

Education 265/165
History of Higher Education in the U.S.
Spring, 2006
Wednesday, 6:15-9:05 p.m. – 513 CERAS
3 or 4 units

Professor: David Labaree
Office: 112 Cubberley
Office phone: 725-6977
E-mail: dlabaree@stanford.edu
Web: www.stanford.edu/~dlabaree
Office hours: by appointment

Course Description

This course provides an introductory overview of the history of higher education in the United States. We will start with Martin Trow's succinct analysis of what makes American higher education distinctive, Ralph Turner's take on U.S. education as a model of contest mobility, and my own overview of the role of the market in shaping the history of American higher education. In week two, we look at the institutional roots of the university in Europe and elsewhere in the world, drawing on Emile Durkheim, Harold Perkin, and William Clark. In week three, we examine an overview of the history of American college and university in the 18th and 19th centuries from John Thelin and consider David Brown's credentialist interpretation of the expansion of colleges at the end of the century. In week four, we focus on the rise of the university in the latter part of the 19th century using Laurence Veysey's classic account in *The Emergence of the American University*. In week five, we read a series of papers around the issue of access to higher education, showing how colleges for many years sought to repel or redirect the college aspirations of women, blacks, and Jews. In week six, we examine the history of professional education, with special attention to schools of business, education, and medicine. In week seven, we read an overview by John Thelin of the history of American higher education in the 20th century, six short institutional case studies by Roger Geiger, and the Marxist explanation offered by Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis. In week eight, we look at the lower tiers of higher education – the community college and the regional state university– drawing on accounts by Alden Dunham, Donald Levine, and me. In week nine, we look at the evolution of the research university, drawing on Clark Kerr's classic account of the subject, an interpretive overview by Roger Geiger, and a set of papers on the recent trends in the structure and practice of higher education by Stephen Brint, Steven Chait, and Patricia Gumpert.

Like every course, this one is not a neutral survey of all possible perspectives on the domain identified by the course title; like every course, this one has a point of view. So let me give you an idea of the kind of approach I will be taking. In this course, we will look on the history of higher education as a competition among competing constituencies over the kinds of outcomes that they want education to produce. In particular, we will look at the way that consumer pressures have driven much of this history in the United States and produced many of the more distinctive elements of American education. We will see how colleges and universities in the U.S. (dependent on tuition, relatively autonomous from state control, and competing in a crowded field for students) have had to be highly sensitive to demands from educational consumers, which has led university leaders to become entrepreneurial, seeking to position their organizations favorably in the educational market.

From this perspective, the history of higher education has revolved around efforts by individual colleges and universities to climb the academic status ladder and defend their position against ambitious competitors on the rungs below. Some of the key status symbols that help maintain one's position in this hierarchy are selectivity in choosing students and faculty, level of program (advanced graduate vs. undergraduate), academic orientation (focus on disciplinary vs. vocational instruction), research orientation (vs. teaching), and association with upper class constituencies (as found in elite universities) and higher status professions (such as medicine and law vs. education and social work). Starting early helps. The Ivies opened before the revolution; then came flagship state universities (early 1800s), land-grant universities (in the mid 1880s), normal schools (in the late 1800s), and community colleges in the early and mid 1900s. As the university model developed in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and then the research university model in the early to mid 20th century, the late comers sought to model themselves on this prestigious model at the top of the ladder. So land grant universities (initially focused on providing technical vocational education) evolved into full service universities with a wide array of liberal arts and professional programs, and normal schools evolved into teachers colleges and then state liberal arts colleges and finally (by the mid 20th century) regional state universities. Only the community college, last in line of succession, was prevented from following this route of institutional mobility. While others imitated the high status model, they were unable to do so with same degree of success because their predecessors had already staked their claim to elite students, advanced graduate programs, academic credibility, and research productivity, and thus could attract the best students and faculty and maintain the highest degree of selectivity.

That's an overview of the kind of argument I will be making about the history of higher education. But you should feel free to construct your own, rejecting mine in part or in whole. The point of this class, like any class, is to encourage you to try on a variety of perspectives as part of the process of developing your own working conceptual framework for understanding the world. I hope you will enjoy the ride.

Eligibility

This class is open to doctoral students, master's students, and undergraduates. **All students who enroll in the class must take it for a letter grade.** Except in cases of medical emergency, **no one will be granted an incomplete grade for this course.** You can take it for either **3 or 4 course units**, but this won't change the reading and writing assignments for the course.

Course Requirements

The Importance of Critical Reading: You need to do more than read the required texts in this class; you need to read them critically. See the section at the end of the syllabus, "Guidelines for Critical Reading."

The Importance of Analytical Writing: The entire grade for this course depends on the quality of each student's work on the written assignments that are defined below. (While I strongly encourage students to participate in discussions in class, this participation is not graded.) One central purpose of the course is to encourage students to develop their skill at producing effective analytical writing. This skill is essential for anyone who wishes to be successful in meeting the requirements of academic study and who expects to have an impact in the intellectual and professional world of education. This course (like any course) is a good place to work on enhancing

your abilities as a writer. See the section at the end of the syllabus, “Guidelines for Analytical Writing.” Also see the section at the end, “Reference Books on Research, Writing, and Making Arguments,” in which I recommend four reference books that can be helpful to students in working on problems of writing, thinking, and carrying out research in education.

Critical Reaction Papers (50%): Write **four reaction papers** dealing with the assigned readings for a particular week. In each of these papers you should provide a brief critical response to some significant issue encountered in the book or other assigned readings for a particular week. You are not being asked to summarize the argument of individual readings, although your discussion should reveal that you have understood what this argument is. Instead you should react to the reading(s) as a critical observer with a specific frame of reference (derived from the course, from your reading elsewhere, and/or from your own experience). You don't need to respond to the whole array of readings for a particular week, although you do need to focus on something that cuts across two or more articles or chapters. Pick one **major issue** from the reading that grabs your attention and briefly develop it. (A focused discussion of one issue works better in a short paper like this than an effort to cover a number of different issues.) Feel free to make connections with other things you know, but be sure that you draw on the reading from that week for a substantial part of your evidence or ideas or examples. You will be evaluated on the basis of the thoughtfulness, depth of understanding, and analytical insight that is reflected in your paper. **These papers should be turned in by class time in the week that the particular reading(s) are assigned.** They should be approximately **3 pages** in length double-spaced (900 words). They can run longer, if you wish, but this is not necessary or even necessarily desirable. **If you turn in more than four reaction papers, I will count the four with the highest grades.**

I have two aims in asking you to write these reaction papers. First, they will encourage you to keep up with the reading and to come to class with some already-formulated thoughts about the issues for that week. You should come to every class with a set of questions and comments and issues that you developed while doing the week's readings, and you should be prepared to draw on these insights selectively in a constructive effort to help shape discussion in class. The critical reaction papers help facilitate this kind of preparation and thereby help promote an informed and broad-based discussion of the issues in class each week. (As I mentioned earlier, participation in such discussions is encouraged but not graded.) Second, these short papers will provide you, at the end of the term, with a set of elaborated notes on course issues and readings that should serve as a useful resource when you write your final paper, when you encounter related issues in your future work, or when you want to revisit some of the readings at a later point. You may want to use these papers to write a running commentary on the issues in the course, with your individual papers building on each other from week to week. You may want to try out ideas in these papers that you will later develop in the final paper for the course. Also, you may want to use these papers as a way to hold an ongoing conversation with me about readings, schools, and history. Whatever you do in each of these papers, however, you should make sure that in some substantial way you are making a response to a significant aspect of the reading. **Please send these papers to me as e-mail attachments, preferably in the form of MS Word documents.** I will be using Word's “tracking changes” function to record comments in the text. I will send papers back to you as an e-mail attachments.

Final Paper (50%): You have **two options** for doing a final paper for this course: 1) write a **take-home final exam essay** in response to questions that I provide; or 2) write a **paper on any topic related to this course** (as long as your section instructor gives advance approval for this

topic). I explain these options below. **All take-home final exams and final papers must be submitted by e-mail no later than class time on Wednesday, May 31. Late papers will receive a reduced grade (e.g., a B+ will turn into a B).**

1) Take-Home Final Exam: In class on **Wednesday, May 24**, I will hand out a list of 3 or 4 final exam questions. These questions will ask you to analyze broad issues in the history of higher education in the U.S. by drawing on required readings in this course. Pick one of these questions and write a persuasive analytical essay in response. You will have one week to write an answer. Be sure to follow the “Guidelines for Analytical Writing,” which are found in a section at the end of this syllabus. These essays should be a minimum of **12 pages** double-spaced (**3,600 words**). **They are due by class time on Wednesday, May 31. Please send them to me as an e-mail attachment. Late papers will receive a reduced grade (e.g., a B+ will turn into a B).**

2) Final Paper: Write a paper on any issue loosely related to this course. (See below for details about the content of this paper.) For doctoral students, these papers should be a minimum of **15 pages** double-spaced (4,500 words); for all others, these papers should be a minimum of **12 pages** (3,600 words). Basically, any topic that you and I agree on will be acceptable for this assignment. A one-page **proposal** for this paper is due on **April 19**. The **paper** itself is due no later than class time on **May 31**. If you turn in a **draft** by **May 17**, you will be permitted to revise the paper (after receiving my comments) and submit it for re-evaluation. **Please send proposals and papers as e-mail attachments, preferably in the form of MS Word documents.** I will send them back by the same route, using Word’s tracking changes function to record comments in the text.

You don’t need to think of this paper as a “history” paper. My aim in this course is not to turn you into historians of higher education. After all, most of you in the course are not here to become inducted into that cult. Instead, you’re here to acquire a general historical framework to use in thinking about higher education issues in your own area of interest, whatever that might be. Through the short reaction papers, I get a good sense of your ability to wrestle with the historical content of this course. Therefore, when you come to the final paper, you are free to pursue your own interests, using the course as a springboard for pursuing these interests and not as a prison for confining them to the realm of history. You should be thinking about how you can use the paper to advance your own intellectual and professional agenda. What are you interested in exploring in your program? What issues brought you here in the first place? What kinds of issues will you be exploring in your honor’s thesis, master’s thesis, qualifying paper, or doctoral dissertation? How can you configure this paper as an opportunity to examine some part of this larger agenda, in a way that will move you along intellectually and professionally? I’m open to anything that is productive for you and that is loosely related to this course.

Consider some of the following options for framing a final paper in this course:

1. Write a paper on any issue related to the history of higher education. The only constraint is that I need to approve your topic. We can negotiate the details of purpose, focus, sources, audience, and so on. Feel free to use this paper as a way to develop your thinking about any course-relevant issue that interests you, to follow up on earlier work you have done in other classes, to carry out a pilot empirical study, to reflect on teaching or research work you have done, or to try out ideas (or analyze data) that you might want to

explore later in a dissertation. If you get the permission of both instructors, you can combine this paper with one you are writing in another course and produce a single larger paper that meets both course requirements.

2. Write a proposal for a research study related to higher education. You are not expected to carry out this study during this quarter but only to frame the issues, define a workable and worthy research question, and spell out the process of data gathering you will go through in order to answer it. This proposal could be for a pilot study or for a study leading to a thesis or dissertation. Advanced doctoral students can use this paper as an early version of their dissertation proposal for a topic related to reform.

3. Write a paper exploring an issue in higher education empirically, using data you will collect (or have already collected) or using primary historical sources.

4. Write a review essay, using two or three books -- from the reading list or elsewhere -- as the basis for the review. Examine a number of examples of review essays before proceeding. Note that a review essay is not just a long book review. Instead, this is a genre which combines a review of several books with an essay about some of the key issues raised by the books but developed further by the essayist. The books provide a platform from which you can launch your own interpretation, synthesis, analysis, political program, and/or theoretical ruminations. However you are still held by the usual rhetorical norms: you need to persuade the reader of your credibility through careful argumentation, effective use of sources and evidence, and artful political-moral-emotional appeals. In such an essay you need to draw on appropriate sources outside the books that are the starting point of the review.

Readings

Books: We will be reading the following books; the first three of them have been ordered through the Stanford Book Store. One copy of each is on reserve at Cubberley Library:

Thelin, John R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. (Paper)

Veysey, Laurence S. (1970). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Assigned Articles: Most of the rest of the required readings can be found in the photocopied course pack, which is available for purchase from CopyAmerica, 344 California Ave., Palo Alto (566-0344). The copy service will bring copies of the course pack to the first class meeting. If you want to buy a copy (\$49.00 including tax), please bring cash or check; no credit cards accepted.

Other readings: A collection of additional readings for the class are available on the web. They can be found on my personal website: <http://www.stanford.edu/~dlabaree/>.

Course Outline

Below are the topics we will cover, week by week, with the readings for each week.

* = Readings that are available in the photocopied course pack.

** = Readings that are available on my web site.

Week 1

Introduction to course

Wed 4/5

- **Trow, Martin. (1988). American higher education: Past, present, and future. *Educational Researcher*, 17 (3), 13-23).
- **Turner, Ralph. (1960). Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 855-867.
- **Labaree, David F. (2006). Markets and American higher education: An institutional success story. Vice presidential address delivered at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco.

Week 2

Historical Roots of the University in Europe and Around the World

Wed 4/12

- *Perkin, Harold. (1997). History of universities. In Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.), *ASHE reader on the history of higher education*, 2nd ed. (pp. 3-32). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- **Durkheim, Emile. (1938/1969). *The evolution of educational thought: Lectures on the formation and development of secondary education in France*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul (pp. 63-173).
- *Clark, William. (2006). Academic charisma and the origins of the research university. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (chapters 1-3, 9, 11).

Week 3

Overview of the Early History of Higher Education in the U.S.

Wed 4/19

- Theilin, John R. (2004). *A history of American education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press (introduction and chapters 1-5).
- *Brown, David K. (1995). *Degrees of control: A sociology of educational expansion and occupational credentialism*. New York: Teachers College Press (preface, chapters 4-6)

Proposal for final paper due

Week 4**Roots of the Growth of the University in the Late 19th Century****Wed 4/26**

Veysey, Laurence S. (1970). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Week 5**Educating and Not Educating the Other: Blacks, Women, and Jews****Wed 5/3**

- *Wechsler, Harold S. (1997). An academic Gresham's law: Group repulsion as a theme in American higher education. In Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.), *ASHE reader on the history of higher education*, 2nd ed. (pp. 416-431). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- *Anderson, James D. (1997). Training the apostles of liberal culture: Black higher education, 1900-1935. In Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.), *ASHE reader on the history of higher education*, 2nd ed. (pp. 432-458). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- *Perkins, Linda M. (1997). The impact of the "cult of true womanhood" on the education of black women. In Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.), *ASHE reader on the history of higher education*, 2nd ed. (pp. 183-190). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- *Palmieri, Patricia A. (1997). From republican motherhood to race suicide: Arguments on the higher education of women in the United States, 1820-1920. In Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.), *ASHE reader on the history of higher education*, 2nd ed. (pp. 173-782). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- *Gordon, Lynn D. (1997). From seminary to university: An overview of women's higher education, 1870-1920. In Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.), *ASHE reader on the history of higher education*, 2nd ed. (pp. 473-498). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Week 6**History of Professional Education****Wed 5/10**

- *Brubacher, John S. and Rudy, Willis. (1997). Professional education. In Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.), *ASHE reader on the history of higher education*, 2nd ed. (pp. 379-393). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- *Grubb, W. Norton & Lazerson, Marvin. (forthcoming 2004). Redirecting higher education: The triumph of professionalism. In *The education gospel: The economic power of schooling* (chapter 2, pp. 102-151; manuscript). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- **Labaree, David F. (Forthcoming 2006). Mutual subversion: A short history of the liberal and the professional in American higher education. *History of Education Quarterly*, 46:1 (Spring).
- *Levine, Donald O. (1986). Business goes to the colleges. In *The American college and the culture of aspiration, 1915-1940* (pp. 45-67). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- *Starr, Paul. (1984). Transformation of the medical school. In *Social transformation of American medicine* (pp. 112-127). New York: Basic.
- **Labaree, David F. (Forthcoming 2006). An uneasy relationship: The history of teacher education in the university. In Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, Feiman Nemser, Sharon, & McIntyre, John (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.

Week 7

Overview of the History of Higher Education in the 20th Century

Wed 5/17

- Theelin, John R. (2004). *A history of American education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press (chapters 6-8).
- *Geiger, Roger. (2004). The development of universities in the postwar era. In *Research and relevant knowledge: American research universities since World War II* (chapter 3, pp. 62-91).
- *Geiger, Roger. (2004). University advancement from the postwar era to the 1960s. In *Research and relevant knowledge: American research universities since World War II* (chapter 5, pp. 117-156).
- **Bowles, Samuel & Gintis, Herbert. (1976). The transformation of higher education and the emerging white-collar proletariat. *Schooling in capitalist America* (chapter 8, pp. 201-223). New York: Basic Books.

Draft of final paper due, if you want a chance to revise and resubmit

Week 8

Mass Higher Education: A Look at the Lower Tier

Wed 5/24

- *Levine, Donald O. (1986). Expansion and the urban university. In *The American college and the culture of aspiration, 1915-1940* (pp. 68-88). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- **Labaree, David F. (1997). The rise of the community college: Markets and the limits of educational opportunity. In *How to succeed in school without really learning: The credentials race in American education* (chapter 8, pp. 190-222). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- **Dunham, Edgar Alden. (1969). *Colleges of the forgotten Americans: A profile of state colleges and universities*. New York: McGraw Hill (introduction, chapters 1-2).

Week 9

Understanding the Evolution of the Research University

Wed 5/31

- *Kerr, Clark. (2001). *The uses of the university*, 5th ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (chapter 1).
- **Clark Kerr Obituary. (2003).
- *Geiger, Roger. (1997). Research, graduate education, and the ecology of American universities. In Lester F. Goodchild and Harold S. Wechsler (Eds.), *ASHE reader on*

the history of higher education, 2nd ed. (273-289). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

*Brint, Steven. (2002). The rise of the “practical arts.” In Steven Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 231-259). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

*Chait, Richard. (2002). The “Academic Revolution” revisited. In Steven Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 293-321). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

*Gumport, Patricia J. (2002). Universities and knowledge: Restructuring the city of intellect. In Steven Brint (Ed.), *The future of the city of intellect: The changing American university* (pp. 47-81). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Final papers due

Week 10

Wed 6/7 – Class Canceled

Guidelines for Critical Reading

Whenever you set out to do a critical reading of a particular text (a book, article, speech, proposal, conference paper), you need to use the following questions as a framework to guide you as you read:

1. What's the point? This is the analysis/interpretation issue: what is the author's angle?
2. What's new? This is the value-added issue: What does the author contribute that we don't already know?
3. Who says? This is the validity issue: On what (data, literature) are the claims based?
4. Who cares? This is the significance issue, the most important issue of all, the one that subsumes all the others: Is this work worth doing? Is the text worth reading? Does it contribute something important?

Guidelines for Analytical Writing

In writing papers for this (or any) course, keep in mind the following points. They apply in particular to the longer papers, but most of the same concerns apply to critical reaction papers as well.

1. Pick an important issue: Make sure that your analysis meets the "so what" test. Why should anyone care about this topic, anyway? Pick an issue or issues that matters and that you really care about.
2. Keep focused: Don't lose track of the point you are trying to make and make sure the reader knows where you are heading and why.
3. Aim for clarity: Don't assume that the reader knows what you're talking about; it's your job to make your points clearly. In part this means keeping focused and avoiding distracting clutter. But in part it means that you need to make more than elliptical references to concepts and sources or to professional experience. When referring to readings (from the course or elsewhere), explain who

said what and why this point is pertinent to the issue at hand. When drawing on your own experiences or observations, set the context so the reader can understand what you mean. Proceed as though you were writing for an educated person who is neither a member of this class nor a professional colleague, someone who has not read the material you are referring to.

4. Provide analysis: A good paper is more than a catalogue of facts, concepts, experiences, or references; it is more than a description of the content of a set of readings; it is more than an expression of your educational values or an announcement of your prescription for what ails education. A good paper is a logical and coherent analysis of the issues raised within your chosen area of focus. This means that your paper should aim to explain rather than describe. If you give examples, be sure to tell the reader what they mean in the context of your analysis. Make sure the reader understands the connection between the various points in your paper.

5. Provide depth, insight, and connections: The best papers are ones that go beyond making obvious points, superficial comparisons, and simplistic assertions. They dig below the surface of the issue at hand, demonstrating a deeper level of understanding and an ability to make interesting connections.

6. Support your analysis with evidence: You need to do more than simply state your ideas, however informed and useful these may be. You also need to provide evidence that reassures the reader that you know what you are talking about, thus providing a foundation for your argument. Evidence comes in part from the academic literature, whether encountered in this course or elsewhere. Evidence can also come from your own experience. Remember that you are trying to accomplish two things with the use of evidence. First, you are saying that it is not just you making this assertion but that authoritative sources and solid evidence back you up. Second, you are supplying a degree of specificity and detail, which helps to flesh out an otherwise skeletal argument.

7. Draw on course materials (this applies primarily to reaction papers, not the final paper). Your paper should give evidence that you are taking this course. You do not need to agree with any of the readings or presentations, but your paper should show you have considered the course materials thoughtfully.

8. Recognize complexity and acknowledge multiple viewpoints. The issues in the history of American education are not simple, and your paper should not propose simple solutions to complex problems. It should not reduce issues to either/or, black/white, good/bad. Your paper should give evidence that you understand and appreciate more than one perspective on an issue. This does not mean you should be wishy-washy. Instead, you should aim to make a clear point by showing that you have considered alternate views.

9. Challenge assumptions. The paper should show that you have learned something by doing this paper. There should be evidence that you have been open to changing your mind.

10. Do not overuse quotation: In a short paper, long quotations (more than a sentence or two in length) are generally not appropriate. Even in longer papers, quotations should be used sparingly unless they constitute a primary form of data for your analysis. In general, your paper is more effective if written primarily in your own words, using ideas from the literature but framing them in your own way in order to serve your own analytical purposes. However, selective use of quotations can be very useful as a way of capturing the author's tone or conveying a particularly aptly phrased

point.

11. Cite your sources: You need to identify for the reader where particular ideas or examples come from. This can be done through in-text citation: Give the author's last name, publication year, and (in the case of quotations) page number in parentheses at the end of the sentence or paragraph where the idea is presented -- e.g., (Kliebard, 1986, p. 22); provide the full citations in a list of references at the end of the paper. You can also identify sources with footnotes or endnotes: Give the full citation for the first reference to a text and a short citation for subsequent citations to the same text. (For critical reaction papers, you only need to give the short cite for items from the course reading; other sources require full citations.) Note that citing a source is not sufficient to fulfill the requirement to provide evidence for your argument. As spelled out in #6 above, you need to transmit to the reader some of the substance of what appears in the source cited, so the reader can understand the connection with the point you are making and can have some meat to chew on. The best analytical writing provides a real feel for the material and not just a list of assertions and citations. Depth, insight, and connections count for more than a superficial collection of glancing references. In other words, don't just mention an array of sources without drawing substantive points and examples from these sources; and don't draw on ideas from such sources without identifying the ones you used.

12. Take care in the quality of your prose: A paper that is written in a clear and effective style makes a more convincing argument than one written in a murky manner, even when both writers start with the same basic understanding of the issues. However, writing that is confusing usually signals confusion in a person's thinking. After all, one key purpose of writing is to put down your ideas in a way that permits you and others to reflect on them critically, to see if they stand up to analysis. So you should take the time to reflect on your own ideas on paper and revise them as needed. You may want to take advantage of the opportunity in this course to submit a draft of the final paper, revise it in light of comments, and then resubmit the revised version. This, after all, is the way writers normally proceed. Outside of the artificial world of the classroom, writers never turn in their first draft as their final statement on a subject.

Reference Books on Research, Writing, and Making Arguments

I recommend the following books to all doctoral students. They can be a big help in thinking about research, writing, and making arguments. These books have been ordered as recommended readings and are available on the course shelf in the textbook section of the Stanford bookstore (also in the trade book section under style manuals). They are also on reserve at Cubberley Library:

Wayne C. Booth et al. (2003). *The Craft of Research* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Howard S. Becker. (1998). *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Joseph M. Williams. (1995). *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Anthony Weston. (2001). *A Rulebook for Arguments* (3rd ed.). Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.

The *Booth* book provides a smart and systematic account of how to carry out research from beginning to end. He starts with the problem of how to conceptualize a study and formulate a question, then moves on to a discussion of how to deal with all the succeeding steps in the research process: dealing with data, using scholarly sources, constructing valid claims based on data, formulating persuasive arguments, representing data, organizing research reports, revising and refocusing arguments, and so on. This is a wonderfully rich resource for anyone who wants to do research and write about it. He manages to be both quite explicit (the difference between a research problem and a research question; how to use quotations in academic writing) while always emphasizing the intellectual work that research entails.

The *Becker* book focuses on "tricks of the trade" in doing research. What he means by this is not the technical tricks but the intellectual tricks that allow researchers to make sense of their data – by asking productive questions, adopting fruitful angles for analysis, employing logical strategies, and avoiding common mental traps. In separate chapters he focuses on imagery (metaphors, images of how things work as a starting place for research efforts), sampling (data as a mechanism for persuasion, validity, representativeness), concepts (uses of theory, approaches to conceptualizing what you see), and logic (considering the full range of possibilities, looking for what's missing). He provides some wonderful examples of "how to think about research while you're doing it" (in the words of the subtitle), drawing heavily on his own research experience. Tricks include such things as treating the exception as the rule, looking for the case that would upset your theory, and exploring the assumptions behind the observation that "nothing is happening."

The book by *Williams* is the best book there is on the issue of how to write in a clear, concise, effective, and graceful manner. It's better than the old standby in this category – Strunk and White's *Elements of Style* – because it goes beyond simply stating a principle and providing an example. As Williams puts it on the opening page, "I want to do more than just urge writers to 'Omit Needless Words' or 'Be clear.' Telling me to 'Be clear' is like telling me to 'Hit the ball squarely.' I know that. What I don't know is how to do it. To explain how to write clearly, I have to go beyond platitudes." This is exactly what he does. He provides a wonderfully illuminating course on the basic principles of good writing, along with a rich array of examples both before and after the application of these principles. This is great stuff that can help any of us clean up our prose.

The *Weston* book is the clearest and most usable manual available to help scholars make effective arguments. The author is a philosopher who has an uncanny ability to provide the lay reader with a concise and understandable outline of the basic rules for constructing arguments that work. In it he walks the reader through the minefield of fallacies that so frequently destroy the most earnest attempts to make claims and support them. His rules are easy to follow and his examples are quite helpful in showing what good and bad arguments look like in practice. The first part of the book focuses on the problem of creating effective short arguments; the second part extends this to the process of writing arguments that extend over a full-length paper or book. This short book is a must read for all of us who are in the business of trying to write in a manner that is both logical and persuasive.