

Genre can be a fickle thing

The differences in genre classification

Bram Dupont

3545997

Blok 4, Studiejaar 2011/2012

13-06-12

Dr. James Hurley

Genre Theory

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
A Case Study of Superhero film: why it is a genre	2
IMDb and the authority of the film industry	4
Wikipedia – the site of the masses by the masses	6
Conclusion	9
Bibliography	10

Introduction

Whenever you feel yourself confronted with the question of genre, you cannot help but feel that this question must have originated from somewhere. We did not, all of the sudden wonder what genre entails. Nor did we spontaneously question the categories we use. The biggest issue with genre is that, although we use it as a system to classify different films with, the consensus does not seem to be there. It is quite common for a film to have a specific label given by one authority and given another by the next. This discrepancy is an interesting one to note for a couple of reasons. First and foremost, this inconsistency challenges us to make sense of the films we watch. Are they actually part of the genre that they are accredited to and if not, what genre should they be categorized under? Secondly, we should think more critically about how we categorize films. Why do we feel a certain film is most definitely a western but most certainly not a comedy? Thirdly and lastly, why do we use genres to categorize films in the first place?

Although not all of these questions have to be answered in this article. They do, however, form the basis of the question that has been asked leading up to the forming of this article. Why is there no consensus between authorities on film? Now, let the term authority be more clearly defined so that later on in this article there should be no debate. An authority, in the sense of this article, is someone or a collective that claims knowledge on the subject. In this article two authorities will be discussed and these authorities should be seen as collectives and not individuals. These two authorities are the Internet Movie Database (abbreviated from this point on to IMDb) and Wikipedia. Since both of these collectives are online sources this nature of theirs will also be taken into account.

Throughout this article one thing will be important to keep in mind and that is that context is key to understanding whatever is being penned down at one point or the other. This is also how the question in this article will be answered, by using the neoformalist approach of historical poetics introduced by Kristin Thompson and David Bordwell. (Bordwell, p. 378-379) The question that has to be answered is how do these two authorities answer the question of genre: how do they classify which film falls under which category? The task at hand is not an easy one but be patient and the answer provided will shed some light on why there is no consensus between authorities. An addendum has to be added that there is some consensus but still not on all fronts. There are a lot of genres that exist today that are not being used by some sites and vice versa. Later on in this article this specific aspect will be addressed properly.

In general and broad terms this article can be divided into five chapters, including the introduction and conclusion. This article will start with an exemplification of the usage of genre which will introduce the differences of genre classification. After this we have IMDb that will be looked at and analyzed. One of the important aspects for this chapter is to deduce where sites such as IMDB get their information from. Knowing how they are provided with information will give us more insight in

how genre is defined for them. Afterwards Wikipedia will be discussed, not only on whether or not it should be considered an authority but also on its answer to the question. Since Wikipedia is a website in which everyone can provide information and that aspect of the website does seem to discredit it a bit. Nonetheless, in the chapter regarding Wikipedia an argument will be made as to why the information provided could in fact be seen as authority. In the chapter after the previous two, a case study will illustrate the point made in the previous chapters. These three chapters will form the body for this article. In the conclusion the arguments made will be formulated into a distinctive answer to the question posed but also the questions leading up to the main question will be summarized.

To summarize, this article will explore the question of genre and specifically how different authorities answer this question differently. The authorities looked at will be IMDb and Wikipedia who work in dissimilar ways and have thus a different system of genre classification. The way to gather information about these two authorities will rely on the context for which they provide and are given their information. By the end of this article, the question of why there is a discrepancy between authorities in the way they categorize genres will be answered.

A Case Study of Superhero film: why it is a genre

One of the genres that is gaining popularity fast the past couple of years is the superhero film genre. This genre has because of its popularity seen a lot of films over the last couple of years, films such as IRON MAN, SPIDER-MAN, BATMAN BEGINS, KICK-ASS, and WATCHMEN just to name a few. Some of these films will portray the superhero in the more traditional sense: as a hero that is larger than life and one that performs deeds that also are most certainly extraordinary. Other superhero films will however focus more on the human aspect of superheroes and will therefore have a different focus in narrative. One aspect about the superhero film is always addressed: what makes a superhero? It is this specific aspect of the superhero film that sets it apart from any other genre and why it in fact should be considered a genre. This is also the question that rises for Vincent M. Gaine. “If we are to perform an analysis of “superheroes” – let alone the superhero genre – we must first define what a superhero is.” (Gaine, p.112) It would be too easy, just as Gaine suggests later on in his article, that a superhero is merely an individual with superpowers. (Gaine, p. 113) The suggestion that a superhero is a person that “operate[s] on the *borders* of society, as it is this liminal state that maintains his extraordinary nature.” (Gaine, p. 114) In short this aspect, or better yet this topic, is what clearly defines a superhero film. The film should be about someone who pushes the limits of what society will accept but is also somehow super in nature.

It is actually important to understand the differences in ways to classify genres in order to make a fair argument whether or not superhero films should in fact be considered a genre or not. The genre of superhero films would in fact not be the first genre which is not considered to be a genre by some. Film-noir has also been debated extensively upon. “[O]ne could argue that film noir is not a

genre but rather a body of films from a specific culture and historical period that can be divided among several related but distinct genres.” (Orr, p. 23) Christopher Orr explains when confronted with the issues concerning film-noir films. He would then go on by saying that “it is often treated as such by many film critics.” (Orr, p. 23) This discussion sounds familiar to the discussion between descriptive and prescriptive linguists. The latter insists upon using grammar and syntax rules as they are prescribed whilst the former insists upon the fact that if enough people use a certain way of saying things this is the correct approach. Having said this it is also important to note that prescriptivists are part of an elite and traditional way of looking at grammar. Descriptivists on the other hand could be best described as those who represent a larger group of people who look at actual usage of language and back this usage up with scientific evidence. Even though the fields of linguistics and film theory are not the same by any means, the aspect of descriptive and prescriptive thinking does apply to both fields when concerned to genre theory.

There is a clear distinction of usage of genre when we look at a site such as IMDb or Wikipedia. In the linguistic sense IMDb would be prescriptive and Wikipedia would be descriptive. Of course this is a bit short-sighted but it in fact makes a lot of sense. IMDb uses the knowledge of the elite while Wikipedia will use knowledge of the masses. If you are told you can only work by the rules given to you. Subsequently you come across a film such as the superhero film that cannot be categorized in just one genre the only logical thing would be to categorize it under a set of categories that would make the most sense. The other option, the one Wikipedia offers, is to deconstruct the rules given and create a new set of rules to work with. Barry Keith Grant actually describes the issue of prescriptive and descriptive best. “Films were loosely typed by producers, audiences, and even reviewers: a movie was a “western” or a “war movie” or a “musical,” and such descriptive labels came to signal information to prospective consumers about the story and the kind of pleasure it was likely to offer.” (Grant, p. XVI) Over times these genre labels changed but not everyone changed with them. Some producers or studios might hang on to old labels to classify films and then new and sometimes more exciting terms get caught in the crossfire.

What should then be done about the superhero film genre? Should we ignore that fact the term is being used by critics, reviewers and audiences just because it does not fit into the framework used in the most traditional sense. Historically speaking genre has been very useful to shape the expectations and possible narrative for the audiences. Grant further explains that genre “became a critical term as well as a collection of popular categories.” (Grant, p. XVI) It is important to note the past tense in his description of what genre is. It was a collection of then popular categories and these categories have changed over time. Today different categories will be used although of course the more traditional categories are still in use.

As a result when we deconstruct what a superhero film is, we are left with either using the term used to describe the specific topical genre it is or, use a combination of genres such as action, fantasy, and science-fiction. When we use the latter option we will however be confronted by the fact

that none of these labels fully describe what a superhero film is. A superhero film surely is action packed but the action is more of a tool to be used than what superhero films are about. They most definitely are not purely science-fiction or fantasy films either. Yes, the things superheroes can do are extraordinary but usually the superhero is set in a setting in which he or she is not common. In *BATMAN BEGINS* for instance, Batman is the only superhero roaming the streets of Gotham City and as far as the audience knows he is also the only one who gets to use the gadgets that he uses. Thematically a superhero film is about more than any of the traditional categories: the superhero film transcends the action but also science-fiction and fantasy genre. The superhero just like the genre exists on the borders of different genres. It may borrow stylistic elements from “the spy film, martial arts adventure and the action film, the Western and the film noir” the superhero film genre however always stays on the border and never fully crosses it. (Gaine, p. 128) This is why the genre deserves to move away from the area of sub-genre and into the list of categories used on sites such as IMDb instead of just by users, critics and reviewers.

IMDb and the authority of the film industry

How then does IMDb answer the question of genre? When we are confronted with the issue of genre, we should be cautious in just accepting whatever answer is given. Genres are, as defined in the book *Film History* by Kristin Thompson and David Bordwell, several “types of films that audiences and filmmakers recognize by their recurring conventions.” (Thompson and Bordwell, p. 734) This definition in itself is vague but one thing about this definition should be considered striking and that is that in defining what a genre is both audiences and filmmakers are taken into account. Moreover, genre seems to be about conventions. A term such as conventions is in fact a broad term and is applicable to various things. Zooming in on what those conventions might be we have Stephen Neale who provides the following definition. “Genres do not consist only of films: they consist also, and equally, of specific systems of expectation and hypothesis that spectators bring with them to the cinema and that interact with films themselves during the course of the viewing process.” (Neale, p. 161) Neale seems to be giving more authority to the viewer in defining what genres consist of. Although his definition is still a bit broad and vague it does however give a clearer understanding of what genre is. Genre classification seems to be about what we expect to see in a specific film. Such as having a lone hero in a Western or having an invasion by aliens in a Science Fiction. Genre helps shape our expectations of films. Therefore it is essential to know who in fact gives these labels to films. These labels do not appear out of nowhere and are used to give the audience a sense of understanding what the film could be about. The audience might know more about the style or narrative of the film based on the genre labels attached to it and that is what genre is about: knowing more about the film without having to have seen it first.

Now we shift our attention to the website of IMDb. This website is like the name suggests a database for movies. The data provided on the different films vary in detail. What's usually the case, is that the more well known the film is the more information can be found. Amongst the data found you can find trivia, reviews, who acted in the film, where it was made and much more. (What is IMDb?)

One of the data which can be found and therefore categorized is genre. An interesting fact about IMDb is that most of the films are not categorized as one genre but in set of genres. Such as THE GREAT DICTATOR which is accredited as a comedy, drama and war film. However, Thompson and Bordwell mention THE GREAT DICTATOR as merely a comedy in *Film History*. (Thompson and Bordwell, p. 224) This difference in genre labeling of the same film is an interesting one. The first thing that makes the dissimilarity peculiar is that for IMDb the genre comedy is not enough to describe what kind of film THE GREAT DICTATOR is. For some reason the editors at IMDb felt that the film showed enough stylistic elements of both drama and war films that they should be included in defining what kind of film it in fact is. Stephen Neale offers a plausible solution to how this is possible. "Moreover, it is at least arguable that many of the most apparently 'pure' and stable genres, both inside and outside the cinema, initially evolved by combining elements from previously discrete and separate genres either within or across specific generic regimes." (Neale, p. 172) This would in fact explain why IMDb would use three genres to describe THE GREAT DICTATOR instead of just one. Still, this is not the full story.

On one of the webpages of IMDb in which they explain where they get their information from and how reliable this information is called *How/where you get your information? How accurate/reliable is it?* They say: "The information in the Internet Movie Database comes from various sources. While we actively gather information from and verify items with studios and filmmakers, the bulk of our information is submitted by people in the industry and visitors like you." (IMDb) So even though IMDb uses some of the information provided by the users most of the information seems to be coming from the studios and filmmakers. This seems to suggest a not per se old-fashioned way of categorizing films' genre but most certainly a biased way of genre classification. Instead of getting information about what genre a film is from different sources than those who made the films or produced them, you would in fact get more diverse information. For studios and filmmakers it at times is an economical issue to promote a film as being part of specific genre although it might in fact have more in common with a different one altogether. The plot even thickens for IMDb when in the privacy notice it is mentioned that the parent company of IMDb is Amazon.com. (IMDb Privacy Notice) Amazon is in part a distributor of film and is therefore interested in giving films the right genre labels to increase the sales. This is not an uncommon practice amongst distributors of film. If we check out the film THE GREAT DICTATOR being offered for sale on Amazon.com we see that the same genres have been labeled to the film as on IMDb. (Amazon) After checking if this is a single case the film INCEPTION is found on both sites and although Amazon adds the genre thriller (Amazon, INCEPTION) into the mix both sites are quite similar in which genres they use for their films.

(IMDb, INCEPTION) It is clear that IMDb gets most of its information from Amazon but as they state on their website regarding where they get their information from: it seems that the public also has a hand in things.

The question remains who IMDb refers to when they speak about where they get their information from and how they verify this. It is however hard to find out whom in fact the editors or administrators are for IMDb. This does not mean that there is no information to be found on this subject whatsoever. The website has a webpage specifically designed for applicants of jobs in the company. An interesting insight this particular webpage gives is that everything is done for a reason. One of the positions in the company to be filled in is that of the business analysis and one of his key responsibilities is to: “Work with large databases to generate user behavior insights; identify drivers and traffic trends.” (IMDb Jobs) Although there are more jobs currently open at IMDb this one highlights the economic tendencies within this website. To be focused, even just a little bit, on what customers might like to view and use this information to your benefit does come across as interesting at least. To some extent this information, concerning the workings of IMDb, verifies the notion that some genre labels are being stamped on a film not because it fits but because it will sell. IMDb is not just a website for the movie enthusiast to find out more about the films they like but it is actually a business and with all businesses every choice is a carefully chosen one.

In short genre classification can be done in two ways: by the audience or by the studios and filmmakers. For a site such as IMDb the emphasis does seem to be on the latter. This can in part be ascribed to the fact that it is owned by Amazon and this company has an economic agenda when it comes to labeling films by genre. Some genres will sell more than others and it is understandable that company will make as much money as possible. Nevertheless, because IMDb is in fact owned by a company which aim it is to make money the information provided by the site should be looked at closely. One cannot simply accept all the information given without being a little wary of the potential motives which precede them. Being a website whose parent company is focused on making a profit the workings of IMDb should be called into question more than it was before. IMDb is, however, still a credible source that provides an older way of categorizing genre and there is another site that lies in wait and that is Wikipedia.

Wikipedia – the site of the masses by the masses

If you by now have not heard about Wikipedia, you most probably have been living under a rock. The website has transformed over the last couple of years from an online encyclopedia used by few to one used by many. However, there is one thing with this site that seems to worry at least most of the faculty's staff at many a university: the content is not always a hundred percent credible. The reason for this is that not every article on Wikipedia uses references to account for the article's credibility. This fact makes the different articles questionable at times. Though, it is of the utmost importance to

always fact check whatever you read. This applies to articles read for courses in university and the articles on a site such as Wikipedia. It would in fact be an incorrect assumption to view all the information on Wikipedia to be false. Wikipedia is a site that thrives on what is called user-generated content. No longer is the audience merely the recipients for information but it has now also become the creator of information. “As audiences have become ‘users’ and user-generated content has started to become a real competitor to traditional media the impact of the Internet on traditional media institutions is stronger than even Poster and Kellner above might have predicted ten years ago.” (Lister et al, p. 221) Martin Lister and others claim in *New Media: a Critical Introduction* that the user or audience has become more important to understanding media. Wikipedia is an important flag bearer for this because as an open-edit encyclopedia the content is regulated by users. Lister would even go as far as describing the website to be “an online encyclopaedia produced by the hive mind of its many users.” (Lister et al, p. 167) Let us keep this idea of a hive mind in the back of our heads for a moment as we delve deeper into understanding Wikipedia and therefore whether or not this encyclopedia can provide any credible knowledge concerning genre.

Actually knowing that content is being generated by users is one thing but knowing who regulates what gets edited away from articles is yet another. For a website which content is freely edited and provided by users there seems to be a clear flaw with the website. Adele Santana and Donna J. Wood sum it up best. “Wikipedia’s processes are not as transparent as the owners claim, the medium fails on grounds of the moral autonomy principle.” (Santana and Wood, p. 141) This failure, they claim, lies in the fact that the editors and administrators of Wikipedia remain anonymous to this day. (Santana and Wood, p. 141) This lack of transparency on who the editors and administrators are is clarified in an article by Aaron Swartz. “Just as Wikipedia’s success as an encyclopedia requires a world of volunteers to write it, Wikipedia’s success as an organization requires the community of volunteers to run it.” (Swartz, par. 20) Having users both edit and contribute to an encyclopedia is of course not without troubles and still it does not mean that the information shared is correct by default. As it is mentioned in the previous paragraph it is imperative to cross-check any information found on a website such as Wikipedia. Even though not every article has reference or enough references most of the time when a claim is made in an article a ‘citation needed’ is added to the specific statement. Wikipedia even provides guidelines to what reliable sources may be. (Anonymous) This aspect of Wikipedia in fact increases the credibility but also encourages the user to not stop at the website but actually research the topic further.

Even though it may seem that there is no structure to whom decides what stays in an article and what is removed this could not be further away from the truth. According to Sabine Niederer and José van Dijck Wikipedia uses a strict organizational hierarchy in which there are different levels of permissions for the users. (Niederer and van Dijck, p. 1372) Moreover, so Niederer and van Dijck claim, the editing of content on Wikipedia is not only done by human agents but also bots. Bots is in fact “short for ‘software robots’.” (Niederer and van Dijck, p. 1369) These bots keep a vigilant eye on

content edited and make sure that no nonsense is added to articles on Wikipedia. (Niederer and van Dijk, p. 1374-1375) This aspect of Wikipedia actually increases the credibility of the information added or removed from articles because it is not only a purely human agent that keeps tabs on what happens but it are also bots that keep tabs.

It has been established however that user-generated content is not something that is being solely used by sites such as Wikipedia: IMDb also has user-generated content although in a watered down form. What does this then mean for the issue of genre? Envision a place in which free speech is a given and the public's opinion is the one that matters. What sets Wikipedia apart from a site such as IMDb is that the genres used are actually part of a consensus between peers. They no longer have to use only the common and 'old' categories but also those that have come into use not too long ago such as superhero film. (Superhero film) This is in fact an interesting thing; the term superhero film is used not only by users but also by scholars and critics in their essays and articles. (Superhero film) The idea that genres should be categorized by style only seems to be an outdated way of thinking when we review the article on film genre on Wikipedia. Film genres are no longer only categorized by style, but also by topic, setting, audience, format, and production. (Film genre) Although not every category may come across as a proper category by scholars, users do however see the importance of categorizing films in this way. We could therefore argue that Wikipedia as an open-edit encyclopedia serves as a platform for the public sphere set in the postmodern time like the one envisioned by Habermas. (Lister et al, p. 427)

The issue of reliability seems to be a great notion for a website such as Wikipedia. However, this issue has mainly to do with how long it has been around as an encyclopedia. Kubiszewski argues that a site such as Wikipedia main problem of credibility lies in the fact that it has not been around for that long and moreover that the information found is for free. "For the majority of its existence, Encyclopedia Britannica was the most accessible encyclopedia available through libraries and bookstores. However, that has changed in recent years. ... As a consequence, although brand equity is important, it may not be sufficient to induce users to pay for online content indefinitely into the future, especially when similar (albeit less credible) information can be found elsewhere on the Web for free." (Kubiszewski et al, p. 664) This is then what Wikipedia has going against it: a long line of service by the scholarly world and an integration into the classes of students at high schools and universities alike.

Lister and others describe Wikipedia best when they say that "as a collectively authored encyclopaedia Wikipedia is the prototypical model of an open source user-generated knowledge world." (Lister et al, p. 206) This aspect of Wikipedia is at the same time the strength and weakness of the website. Relying on solely user-generated content comes at the price of being less reliable for scholarly research. However, as with encyclopedia in general Wikipedia is a stepping stone to further research. Concerning the aspect of genre on Wikipedia we can make the fair assumption that it is a break away from the more traditional way of classifying film. Users see the importance of not only

classifying film by style but also by things such as topic or setting. Moreover, on Wikipedia terms such as the screwball comedy are used to describe films whereas on IMDb we would see the common denominator comedy used. We could even make the argument that the hybrids genres found on Wikipedia in fact show a trend which is used in Hollywood quite often and even is so in general. (Neale, p. 172) Genres are never clear cut and instead of rigidly trying to hold on to thinking this should or could be the case would in fact hurt our understanding of genre. Wikipedia therefore understands this idea more than IMDb, instead of rigidly packing more and more genres on one film they often give the film the genre label it deserves.

Conclusion

In the end genre classification is actually a fickle thing. It can swing both ways when it comes to categorizing genre. If both the studios and filmmakers dictate what kind of genre a film should be they take away every possibility for the audience to make something of the film. If this happens, like it is the case for IMDb, we should be wary of the motives that precede the labeling of specific films. Sometimes the argument to classify a film as an action film for example is based purely on economic arguments. Even if this is not the case being owned by a company which main focus is making money actually in part discredits the website's genre classification.

On the other hand we have a website such as Wikipedia. A site built by users for the users and this is in itself something to certainly applaud. The website however does have some hiccups. Not all the information which is presented is actually as credible as we would love to think. Having said this, Wikipedia does have a greater range of genre categories to choose from and this choice is what sets it apart from the top-down approach presented by IMDb. Wikipedia shows the possibility of giving someone else but the companies in charge of distribution and production of films to have a say what genre a film should fall under.

Therefore, when we are confronted with a relatively new genre in use like the superhero film genre we have the choice to either work within the framework of a past collection of categories or instead use those that are used nowadays.

Although the choice of categorizing genre can be seen as subjective, it actually is not. More and more genres have come into play and are being used. Nevertheless, sites such as IMDb seem to be holding on to the old way of categorizing genres. This of course is more than within their right. We should however also realize that with the coming of the digital age in film times have changed. Wikipedia shows us that a lot more people have a say about what genre should be and having suddenly millions of voices instead of a select few is both a blessing as a curse. Hopefully in time the voices being heard on sites such as Wikipedia will ooze through to IMDb and the way we categorize genre will be more in check with how we do it in our day to day lives. Until that day we will see the division between how companies and company driven websites and those run by users only.

Bibliography

- Anonymous. "Wikipedia:Identifying reliable sources." *Wikipedia*. n.p. n.d. Website. 11 June. 2012 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Reliable_sources>
- Bordwell, David. "Historical Poetics of Cinema." *The Cinematic Text: Methods and Approaches*. Ed. R. Barton Palmer. New York: AMS Press, 1989. 369-398. Print.
- "Film genre." *Wikipedia*. n.p. n.d. Website. 11 June. 2012 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Film_genre>
- Gain, Vincent M. "Genre and Super-heroism." *The 21st Century Superhero*. Ed. Richard J. Gray and Betty Kaklamanidou. London: McFarland, 2011. Print.
- "How/where do you get your information? How accurate/reliable is it?" *IMDb*. Amazon.com, n.d. Website. 11 June. 2012. <http://www.imdb.com/help/show_leaf?infosource>
- "IMDb Jobs." *IMDb*. Amazon.com, 15 November. 2010. Website. 11 June. 2012. <<http://www.imdb.com/imdbjobs/>>
- "IMDb Privacy Notice." *IMDb*. Amazon.com, n.d. Website. 11 June. 2012. <<http://www.imdb.com/privacy>>
- "Inception." *Amazon*. Amazon.com, n.d. Website. 11 June. 2012 <http://www.amazon.com/Inception/dp/B0047WJ12K/ref=sr_1_1?s=instant-video&ie=UTF8&qid=1339445449&sr=1-1>
- "Inception." *IMDb*. Amazon.com, 15 November. 2010. Website. 11 June. 2012. <<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1375666/>>.
- Kubiszweski, Ida, Thomas Noordwier and Robert Costanza. "Perceived credibility of Internet encyclopedias." *Computers and education* 56.3 (2011): 659-667. Print
- Lister, Martin, et al. *New Media: a Critical Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print
- Neale, Stephen. "Questions of Genre." *Film Genre Reader III*. Ed. Barry Keith Grant. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003. 160-184. Print
- Niederer, Sabine and José van Dijck. "Wisdom of the crowd or technicity of content? Wikipedia as a sociotechnical system." *New media and society* 12.8 (2010): 1368-1387. Print.
- Santana, Adele and Donna J. Wood. "Transparency and social responsibility issues for Wikipedia." *Ethics and information technology* 11.2 (2009): 133-144. Print
- "Superhero film." *Wikipedia*. n.p. n.d. Website. 11 June. 2012 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superhero_film>
- Swartz, Aaron. "Who Runs Wikipedia?" *aaronsw.com*. n.p. n.d. Website. 11 June. 2012. <<http://www.aaronsw.com/weblog/whorunswikipedia>>
- "The Great Dictator." <http://www.amazon.com/The-Great-Dictator/dp/B004DHNQGG/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1339437542&sr=8-1>
- Thompson, Kristin and David Bordwell. *Film History: An Introduction*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2002. Print.
- "What is IMDb?" *IMDb*. Amazon.com, n.d. Website. 11 June. 2012. <http://www.imdb.com/help/show_leaf?about>