This paper argues that special collections pedagogy should focus on students’ critical engagement with material objects rather than on passive reception of information. Taking a pedagogical framework from Paulo Friere and considering recent developments within innovative special collections teaching practices, this essay assesses two examples from the author’s own teaching that follow this pedagogical philosophy.
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In the fall of 2011, as a Visiting Assistant Professor in Emory University’s English Department, I took the plunge into special collections pedagogy with my sophomore-level class, English 205: Poetry. A year later, I found myself working at the University of North Carolina’s Wilson Special Collections Library leading instruction, mostly with their Rare Book Collection. Because of these two experiences, I bring the perspectives of both professorship and librarianship to the special collections classroom and have an opportunity to analyze it critically from both sides.

One of my main interests as a teacher and a librarian is getting undergraduate students to engage critically with special collections materials. By “engage critically,” I mean that students generate meaningful questions about rare books and manuscripts in a way that illuminates ideas they have been discussing in their regular classroom and that allows students to understand those ideas in a new way. My larger goal is for special collections instruction sessions to spark undergraduate students’ curiosity about humanistic subjects in a way that will help them connect with the liberal arts on a visceral level. Hands-on experiences with rare and unique materials such as those that exist in special collections libraries create lasting impressions that students, I hope, carry beyond their college years and into their adult lives. Special collections can capture the imaginations of today’s undergraduate population in a way that regular classroom teaching alone cannot. Therefore, over the past year, I have assigned myself the task of improving my own pedagogical approach in the special collections classroom by
investigating recent literature for innovative methods and critically assessing my own teaching practices.

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of contemporary pedagogical techniques within the special collections classroom and to conduct a self-assessment of my own teaching with special collections materials. In addition, I will critically analyze two special collections assignments that I have conducted with undergraduate students, one at Emory University and the other at University of North Carolina. The “text” of my analysis will not be the students themselves but these assignments and my own practice and observations of success within the classroom.

**Framework**

This essay addresses the critical engagement of students with material objects within the special collections instruction session. It does not address other elements of special collections instruction, including bibliographical instruction, archival orientation, or introduction to special collections policies and procedures. These may all be part of any instruction session that includes critical engagement with material objects, but they are not within the scope of this inquiry. The moment when students encounter special collections materials and begin thinking about them in context with their regular curriculum is the focus of this essay.

The scholarly literature from the past decade shows that more and more faculty and special collections librarians are pursuing hands-on instruction with manuscripts, archives, and rare books. The rejection within the humanities classroom of passive learning through secondary sources and traditional
lecture has driven professors to seek primary sources in order to illuminate and illustrate their subjects. The need to increase access and foster a new generation of researchers has led special collections librarians to pursue outreach to undergraduate and graduate students and invite them *en masse* into the library. Sometimes in collaboration and sometimes in silos, faculty members and librarians at colleges and universities have been working to get undergraduate students into special collections libraries to do research or, at least, encounter what special collections hold. Despite some early anxieties on the part of traditionalists within the world of special collections, both parties have generally viewed this partnership as a positive development in undergraduate and graduate education.

If there is a universal criticism of special collections instruction, it is against the “show-and-tell” method.¹ This pedagogical approach entails the selection of materials tailored to the focus of a specific class; during the class visit a librarian or archivist leads the students through the materials, showing and telling them what they are. Within general humanities pedagogy, the “show and tell” method is analogous to the “banking method,” critiqued by Paulo Freire. He describes the banking method as follows:

> The teacher talks about reality as if it were motionless, static, compartmentalized, and predictable. Or else he expounds on a topic completely alien to the existential experience of the students. His task is to “fill” the students with the contents of his narration—contents which are detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give them significance. Words are emptied of their concreteness and become a hollow, alienated, and alienating verbosity…. Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. (71-72)

Freire argues that we must dispose of the banking method and embrace a radically democratic pedagogy where the “students—no longer docile listeners—are now critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher. The teacher presents the material to the
students for their consideration, and re-considers her earlier considerations as the students express their own” (81).

Within this framework, the “show and tell” method common to special collections instruction is analogous to the banking method and may fail to inspire critical thought and curiosity among our student visitors. In a show and tell, students receive information about the materials with which they are presented passively; they become neither agents of their own learning nor active participants in critical analysis. Our goal as faculty and librarians, according to Friere, should be to shake up docile learning by making the special collections instruction space one of dialogue, investigation, and critical analysis.

It is within the framework of Friere’s radical democratic pedagogy that I will consider the contemporary scholarly literature on special collections pedagogy, which reflects many of his original ideas. I will then assess my own methods in the special collections classroom against these standards.

**Literature Review**

Over the past decade, the scholarly literature has tackled the complacency of the show-and-tell by offering case studies, suggested assignments, and assessment methods of different pedagogical approaches within the special collections setting. Below is an overview of this literature.

One of the first articles to address special collections instruction was Ann Schmiesing and Deborah Hollis’s “The Role of Special Collections Departments in Humanities Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching: A Case Study.” In this essay, the authors bemoaned the lack of instruction in special collections libraries in comparison to
other libraries on college campuses. Their case study of the special collections library at the University of Colorado at Boulder revealed the value of special collections instruction to undergraduate and graduate education. Based on their own experiences teaching with rare books and manuscript materials, Schmiesing and Hollis argued that special collections instruction provides the following benefits to students: collaborative learning, appealing to different learning styles, motivating students to engage more fully with classroom materials, and the potential for research (466). They suggest creating a learning environment within special collections that encourages collaborative and active learning—where students work together to engage critically with the materials.

Schmiesing and Hollis’s article reflects much of the practice going on today in the special collections classroom. However, for its time it was radical for some, as is evidenced in Michelle Visser’s 2003 article, “Inviting the Rabble.” In this essay, Visser addresses the inherent elitism of special collections libraries and the fear among some librarians and archivists of allowing groups of undergraduates—or “the rabble”—such access to rare and valuable materials. Her article also underscores the value of outreach to faculty who may be unaware of the connections between their courses and special collections holdings. Visser describes putting Schmiesing and Hollis’s suggestions to work by approaching a member of the biology faculty at her university who was teaching a course called Plagues and Peoples. The professor was reluctant at first and suggested that Visser provide her with slides of the texts to show in her own classroom. Visser instead invited the faculty member to visit the collection and experience the materials first hand. The visit was transformative, and the faculty member and Visser collaborated to design an instruction session for the large biology course. Visser notes that after this
first experience, “A distinct pattern emerged as other scientists were approached. They were interested in hearing about the collection but initially wanted to use copies of materials in their classrooms. Once they were persuaded to visit the department, all of them opted to bring their classes. After they brought their classes, ideas began to fly about course-integrated use of special collections materials” (33).

In 2006, Pablo Alvarez wrote of the value of introducing undergraduates to rare books by way of canonical texts like Dante’s *Commedia*. By inviting undergraduate classes to special collections for instruction with major texts, rare book librarians could unlock the research potential of these materials. This experience, he argued, would also combat the propensity in the contemporary classroom toward “literary theory, or ‘cultural studies’” that often neglects the importance of primary sources in the undergraduate classroom. Alvarez’s method was traditional lecture with the aid of the materials or digitized slides. He writes of his own practice, “I have often delivered a general presentation on the impact of printing in the West, or on the transition from manuscript to print culture, for undergraduate classes such as *Europe before 1492* (History), *Introduction to Media Studies* (English), and *Introduction to Art History* (Art History)” (96).

After Alvarez, special collections librarians and archivists have branched out into Socratic methods and discussion-based instruction with a greater diversity of materials. For example, in a 2008 article, “Teaching with Ephemera,” Julia Gardner and David Pavelich describe their attempt to go beyond canonical texts by using what they describe as “the truly staggering variety of materials in our libraries, materials that are perhaps less polished, less fine, less well known” (86). Instead of lecturing to these students about the
importance of these objects, they pose questions that “look to the objects and ask the
students to make conclusions based on the evidence at hand” (86). They allow the
students time at the beginning of the instruction session to examine the materials before
leading the discussion. For example, of a tattered British broadside, they might ask
students, “Who would have read this broadside? What does its format, paper, typography
(or lack thereof) tell us? Does this ‘thing’ remind you of anything you might have
hanging in your dorm room? Why is this poem not considered essential reading for
students of English literature?” (87). Garner and Pavelich point out that one of the
benefits of working with ephemera and primary documents is that students have an
opportunity to evaluate these sources and determine their relevance to the course:
“Students might be encouraged to question, for instance, a broadside advertising a
performance: did the play really take place? How can they determine if it did? Working
through these sorts of questions helps students understand that accepting a source at face
value may require further research on their part to determine its usefulness” (90).

Special collections instructors, however, do not always work alone, or in single
instruction sessions. The rising popularity of primary sources in the undergraduate
classroom has led faculty to design whole courses within special collections settings.
Trevor James Bond and Todd Butler’s 2009 article, “A Dialog on Teaching an
Undergraduate Seminar in Special Collections,” reflects on a semester-long course they
co-taught at Washington State University (310). Over the course of the semester, their
students designed and built their own exhibit while Bond (a special collections librarian)
and Butler (a professor of English) grappled with teaching this innovative course. The
article presents an interview-style dialogue between the two of them about the challenges
they and their students faced. Even though most special collections instruction takes place over a much more limited time span, there are useful pedagogical methods that can be gleaned from their work. Of his goals, Bond writes, “So my primary desire for the class was to engage our students with special collections, which meant combining individual work with collaborative assignments. I wanted them to have a hands-on experience unlike any of their other courses, and to teach them that the materials that we hold aren’t museum pieces” (311). Butler, on the other hand, writes, “I also wanted something different, something that would help our students reconsider the very nature of the literature they’d been studying for the past several years” (311). Both parties have different yet similar goals, the librarian to change the students’ perceptions of the materials and the faculty member to change students’ perceptions of what they had learned thus far in the literary studies classroom. Bond and Butler both conclude that they wanted the students to engage critically with the materiality of the items in the special collections library. Butler concludes, “After teaching this course, I’m convinced that at least in this case, that our studies succeeded most when they were done not in the abstract but in relation to the archive and its materials. The physical elements of books are the key to making the questions and approaches of book history real and understandable to our students” (315).

With the increase in special collections instruction, Anne Bahde and Heather Smedberg identified the need to create tools to assess the learning outcomes of students. In their 2012 article, “Measuring the Magic: Assessment in the Special Collections and Archives Classroom,” they point out that much of the evident success of instruction sessions is anecdotal. They point to the need for special collections instructors to “show
that those in-class experiences are meaningful in the right ways, to the right people” (152). Their article offers a broad view of different kinds of assessment that special collections might employ to gauge the success of their instruction. These include questionnaires and surveys, classroom assessment techniques (CATs), pre-tests and post-tests, out-of-class assignments, citation analysis, observational assessment, and a blended approach of these methods to assessment.

**Self-Reflection**

Between 2006 and 2011 I taught literature, writing, and cultural studies at the undergraduate level at Emory University. With classes of fewer than twenty-five students, I spent the majority of class time leading discussion and took my model from Friere’s democratic classroom. My role, as I saw it, was to facilitate learning and encourage critical thinking by confronting students with questions with which they grappled individually and as a group. The goal of this quasi-Socratic method was to show students how to formulate their own questions about the texts and topics we were studying and to model the critical thinking process during in-class discussion. Students were expected to reproduce this kind of critical thinking in their writing assignments, where I privileged originality of thought, insightful research, and close reading.

Since joining Wilson Library in the fall of 2011 I have led approximately thirteen instruction sessions and workshops for undergraduate and graduate students in addition to two workshops for K-12 teachers. For the majority of these sessions I have selected ten to twenty items that align with the topic the students have been studying. Usually I explain what the objects are, often drawing on material and book history or cultural and historical
context to illuminate their import. After this show-and-tell, I invite the students to spend time examining the objects and asking questions. During this time I hope they satisfy their curiosity about the materials, engage with them critically, and take the opportunity to ask any questions they might have.

Since teaching at Wilson Library I have felt a methodological gap between the critical engagement of my former classroom and the show-and-tell I now more often employ. This seeming gap is the impetus for this self-reflective study of my own practice. The reasons behind this gap are myriad. For example, a democratic classroom is a difficult thing to curate and does not occur the moment a teacher encounters her students; it takes time for the students to get comfortable speaking their minds and formulating their own critical questions. A special collections instruction session usually lasts only a little over or under an hour, and students are inevitably shy. The materials with which I confront students often require some explanation in order for the students to understand them, so a banking method or lecture approach is almost always necessary before critical inquiry can begin. And, of course, professors often expect show-and-tell sessions and may not be ready for another instructor to lead their students through a critical discussion that privileges student ideas over authorized information.

The literature suggests, however, that I must overcome these obstacles and ask my students to discuss and think critically about the materials I show to them. Schmiesing and Hollis argue that we must encourage students to collaborate, that we must appeal to different learning styles, and that we must reveal the potential for research; Visser as well as Bond and Butler charge us to collaborate with faculty to design instruction and assignments; Gardner and Pavelich propose asking students a series of critical questions;
and Bahde and Smedberg suggest employing classroom assessment techniques such as exercises and worksheets as well as out of class assignments in order to assess the impact of our students’ encounter with special collections materials.

What follows are two assignments that put these best practices to work within the special collections classroom. They derive from my own practice when I have gone beyond the show-and-tell and have turned toward a more student-centered, democratic special collections instruction space. I will critically assess these instances and my own observations about their outcomes in light of the prescriptive suggestions within the literature review above.

**Assignment 1: Critical Assessment**

In the fall of 2011 at Emory University I taught a sophomore-level class focused on poetics. According to the course description on the syllabus, this course was designed to “introduce students to the pleasures of reading, hearing, speaking, and studying poetry critically.” The semester was divided into three parts. The first focused on the formal aspects of poetry, its “language, imagery, rhythm, rhyme, and poetic form” as well as the complex vocabulary of poetics. The second was dedicated to archival research and was intended to give students “a perspective of how poets themselves create poetry.” The final part gave students a chance to read poetry from a specific national and historical context—twentieth-century Ireland—and helped students understand “that poetry is often a kind of conversation in which poets engage each other’s work across space and time.” According to the syllabus, the course had four main objectives:
• To provide a comprehensive introduction to both the mechanics and magic of poetry
• To introduce students to writing about poetry and to improve their critical reading and writing skills
• To familiarize students with archival research
• To accustom students to the orality of poetry and to understand it through the eye and the ear

Throughout the semester students wrote one critical analysis, one archival research paper, one comparative analysis, and three short response papers. In addition to these writing assignments, they also did group presentations of their archival research and recited one poem from memory.²

This analysis will focus on the second part of the class where students engaged in archival research at Emory University’s Manuscripts, Archives, and Rare Book Library, wrote individual papers on their assigned poet, and presented their research findings in groups. Below is the text of that assignment:

MARBL Presentations and Papers

This assignment is designed to advance your understanding of how poetry works by giving you a different perspective on how poems are put together – and a sense of the many, many decisions that poets make as they write and of the sheer labor that the craft of writing poetry demands. For this assignment, then, your groups will spend time digging through the manuscripts in Emory’s Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library (MARBL). You will then bring what you have found back to the class, both presenting your research and engaging your fellow students in a lively discussion based on your findings. As you work on these poems in process, one of the primary questions I would like you to keep in mind is how these materials advance, restrict, or otherwise revise our experience of poetry—and even our sense of what poetry is.
I have provided you with a starting-point for this assignment: a list of materials that will be of interest to you and that are on hold for you already in MARBL. You are welcome to examine all or some of these materials and also to go farther afield in your research into the MARBL collections as they relate to your particular volume of poetry. Please note, though, that you are restricting your research to these primary materials: no secondary materials should be used either for your presentations or for your paper unless you check with me well in advance.

Presentation:
The form of the presentation is largely up to your group, though there are some guidelines you must follow. First, each group will responsible for leading 30-45 minutes of class that includes a Q & A; second, each person in the group must participate in some element of the presentation. You should all examine the materials and together decide (1) what elements might be of interest to the class and (2) how best to present those materials: a handout, a poster, PowerPoint, etc.

You will also be responsible for assigning a few poems for your fellow classmates to read in preparation for the day of your presentation. Please have these poems ready to distribute in the class prior to your discussion.

Paper:
Each individual in your MARBL group will independently write a critical paper (Paper 2) of 6 pages that uses your archival research to make an original argument about a single poem or poems. This paper will be due one week after your group presentation. As usual, you must follow MLA standards of formatting and documentation.

Dates:
Carol Ann Duffy
Presentation: Thursday, 10/27
Paper due: Thursday, 11/3

Lucille Clifton
Presentation: Tuesday, 11/1
Paper due: Tuesday, 11/8

Seamus Heaney
Presentation: Thursday, 11/3
Paper due: Thursday, 11/10

The following materials are on hold for each group behind the reference desk in MARBL:

Seamus Heaney
Seamus Heaney collection, 1972-1997 (MSS 653)
Manuscript poems from North in Series 1: Writings by Seamus Heaney (Box 1)
Seamus Heaney papers, 1951-2004 (MSS 960)
Reviews of North in Subseries 3.3: Printed Material Reviews (Boxes 80-81)
Ronald Schuchard papers, 1981-2005 (MSS 1005)
Drafts of Seamus Heaney’s Ellmann Lectures, “The Place of Writing” (Box 3)

Carol Ann Duffy
Carol Ann Duffy papers, 1985-1999 (MSS 834)
Notebooks with manuscript poems from The World’s Wife in Notebooks (Boxes 2-3)
Notebooks with manuscript drafts of prose adaptations of Grimm’s fairy tales (Box 2)
Typescript of *The World’s Wife* (Box 3)
Correspondence (Box 4)
Duffy, *Grimm Tales* Multiple editions, in MARBL and General Circulation

Lucille Clifton
Lucille Clifton papers, 1930-2009 (MSS 1054)
Drafts of poems from an ordinary woman, Subseries 2.2A, Collected Works (Box 16)
Drafts of *good woman: poems and a memoir* 1969-1980 (Box 17)
Correspondence surrounding 1974, Series 1, Correspondence (Box 1)
Reviews of *an ordinary woman*, Subseries 7.2, Printed Material about Clifton (Box 67)
Discussion of *an ordinary woman* by Lucille Clifton, Subseries 9.1, Audio Recordings
Clifton, *good woman: poems and a memoir* PS3553 .L45 G63 1987 DANOWSKI

This assignment was developed by Elizabeth Chase, the reference archivist at Emory’s Manuscripts, Archives, and Rare Book Library (MARBL), in collaboration with previous instructors of the course. I modified it to fit the specific needs of my classroom, but I credit Chase with its authorship. The students began working on the assignment about one-third of the way through the semester.
Before beginning the assignment, my students visited MARBL for an instruction session led by Chase, who chose a selection of manuscripts and rare books for the students to examine. She also handed out photocopies of multiple drafts of poems and asked the students to work in small groups to compare changes in these texts. After the group work, she asked the students to share their findings with the rest of the class. This in-class assignment prepared the students for what they would encounter in their research as well as modeled for the students how to go about doing comparative analysis using manuscript materials.

After the instruction session, the students had two to three weeks to complete the assignment, depending on which group they were assigned. Their research in MARBL was done outside of the classroom on their own time. Each group was responsible for an entire class period during which they would assign poems for their fellow students to read, give a presentation, and lead class discussion. A week later, individuals turned in critical essays were to rely wholly on their findings in MARBL.

This assignment fulfills many of Friere’s ideals of the democratic classroom as well as many of the goals stated in the contemporary special collections pedagogy literature. For example, it was not developed in a silo but instead resulted from collaboration between faculty and special collections staff. During the instruction session the students were asked to collaborate to formulate their own questions and conclusions about the manuscript materials. Their work pointed the way to new research. The student research, while guided by the suggested list of materials to examine, was wholly self-motivated so that students had to formulate their own questions and analysis. Students collaborated with each other in groups and later engaged with the rest of their classmates.
to educate them about their own experiences in MARBL and to answer their questions.

The assignment motivated students to consider how the materials “advance, restrict, or otherwise revise our experience of poetry—and even our sense of what poetry is advance, restrict, or otherwise revise our experience of poetry—and even our sense of what poetry is” (Chase). These considerations were broad but drew on questions the class had been exploring throughout the semester and thus were designed to change students’ perceptions by way of critical thought.

My assessment of the success of the assignment relies on the grades and feedback I gave to the students after its completion. For the papers, five students received a grade of A, two an A-, two a B+/A-, one a B+, three a B, and one a C-. The presentation grades were higher and ranged from one B- to a number of A’s. Two of the three groups had great success engaging their fellow students and coming to original conclusions substantiated by their findings. For example, one student received the following feedback on his presentation work:

> Your presentation was excellent. I loved the way you challenged the audience to perk up and participate. And you handled the spontaneous discussion … quite nicely by not letting it fluster you. The drafts you presented were so illuminating and you did an excellent job bringing the class through each of them. Good work!” (Kader)

One group had less success due, it seemed, to their lack of commitment to completing the work necessary for the assignment. For example, one student from this group received the following feedback:

> [W]hile you did an excellent job leading discussion during your group’s presentation, I was disappointed that you did not bring in any information from the archive. The whole point of this assignment was for you to get into those materials, and from your presentation and this essay, I do not see any substantial evidence that you engaged thoughtfully with these materials. (Kader)
The energy in the class and the level of student participation rose substantially, even during the less successful presentations. Anecdotal evidence as well as student evaluations suggest that the students enjoyed and learned from the assignment. Many said it made them think about poetry in a new way.

From my point of view as the instructor, this assignment was successful within the context of the class because it allowed students to use the vocabulary and methods they had acquired in a new context. Most of the students had only previously encountered poetry in its published—and often anthologized—form, so this assignment challenged their perceptions of what poetry is. One student, who published an essay about his experience in MARBL Magazine, wrote, “Seeing the amount of work [poets] put into the creative process inspired reverence…. Viewing manuscripts with Seamus Heaney’s own handwriting seems more like interacting with the poet than simply reading his poems does…. [In MARBL] I learned that there is tremendous thought behind the mass-produced words on a printed (or digital) page” (Klein 2). This kind of intellectual and tactile experience allowed students to challenge their own preconceptions of poetry and direct their own critical engagement with the poets’ work. The self-directed nature of the research and the student-centered group presentations facilitated a democratic classroom and fulfilled both Friere’s ideals and the aims of the course goals as stated on the syllabus.

While the assignment was a success, it could be altered in various ways to provide different outcomes. For example, an entire course taught in MARBL focused solely on these three poets and using their complete archives would have allowed the students more time and greater understanding of their work. This kind of structure could have allowed
the students to craft a digital or physical exhibit with their findings, which would have inspired more commitment from the whole class. Within the context of a survey course, however, this would have voided much of the course’s breadth.

To grant the students even greater control over the assignment, I could have allowed them to choose from any poet whose papers exist at MARBL rather than assigning them one of three. This would have exposed students to the more challenging aspects of archival research such as inscrutable handwriting and tantalizing-yet-restricted files. This approach would have required the abolition of group work and would have provided less of a guarantee that the students would find fruitful avenues of archival research.

Within the context of the assignment as it was performed, the students’ archival research could have been more structured to ensure closer engagement with the materials. For example, the class could have met multiple times in MARBL where I could have monitored the students’ research. This approach, however, would have strained the staff at MARBL and would have diminished time in the classroom to cover foundational poetic concepts.

**Assessment 2: Critical Assessment**

In the fall of 2013 I collaborated with Michelle Robinson of UNC’s Department of American Studies to design a research assignment for her AMST 365: Women and Detective Fiction course. After meeting with her over the summer to discuss crafting an assignment using special collections materials, I designed an in-class exercise using the Mystery-Detective and Mass Market Paperbacks Collections within Wilson Special
Collections Library’s Rare Book Collection. Robinson then developed an optional research assignment also based on these materials and my in-class exercise.

The course traced “the origins of detective fiction and major developments in the history of the genre with a focus on women authors and protagonists” and focused on “historical and social contexts and to theoretical arguments relating to popular culture, genre studies, and gender.” According to the syllabus, the goals of the course were to enable students to

- Define genre. Outline a brief chronology of the genre of detective fiction. Identify elements and narrative conventions in detective fiction and each of its major subgenres.

- Examine different models of genre and multiple theories about the sociology and function of genre. Utilize terminology associated with genre studies, narratology and other major approaches to the study of literature.

- Relate the emergence of (sub)genres and female detectives to specific developments in political and economic life, gender roles, and social institutions, as well as modes of production.

- Contrast theoretical arguments about gender. Identify changes in the genre of detective fiction introduced by women authors and fictional detectives that are women.

- Consider the intersectionality of identity factors such as race, gender, sexuality, class and ethnicity in our examinations of popular culture.

- Summarize and evaluate the arguments of literary theorists and critics.
• Classify generic elements in works of literature. Discover hybrid genres and variations on genre formulas. Use genre formulas to predict narrative outcomes.

• Assess the success of literary texts as examples of detective fiction.

• Build creative and critical thinking skills. Work individually and collaboratively to pursue original research questions and develop methodologies for studying gender and genre.

Throughout the semester the students wrote two short papers, one group paper supplemented by a “Class Sourced Data Submission” based on the Nancy Drew Wanderer series, one book review, and a final paper. They also had a final exam.³

The in-class assignment I developed for the class was intended to educate students about the material aspects of books and to prepare them for their final paper, if they chose to pursue special collections research. Below is text of the handout I developed for the in-class assignment:

Judging a Book by its Cover: 10 Material Elements of 20th Century Books

In addition to analyzing the text of a book, we can also critically assess its materiality. The material aspects of a book can tell us about the decisions and motivations behind its publication, how and by whom it was intended to be read, and the ways it has been treated as a physical object. Lying on a desk or sitting on a shelf, a book communicates a good deal to the casual reader. As critical readers, we can interpret these signs and their cultural and rhetorical significance. Below are 10 material elements of books followed by questions we might consider as we interpret them:

1. Size
What does the size of a book say about how the publisher intended it to be read? Is a book small enough to fit into a pocket book? Is it lightweight enough to be carried around comfortably? Or is it larger and heavier and perhaps intended to stay at home?
Note: In public or at home, books and those who own them are judged differently by casual observers. Keep this in mind as you address the nine other material elements.

2. Dust jacket cover art
To what audiences is the cover trying to appeal? What is the tone of the cover? What kind of response does it try to elicit from readers and potential readers? What symbols does it employ? What types of human figures does it use and in what situations? What narrative does it try to tell?

3. Font
What does the font of the title, title page, body text, or other text communicate about the book and how the reader is supposed to feel about it? How does the font interact with other visual elements of the book’s cover and title page?

Note: Fonts have long history going back to manuscript culture and the invention of the printing press. Classic fonts like Gothic and Roman carry historical and national associations, while newer fonts can evoke all kinds of reactions from readers. For example, does the book title *Gaudy Night* communicate different things to you depending on the different fonts below?

*Gaudy Night*

*Gaudy Night*

*Gaudy Night*

4. Spine
What do the font (both style and size), visual elements, and colors try to communicate? What does the spine of a book tell you about its quality and how it has been read and treated by its owners? Was it a spine meant to last? Or was the book intended to be disposable after a certain number of years or reads?

Note: The spine is the only part of the book that is visible on a bookshelf, so it is meant to communicate a great deal to the casual browser.

Remember, when assessing the strength of a spine, be gentle and do no harm to the book!

5. Paper quality
How thick is the paper? How well has it held up over time? Does it seem brittle? Is it discolored? How dark is the ink and does it seem to have faded over time?

Remember, when assessing paper quality, be gentle and do no harm to the book!

6. Margins
How much space is there around the text for note taking?
Note: Annotation is a scholarly practice that goes back to the Middle Ages. Margins are traditionally a place for the reader to take notes in a book. The bigger the margins, the greater the invitation to the note taker—and the more expensive a book is to produce.

7. Illustrations
What kinds of illustrations are there in the book? Cover art? Frontispiece (an illustration opposite the title page)? Illustrations throughout, perhaps depicting scenes from the text? To what kinds of readers would these appeal? What might the illustrations add to the experience of reading the book?

Note: Illustrations are expensive. They require an artist as well as additional technology and technique, separate from printing costs. What might be the motivation behind this added cost to a book’s production?

8. Back cover art/information (dust jacket)
Does the art from the cover or the spine make its way over to the back? Does this contribute to some kind of narrative that the book jacket is trying to tell? If there is a description of the book, in what ways does it describe (or fail to describe) the contents? What is the tone of the description and what kind of rhetoric does the writer use? If there are blurbs, who are the sources and what was their status at the time the book was published?

9. Dust jacket flaps
Many of the same questions from number 8 apply here. Also, the back flyleaf may contain a biography of the writer. How is the writer situated? In what context is he or she described?

10. Hardcover
Dust jackets rarely remain with their books, and sometimes the hard covers are designed to appeal to readers on their own. Is there any art or decoration, and if so what does it convey? Looking at the spine, how does the title appeal to the reader? Is to be read vertically or is the text set horizontally? What was the intended afterlife of this book? What was a reader supposed to do with it when finished? (Kader)

This in-class assignment prepared the students to pursue research on the following prompt, which was one of their options for their final paper:

Referencing the 10 material elements of books on Dr. Emily Kader’s handout “Judging a Book by Its Cover,” complete a close visual and material analysis of 2-3 editions of a single detective book (or 2-3 books within a single detective series) from the Rare Book Collection at Wilson Library. After determining whether the books you’ve selected are examples of classical or hardboiled detective fiction, create an argumentative essay that responds the following
question: Do the material/visual/design elements you noted complement, enhance, challenge or undermine our ideas about the subgenre of detective fiction to which the book belongs? To what extent do these elements provide “instructions for reading”; that is, (how) do they set a horizon of expectations for an engagement with their particular subgenre? Identify and include detailed descriptions of material elements to support your argument, and be sure to indicate how the books compare to one another. Reference Roger Caillois's essay (“The Detective Novel as Game”) as well as your class notes to establish generic conventions if you are writing about classical detective fiction. Use George Grella's essay (“Murder and the Mean Streets: The Hard Boiled Detective Novel”) as well as class notes to establish conventions for hardboiled detective fiction. (Raymond Chandler’s and Dorothy Sayers’ essays may be helpful as well.) Feel free to draw attention to facets of book design that are not included in Kader’s list. (Robinson)

The students visited Wilson Library within the first few weeks of the semester to see examples of nineteenth- and twentieth-century mystery-detective fiction. They were given the above handout as they came into the instruction space. The materials I pulled for the session included multiple editions of single titles that had noticeable material, textual, and pictorial differences. I first led the students through these for the show-and-tell portion of the session. Twice I paused to show students examples of material texts that might be compared and asked them to interpret the differences they perceived. For the remainder of the class period the students examined the books using the questions on the handout as a guide. The professor and I encouraged the students to discuss the books among themselves and ask us questions as they conducted their informal analysis.

Like the MARBL assignment, this in-class exercise fulfills many of the ideals laid out by Friere as well as contemporary special collections pedagogy. It resulted from a collaborative meeting between a faculty member and reference librarian where the insights of both parties led to an assignment ideal for the class’s learning goals. During the instruction session, the students asked questions and discussed their ideas with each other as well as Robinson and myself. The mixture of verbal and written questions
appealed to students with different learning styles and were designed to show the way to potential research. The handout also gave students hands-on experience with materials in the collection, as students were asked to evaluate elements such as the paper quality, spine strength, and size of the books.

The assignment also served many of the objectives of the syllabus. Because the students looked at mystery and detective novels and serials from various decades and subgenres, including classical detective, hard-boiled, and pulp fiction, the assignment helped students “[i]dentify elements [of] detective fiction and each of its major subgenres.” Examining the material aspects of books also helped students understand “specific developments in political and economic life, gender roles, and social institutions, as well as modes of production.” And their analysis of these material elements allowed students to “[b]uild creative and critical thinking skills … pursue original research questions and develop methodologies for studying gender and genre” (Robinson).

My assessment of the success of this assignment is based on my observations during the session as well as written feedback from the professor and the students. Compared to the regular time period during which students examine materials during an instruction session, this period of examination was much livelier. The discussion among the students was audible, and more of them asked questions of me and their professor than in regular sessions. After the session, Robinson asked each student to provide written feedback of the session. In this evaluation, the handout received high marks. The students noted that it gave them a starting place for their inquiry and helped them focus on aspects of the materials they would have otherwise missed. Robinson also expressed high
satisfaction with this teaching tool and used it to develop the final writing assignment for the class.

Only a small number of students chose to pursue special collections research for their final papers, likely because of the restrictive nature of the special collections operating hours, security, and research. As ever, these remain constant barriers for students given with the choice to pursue research in settings that are more familiar. However, the in-class assignment was valuable in itself because it introduced many students to thinking critically beyond the text itself and into the material aspects of books.

In the future, this course could expand its use special collections in various ways. For example, the students could be required to select single editions of a text and perform research on its production. They might consider the political and economic forces driving the publisher, the control over design given to the author, and the reputation of the artists charged with the book’s design. Or the students could create a digital project that charts changes in a single book’s aesthetics in different editions and printings, taking into account historical or societal changes that may have influenced its material elements.

Ways that the success of these or the current assignments might be assessed by special collections staff might include an official survey of student experience and access to student assignments or presentations with special collections materials.

Conclusion

Assignments, no matter how big or small in scale, can help special collections instructors guide students toward critical engagement with archives, manuscripts, and rare books. They provide structure for the instruction session and give it a measurable
learning goal. Within this framework, and in collaboration with faculty, special collections instructors can break down the many barriers that impede student curiosity and critical engagement. Faculty have long known that assignments motivate student learning. They provide students with parameters for inquiry by posing initial questions and showing students portals through which they might begin their search for understanding. They give students who may not understand the materials they are encountering a touchstone that can restore their confidence in their own critical abilities. Assignments give students license to discover, to analyze, and to interpret. In the special collections classroom that aspires toward Friere’s democratic learning environment, they can be the conduit through which instructors and shy, unsure students connect, collaborate, and critically engage with their shared subject.

NOTES.

1 For example, see Jennifer L. Crye’s “Instruction and Assessment in Special Collections: An Exploratory Study of Student, Staff, and Faculty Perceptions,” pages 37-40, and Magia G. Krause’s “‘It Makes History Alive for them’: the Role of Archivists and Special Collections Librarians in Instructing Undergraduates.”
2 For the full syllabus, see appendix 1.
3 For the full syllabus, see appendix 2.
Poetry: ENG 205  
Fall 2011, Tuesdays and Thursdays: 10:00-11:15

Professor Emily Kader  
Mailbox: English Dept., Callaway N-302  
Office: Callaway N-306  
Office hours: Tuesdays 11:30-1:30; Thursdays 12:30-2:30

Course description:
This course will introduce students to the pleasures of reading, hearing, speaking, and studying poetry critically. The first portion of the course will be devoted to familiarizing students with how poems work and attending closely to language, imagery, rhythm, rhyme, and poetic form. This portion will train students to be close readers of poetic texts, a skill they may transfer thereafter to any text, both literary and non-literary; it will also train students on the complex vocabulary of poetry. Students will gain a perspective of how poets themselves create poetry by working with manuscripts in Emory’s Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library (MARBL). Students will have an opportunity to work with the drafts, manuscripts, and letters of three major contemporary poets. We will conclude the course with a study focused on twentieth-century Irish poetry. This portion of the course will help students understand that poetry is often a kind of conversation in which poets engage each other’s work across space and time. By examining the work of our Irish poets, students will also confront the historical and political effect of poetry within a specific national context. Throughout the course we will pay special attention to the orality of poetry as we listen to, speak, and perform it ourselves. Through a range of assignments, including analytical papers, archival research, group presentations, and poetry recitations, students will become familiar with poetry and the many forms it takes in the past and in the present.

This course has the following objectives:
- To provide a comprehensive introduction to both the mechanics and magic of poetry
- To introduce students to writing about poetry and to improve their critical reading and writing skills
- To familiarize students with archival research
- To accustom students to the orality of poetry and to understand it through the eye and the ear

Required texts:  
- *Flight and Earlier Poems*, by Vona Groarke  
Supplementary texts provided on Blackboard marked BB

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Attendance: I expect each student to come to class regularly, on time, and prepared. I will take attendance in each class. Missing more than 2 classes for whatever reason will negatively affect your participation grade, which accounts for 15% of your final grade. Missing more than 8 classes will result in an “F” for the course. If you are absent on the day a paper or other assignment is due, it is still your responsibility to turn in that paper on time. Late work will not
be accepted, except at my discretion (and with a grading penalty). If you miss class, please contact a classmate for notes and announcements that you missed.

**Participation:** Being physically present in class is the bare minimum: I also expect you to be mentally present and to engage actively and regularly in class discussion. Participation largely depends on preparation; you are, of course, required to do all reading and writing assignments and to come to class with all materials. And do your reading well: mark up your book, take notes for yourself in the margins, underline important passages, turn down pages to which you want to return. In this course, plan on coming to each and every class ready to participate in our discussion. In addition, there will be short in-class writing assignments throughout the semester that will be factored into your participation grade.

**Assignments:**

**Paper 1**
A 4-page analytic paper on a single poem that makes a substantive argument and supports it through close reading. I will distribute a prompt later in the semester.

**MARBL Project—Presentation/Discussion**
One of the goals of this semester is to learn about *how* poetry works—the mechanics behind the magic. To gain a different perspective on how poems are put together, students will delve into the rich archival resources available right here in Emory’s Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library. In small groups, you will undertake a focused exploration of a single volume of poetry by a single poet—Lucille Clifton, Carol Ann Duffy, or Seamus Heaney. You will spend time digging through the archive and will then bring what you have found back to the class, both presenting your research and engaging your fellow students in a lively discussion based on your findings. As you work on these poems in process, one of the primary questions I would like you to keep in mind is how these materials advance, restrict, or otherwise revise our experience of poetry and even our sense of what poetry is. More details will follow.

**Paper 2 (MARBL)**
Each individual in your MARBL group will independently write a critical paper of 6-7 pages that uses your archival research to make an original argument about a single poem or poems. This paper will be due one week after your group presentation.

**Paper 3**
In your third paper (6-7 pages), you will be responsible for comparing two or more poems by two different authors from our case study of twentieth-century Irish poetry.

**Responses (3)**
These informal responses may take one of two forms, but, in either form, they will respond to a single poem. These are the forms your responses can take:

1) You may freely and informally respond to the poem in prose (in 2 double-spaced pages), basing your thoughts/musings/analysis very closely on the poem’s language itself. Feel free to use the terms and vocabulary and even other poems we have discussed in class for the purpose of comparison.

2) You may choose to respond to the poem in verse, taking the poem for your object and responding to its theme, form, etc., in your poem. In addition to composing your poem, you must provide a paragraph or two explaining both poems and describing the relationship you see between them.
Recitation
You will recite from memory a poem of your choosing of at least 14 lines in length. After declaiming your poem, you should be prepared to talk for a few minutes about why you chose the poem you did for memorization, what your strategies were for memorizing it, and how learning and speaking the poem orally changed your understanding of it.

Grading Percentages:
- Participation 15%
- Paper 1 15%
- Paper 2 20%
- Paper 3 20%
- Short responses 10%
- MARBL Presentation 10%
- Recitation 10%

Honor Code:
Students are expected to adhere to the principles of intellectual honesty and integrity outlined in the Emory Honor Code and will be held responsible for any and all breaches in this agreement. Plagiarism is a serious academic offense, and one that I take very seriously. All students should familiarize themselves with the Emory Honor Code: http://www.college.emory.edu/current/standards/honor_code.html.

Writing Center:
I strongly encourage all students to take advantage of the assistance offered by the Writing Center, located at Callaway N212. The Writing Center is an excellent resource for writers of all skill levels. It offers help on all aspects of writing, including but not limited to brainstorming, organization, thesis formation, and revision. You can make appointments for tutoring sessions and find more information about the Writing Center on their website: http://www.writingcenter.emory.edu/.

Course Schedule:

What is poetry?
Thursday August 25: Introduction to course

Tuesday August 30: William Shakespeare, Sonnet 55, pg. 172
Emily Dickinson, [“I dwell in Possibility –”] (BB)
Lewis Carroll, “Jabberwocky”

Thursday September 1: Marianne Moore, “Poetry”
Ted Hughes, “The Thought Fox,” pg. 1124
Langston Hughes, “The Weary Blues,” pg. 912

Diction
Tuesday September 6: John Keats, “Ode to a Nightingale,” pg. 582, and “Ode on a Grecian Urn,” pg. 585
Jonathan Swift, “A Description of a City Shower,” pg. 333
Thursday September 8: William Carlos Williams, “This is Just to Say,” pg. 830
Ted Hughes, “Pike,” pg. 1125

Speaker
Tuesday September 13: Christopher Marlow, “The Passionate Shepherd to his Love,” pg. 168
Sir Walter Raleigh, “The Nymph’s Reply to the Shepherd,” pg. 121

Thursday September 15: Robert Burns, “To a Mouse,” pg. 452
Gwendolyn Brooks, “We Real Cool,” pg. 999
Philip Larkin, “This Be the Verse,” pg. 1033

Response 1 Due

Imagery
Tuesday September 20: William Blake, “The Lamb,” page 441, and “The Tyger,” pg. 446
Wilfred Owen, “Dulce Et Decorum Est,” pg. 890
Philip Larkin, “High Widows” (BB)

Langston Hughes, “Harlem,” pg. 915

Tuesday September 27: William Carlos Williams, “The Red Wheelbarrow,” pg. 829
Wallace Stevens, “The Emperor of Ice-Cream,” pg. 816
Louis MacNeice, “Snow” (BB)

Symbol and Metaphor

Paper 1 Due

Tuesday October 4: Visit to MARBL

Thursday October 6: Emily Dickinson, [“I felt a Funeral in my Brain,”], pg 723, [“The Soul selects her own Society –”], pg. 725, [“Because I could not stop for Death –”], pg. 726

Tuesday October 11: NO CLASS – FALL BREAK

Rhythm and Rhyme
Thomas Hardy, “Channel Firing,” pg. 749
Vona Groarke’s “Folderol,” in Flight and Earlier Poems
Derek Mahon, “A Disused Shed in Co. Wexford,” pg. 1194-95

Form
Tuesday October 18: Stanza
Wilfred Own, “Strange Meeting,” pg. 891
Alexander Pope, “The Rape of the Lock,” pg. 357
Philip Larkin, “Sad Steps,” pg. 1032
Seamus Heaney, “Punishment,” pg. 1180-81

Meter
Edgar Allen Poe, “The Raven,” pgs. 615-18

Response 2 Due

Thursday October 20: Sonnet
William Shakespeare, Sonnet 1, pg. 169; Sonnet 20, pg. 171; Sonnet 129, pg. 177; Sonnet 130, pg. 177
e. e. cummings, [“next to of course god america i”], pg. 894

Tuesday October 25: Villanelle
Dylan Thomas, “Do Not Go Gentle into That Good Night,” pg. 991
Paul Muldoon, “Milkweed and Monarch,” pg. 1226

Sestina
Elizabeth Bishop, “Sestina,” pg. 963

Free Verse
Walt Whitman, Song of Myself, pgs. 679-84
Langston Hughes, “Theme for English B,” pg. 915

Thursday October 27: MARBL Presentations

Tuesday November 1: MARBL Presentations

Thursday November 3: MARBL Presentations

Tuesday November 8: W. B. Yeats, all poems listed in the Norton, plus “The Fisherman” and “The Song of Wandering Aengus” (BB)

Thursday November 10: Louis MacNeice, all poems in the Norton plus “Snow,” “Belfast,” “Turfstacks,” and “Carrickfergus” (BB)


Tuesday November 22: TBA

Thursday November 24: NO CLASS – THANKSGIVING BREAK

Tuesday November 29: Nuala Ní Dhomhnaill, “Geasa (The Bond),” “Féar Suaithinseach

Recitations

Response 3 Due—One page on the experience of memorizing a poem or a poetic imitation followed by half a page about the formal choices you made

Thursday December 1: Vona Groarke
Recitations

Tuesday December 6: Groarke, cont.
Recitations

Last day of class

Thursday December 8: Paper 3 Due
Women and Detective Fiction
From Miss Violet Strange to Veronica Mars

AMST 365 - Monday/Wednesday/Friday 10-10:50, Greenlaw Hall 318
Instructor: Dr. Michelle Robinson
Office Hours: Monday/Wednesday/Friday 11-12 am and by appointment, Greenlaw Hall 529

Course Description
This course will trace the origins of detective fiction and major developments in the history of the genre with a focus on women authors and protagonists. We will examine amateur sleuths, private investigators and police detectives in fiction and film, with close attention to historical and social contexts and to theoretical arguments relating to popular culture, genre studies, and gender.

Course Goals and Key Learning Objectives:

Define genre. Outline a brief chronology of the genre of detective fiction. Identify elements and narrative conventions in detective fiction and each of its major subgenres.

Examine different models of genre and multiple theories about the sociology and function of genre. Utilize terminology associated with genre studies, narratology and other major approaches to the study of literature.

Relate the emergence of (sub)genres and female detectives to specific developments in political and economic life, gender roles, and social institutions, as well as modes of production.

Contrast theoretical arguments about gender. Identify changes in the genre of detective fiction introduced by women authors and fictional detectives that are women.

Consider the intersectionality of identity factors such as race, gender, sexuality, class and ethnicity in our examinations of popular culture.

Summarize and evaluate the arguments of literary theorists and critics.

Classify generic elements in works of literature. Discover hybrid genres and variations on genre formulas. Use genre formulas to predict narrative outcomes.

Assess the success of literary texts as examples of detective fiction.
Build creative and critical thinking skills. Work individually and collaboratively to pursue original research questions and develop methodologies for studying gender and genre.

**Course Materials:** Please feel free to use other editions or library copies if it is more convenient (or cheaper) for you. The following books are available at the UNC Bookstore:

**Required**
- **“K” is for Killer** by Sue Grafton (Paperback; Saint Martin’s 2009; **ISBN-10:** 0312373120; **ISBN-13:** 978-0312373122) 304 pages.
- **All She Was Worth** by Miyuki Miyabe (Paperback; Mariner 1999; **ISBN-10:** 0395966582; **ISBN-13:** 978-0395966587) 304 pages.
- **Dog Day** by Alicia Giménez Bartlett (Paperback; Europa 2006; **ISBN-10:** 1933372141; **ISBN-13:** 978-1933372143) 208 pages.

**Recommended**
- **Veronica Mars: The Complete First Season** (2004). (Warner Home Video 2005; 6 discs; **ASIN:** B000A59PMO)
- Media Resources Center (UL) call no. 65-DVD3653 v.1-5; available from Netflix Shipping and for purchase on Amazon Instant Video

**Course Requirements:**

- **20%** Attendance and participation are mandatory for this course. Four unexcused absences or recurring tardiness will result in a deduction of at least 5% of your attendance and participation grade. Participation includes preparation before class, in-class contributions, and self-assessments, as well as mid-semester and semester course evaluations. You will have opportunities to gauge your comprehension of course materials using ungraded assessments (multiple-choice, fill-in-the-blank, or short answer) distributed via Sakai or in class. You are encouraged to email or visit office hours to ask about concepts and/or materials that are difficult or raise important questions.

- **30%** Two Short Paper Assignments (15% each, due September 13 and October 28) of 3-4 pages each. These short papers should demonstrate your skills at close reading/literary analysis and your familiarity with important concepts, and should consider relevant historical contexts.

- **15%** A Group Paper based on Class Sourced Data Submission (Due September 26) on one volume of the Nancy Drew Wanderer Series and a contribution to a collective Annotated Bibliography on Nancy Drew (a
1-paragraph length article summary, due September 24). I will provide all materials for this assignment. The due date for this assignment will be determined based on our work with the Digital Innovations Lab and the use of the Final Exam, tbd.

10% and 15%  A **Book Review** (due by 5pm November 16) of 2-3 pages in length and a **Final Short Paper Assignment** (4 pages, due by 5pm December 2).

**OR**

25%  A **Final Paper or Project assignment** (due by 5pm December 2) of 7-8 pages that will analyze one or more texts in depth or pursue an original topic of your choice. There will also be creative options for the final paper. A paper proposal is due November 16, and will count for 20% of the final paper assignment grade.

5%  A **Final Exam**, scheduled for Friday, December 13, at 8am.

These assignments are subject to change based on our interests; any changes to course requirements will be posted in an amended syllabus. All assignments will be available on and submitted via Sakai unless otherwise instructed. For extensions on assignments or alternate assignments, please consult with me as far in advance as possible. Please feel free to come and discuss any of the course requirements or other questions about the class during office hours.

**Plagiarism and other acts of Academic Dishonesty** listed in the honor code will not be tolerated. The UNC Honor Code defines plagiarism as the “deliberate or reckless representation of another’s words, thoughts, or ideas as one’s own without attribution in connection with submission of academic work, whether graded or otherwise.” It is crucial for our environment to reflect individual responsibility and mutual respect for academic goals. If you have concerns about accidentally plagiarizing the work of others or citing texts correctly, please come speak to me and I will refer you to on-campus resources. Information on proper citation procedures is available at www.lib.unc.edu/copyright.

**Schedule of Readings** (* indicates a reading posted on the course website, e-reserves, or available online). The schedule is subject to change based on our interests; changes and supplementary readings will be posted on the course website.

**8/21 - Introduction to the Course and Major Themes**

**8/23 - What is genre for? Really, what is it for?**

**8/26 - Gothic Fiction and The Locked Room Mystery**


8/28 - **Kings, Queens, and Ministers**

8/30 - **An Unsuitable Job for a Woman?**

9/2 - Labor Day - NO CLASS

9/4 - **Miss Sherlock Holmes and the Mother of Detective Fiction**

9/6 – **Theories of Classical Detective Fiction**

9/9 - **The Four Queens and the “New Woman”**

9/11 - **A Body in the Library by Agatha Christie**

9/13 - Wilson Library, Mystery-Detective Collection

First Short Paper Assignment is due by 5pm on Friday, September 13, 2013
9/16, 9/18 – A Body in the Library (cont.)

9/20 - Young, Blonde and Attractive

9/23 *GROUP WORK on Nancy Drew Article and Book from the Nancy Drew Wanderer Series; bring a draft of your entry for the Annotated Bibliography to class; formulate and submit research questions by the end of class.

Post submission for Annotated Bibliography by noon, Tuesday, September 24, 2013.

9/25 *GROUP WORK continued

Submit Data for Nancy Drew Group Project by 5pm, Thursday, September 26, 2013.

9/27 *GROUP WORK continued


10/2 - Theories of Hard-Boiled Crime Fiction and Film Noir

10/4, 10/7 Veronica Mars, Episodes 1-8

10/9, 10/11, 10/14 Indemnity Only by Sara Paretsky

10/16 * “K” is for Killer by Sue Grafton

10/18 Fall Break – NO CLASS

10/21, 10/23 “K” is for Killer by Sue Grafton (cont.)

10/25, 10/28 Veronica Mars, Episodes 9-16

Second Short Paper Assignment due by 5pm on Monday, October 28, 2013.

10/30, 11/1, 11/4 Dog Day by Alicia Giménez Bartlett
11/6, 11/8, 11/11    *All She Was Worth* by Miyuki Miyabe

11/13, 11/15    *Veronica Mars*, Episodes 17-24

Book Review OR Final paper Proposal due by 5pm on Saturday, November 16, 2013.

11/18, 11/20, 11/22, 11/25 *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* by Stieg Larsson

11/27 – 11/29 Thanksgiving Break – NO CLASS

12/2, 12/4 -  Wrap Up, Review, and Preparation for the Final Exam

Final Paper or Project due by 5pm on December 2, 2013.

Final Exam is Friday, December 13, 2013 at 8am.
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