support, but this is difficult because of enrollment limitations, which is supposed to be no more than twenty-two students, (although it often exceeds this) as well as budgetary constraints. The role of the teaching assistant is a complex one, as these students are not only responsible for organization of the

labs and equipment but also actively participate in classroom activities, assist students with the development of their projects, provide technical training, and be literate in the relevant scholarship. Every TA who has been involved with the course has been a first-class pedagogue and often a producer in their own right. Even more importantly, each has shared their passion for critical media literacy.

Moreover, many students who have previously taken the course return to do guest lectures and presentations as well as volunteering to assist in the labs and to teach the incoming students the tricks of the trade. These altruistic and unexpected contributions speak to the importance and significance of such classes to the myths about student apathy.

Each year, months before the beginning of the course, I meet with the representatives from all of the resource centers and the teaching assistant (if one is assigned) to discuss the technical aspects of the course: organization, coordination, and new technologies, programs, and teaching suggestions.

What never ceases to amaze me, even after ten years of teaching the course, is that every individual involved with the class do so because of their commitment to the students and to the course. Indeed, such ongoing involvement with the course is hardly a part of their job descriptions. For example, last year we introduced, for the first time, a separate sound workshop, which was taught by a graduate student (who received course credit) and a representative of CLICC. Furthermore this was only the second

year in which a separate web-page production tutorial was scheduled with an IS (Information Studies) technician. It is these resource people who substantively contribute to the ongoing success of this course.<sup>1</sup>

The technical dimensions are taught at an introductory level and most of the students have no prior production experience. Before the class is finished, however, they are proficient in such skills, which include shooting techniques, lighting, sound, interviewing, editing, narration, storyboarding, and scripting. Students can also pursue web design, which involves meeting with experts outside of the course lab.

They also become knowledgeable in some of the scholarly research in the field, which involves learning about not only the practical codes or grammar of media production but also the theoretical skills necessary to consciously

---

1. These includes Jessica Mentessoglou, Supervisor for Instructional Technology Services, UCLA, Library Computing Center (CLICC); Alan Lebetkin, Resource Scheduling and Communications Coordinator for Instructional Technical Services for Library Computing Services (CLICC); Chris Dutton, Audio Visual Services Manager (AV), Office of Instructional Development (OID); Juan Halcon, Senior Coordinator for Audio Visual Services (AV), Office of Instructional Development (OID), Caroline Tam Kong, Instructional Technology Coordinator, Social Sciences Computing (SSCE); Heath Hewitt, Technician/Analyst, Macintosh General User Support Training, Educational Technology Unit (ETU), Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSEIS); Peter Kovaric, Chief Technology Officer, Director Educational Technology Unit (ETU), Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSEIS); David Cappoli, Digital Resources Librarian, Information Studies Department, Graduate School of Education and Information Sciences (GSEIS) and last, but certainly not least, Samantha Hogan, Student Affairs Officer, Dept of Women's Studies (WS); Richard Medrano, Administrative Coordinator, Women's Studies (WS) and Ramces Jimenez, Administrative Assistant, Social Science and Comparative Education (SSCE) Graduate School of Education and Information Sciences (GSEIS).



decode it. In this regard, I have developed a specialized reader as well as a constantly updated website with media and multiple articles from academic, professional, and popular forums. I also make extensive use of the Instructional Media Library films and videos, as well as my own personal collection, which I show in class and also make available on reserve. This often includes a growing goldmine of online documentaries. The number and diversity of guest lecturers who have presented in this course are astonishing and include leading academics as well as highly successful producers, director and artists from both independent and commercial media.<sup>2</sup>

The course website also provides for a discussion board in which students can choose from potential topics or “pitch” their own for the final assignment. This process often starts before the course formally begins and students are required to have broken up into groups and decided upon a general subject and form of media that they want to produce (for example, websites, documentaries, PowerPoint, or other artistic endeavors). Although we reserve some time in the course to discuss these projects much of the decisions and structure of these enterprises takes place through students’ conversations with one another as well as with myself or one of the course assistants.

Needless to say, there is a lot of work involved in this class and students must be pre-

---

2. New media and cultural studies scholars/activists Professors Leah Lievrouw and Douglas Kellner have presented in every class since the courses inception!

pared to actively participate. Indeed, the form and substance of this course is at odds with most traditional classes and demands that students take on responsibilities, which require engaged critical thinking and practice and a workload that exceeds the worth of the 6 units they are awarded on its completion. Yet, each quarter the course is overenrolled and has a large waiting list. This fact raises questions about stereotypes of contemporary students, which include characterizations of them as lazy, passive, and solely concerned with grades. In fact, it should lead us to seriously interrogate the context in which this all takes place and the dominant paradigms of postsecondary learning, which many experts describe as commodity-based vocational training that bears little resemblance to a real education.

Indeed the brilliance of most of the final productions, which are screened in a small public forum at the end of the class, belies this assessment. Students have translated theoretical and practical concepts into a final group educational projects, which usually take the form of a progressive digital video montage or documentary that often uses media to critique media. Moreover, these productions are always informed by the student’s own standpoints and voice and often address issues related to social justice and/or the politics of representation.

Many of the productions are so expertly conceived, in both form and substance, that they are presented in courses both on campus and off, at academic conferences, in art shows and lectures, and at film and media festivals.

Other academics, teachers, students, and festival organizers often contact me about many of these projects. It is in this sense that the students have contributed to the growing field of pedagogical media resources.

Moreover, the enthusiasm they take in their productions is contagious, and it is within this context that there is a revolutionary shift in student and faculty attitudes, which transform the classroom into a challenging, provocative, and entertaining forum. As bell hooks describes it, to take “pleasure in teaching is an act of resistance countering the overwhelming boredom, uninterest, and apathy that so often characterize the way professors and students feel about teaching and learning, about the classroom experience” (1994: 10).

Given that student voice is central to critical media literacy approaches and practices, it is only apt that this special issue of the CSW newsletter features articles written by some of the graduates of this course. These writings capture the diversity and differing standpoints mediating the student’s experiences and, I believe, speak to the efficacy of teaching critical media studies.

## **CONTENTS OF THE ISSUE**

In her article, my co-editor Laura Nava manages to articulate the holistic nature of becoming critically media literate. Discussing what she learned in the course, especially in relation to her final group project, Now Showing: Gender, she reveals the transformative nature of

this kind of literacy. Moreover her subsequent experiences and current success speaks to the significance of critical media literacy not only in academic pursuits but in the practical relations of everyday life, including employment and activism.

Video documentaries by two groups were chosen for screenings at the prestigious UC Davis Feminist Film Festival in 2009 and 2010: [Are You Black Enough: The Politics of the Black Female Identity](#) and [Inside the Digital Closet](#) are impressive examples of the issues often addressed in student productions. This achievement is even more remarkable given that both of the student groups had no prior production experience. The articles by Hasti Barahmand and Kunti Duda-kia and Shante Espericutetas and Laura Nava discuss this experience as well as the form and content of their productions.

Diversity issues are also fundamental to Krista Hawkins' coproduction, [Commodifying Lolita: The Hypersexualization of 'Tweens' in America](#), which addresses the escalation of what many experts describe as the "sexualization" of girls in contemporary advertising and mass media. This oppositional video focuses particularly on media directed at the tween demographic, girls between 8 and 12 years old. She describes the development of this project in relation to her research.

Some students not only completed a class media project but went on to enroll in Independent Studies courses in which they produced more expansive documentaries on topics which are of indicative of their particular interests. In

Stephanie Ohannesian's article, she discusses both of these; the first, called [The Great Imbalance](#), is an investigation of the paradox of contemporary relationships to food that juxtaposes eating disorders with food insecurity. Her second coproduction, entitled [Bite Me](#), which she pursued after completion of the course, is a provocative interrogation of the massive appeal and popularity of [Twilight](#). Both focus gender and class relations.

The politics of gender are also examined by Richard Van Heertrum and Kip Austin Hinton in [Deconstructing the Superhero: American Idols in Film](#)—in particular, constructions of masculinity in the media and the "macho myth." Van Heertrum and Austin present a critical reading of the popularity of superheroes, which is framed by an interview with leading cultural studies scholar John Lawrence.

Contemporary news broadcasts and their presenters are interrogated by Amanda Kenderes in [Spitballs at Battleships: A Show and Tell of Women in the News](#). The deeply rooted sexism that is encoded in television newscasts is the subject of her inquiry, which employs some astonishing footage that would appear to reinforce her critique.

It is not only gender but also intersectional relations of race, class, and age that inscribe two projects which address the 2008 elections. In [Voting in Black & White: Politics of Race & Gender in American Culture](#), Michelle Mearlette-Hernandez and her coproducers contextualize the Democratic primaries—in which, for the

first time in U.S. history there was a woman and Black man, running for the office of President of the United States—through the use of material from historical archives and discussions of the Reconstruction Era, the suffragist movement, and the civil rights and protest movements of the 1960s.

The politics of representation are front and center in Heather Caban's coproduction [A Generation of Change: The Historic 2008 Presidential Election of Barack Obama](#), which is a multiperspectival engagement of the optimism and radical changes that were associated with Obama's election. Juxtapositions of diverse interviewees and media montages characterize aspects of American history too often excluded from mainstream mass media.

In the closing article, CSW Research Scholar Myrna Hant discusses the relevancy of a pedagogy of critical media literacy. Indeed, Hant documents the remarkable success of her own unique teaching approach, which she developed, in part, during—and after—auditing the critical media literacy course.

Readers can not only read the student's reflections on their projects in this special issue but also view the projects themselves by visiting the course website, which includes these and other student media productions: <http://women.ucla.edu/faculty/hammer/cm178/>. In addition, CSW is hosting a special screening of excerpts from some of these student films on October 19th in Moore 3340.

**Rhonda Hammer is a CSW Researcher Scholar and a Lecturer in Education and Women's Studies at UCLA.**

## REFERENCES

- Beach, Richard. 2007. Teaching Media Literacy.com. New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Boyer, William. 2003. Myth America: Democracy Vs. Capitalism. New York: The Apex Press.
- Buckingham, David. 2003. Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Culture. Cambridge: Polity.
- Debolt, David, 2008. "Colleges Struggle to Keep 'Smart' Classrooms Up to Date." Available at: <http://chronicle.com/free/v55/i08/08a01701.htm>
- Giroux, Henry. 2010. "A Society Consumed by Locusts: Youth in the Age of Moral and Political Plagues." <http://www.truth-out.org/a-society-consumed-locusts-youth-age-moral-and-political-plagues58209>
- Hargittai, Eszter, 2010. "Digital Na(t)ives? Variation in Internet Skills and Uses among Members of the 'Net Generation.'" Sociological Inquiry, 80(1): 92-113
- Hargittai, Eszter. 2008. "The Digital Reproduction of Inequality." 936-944. In Social Stratification. Edited by David Brusky. Boulder: Westview Press.
- hooks, bell. 1994. Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom. New York: Routledge
- hooks, bell. 2010. Teaching Critical Thinking: Practical Wisdom. New York: Routledge.
- Kaiser Family Foundation. Jan. 2010. "News Release: Daily Media Use Among Children and Teens Up Dramatically From Five Years Ago." <http://www.kff.org/entmedia/entmedia012010nr.cfm>
- Lazere, Donald. 2009. Reading and Writing for Civic Literacy: A Citizen's Guide to Argumentative Rhetoric. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Margolis, Jane (2008) "Introduction: The Myth of Technology as the 'Great Equalizer'" In Margolis, Stuck in the Shallow End: Education, Race, and Computing, pp 1-16. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Margolis, Jane and Alan Fisher. 2003. Unlocking the Clubhouse: Women in Computing. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1965. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nemko, Marty. May 2, 2008. "America's Most Overrated Product: the Bachelor's Degree." The Chronicle of Higher Education. Available at: <http://chronicle.com/free/v54/i34/34b01701.htm>
- Rampel, Catherine. 2008 "A Sociologist Says Students Aren't So Web Wise After All" Chronicle of Higher Education. May 2, 2008. Available at: <http://chronicle.com/article/A-Sociologist-Says-Students/2058>
- Parry, David. 2010. "Not So New" Flow Television Available at: <http://flowtv.org/2010/02/not-so-new-thoughts-on-emerging-mediadavid-parry-university-of-texas-at-dallas/>
- Rideout, V. D. Roberts and U Forbes. 2005. "Generation M: Media in the Lives of 8-18 Year Olds. Kaiser Family Foundation Study, March 2005. Available at: <http://tinyurl.com/23hr843>
- Vaidhy Anathan, Siva. Sept. 2008. "Generational Myth: Not All Students Are Tech-Savvy" The Chronicle of Higher Education. Available at: <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v55/i04/04b00701.htm>
- Young, Jeff. 2008 "A Sociologist Says Students Aren't So Web-Wise After All" The Chronicle of Higher Education <http://chronicle.com/blogPost/A-Sociologist-Says-Students/3883>

# Critical Media Literacy Empowering Students

**A screening of excerpts from some of the films featured in this special issue will be held on**

**TUESDAY**

**October 19**

**4 to 5:30 pm**

**3340 Moore, UCLA**

**JOIN US!**