

Education 352X
Ed Schools: Historical and Sociological Perspectives
Spring 2005
Tuesday, 6:15-9:05
207 Cubberley
3-4 Units

Professor: David Labaree
Office: 312 Cubberley
Office phone: 725-6977
E-mail: dlabaree@stanford.edu
Web: <http://www.stanford.edu/~dlabaree>
Office hours: by appointment

Course Description

This course is an interpretive plunge into the curious nature of the American education school. This institution is the Rodney Dangerfield of higher education: it don't get no respect. The ed school is the butt of jokes in the university, where professors portray it as an intellectual wasteland; it is the object of scorn in schools, where teachers decry its programs as impractical and its research as irrelevant; and it is a convenient scapegoat in the world of educational policy, where policymakers portray it as the root cause of bad teaching and inadequate learning. Even ed school professors and students express embarrassment about their association with it.

The lowly status of the education school – defined here as a college, school, or department of education within an university – is the issue that defines the starting point of this course. Why, we ask, does the education school get no respect? This leads us to look at its historical development, in order to figure out how it evolved into its current unenviable position in the academic hierarchy, and to explore the contemporary factors that continue to reinforce that position. Also, we examine the major functions of the education school – preparing teachers, training researchers, producing educational knowledge – and the peculiar problems these pose for the institution. My own position is one of principled ambivalence about the cumulative qualities of the education school: I admire its quixotic persistence in pursuing worthy pedagogical and intellectual aims that have been studiously avoided by the rest of higher education, while at the same time I decry its relentless mediocrity and its abject compliance with the always demeaning and frequently dysfunctional role assigned to it.

This class speaks to a variety of issues that might be of interest to you: higher education (it looks at the ed school as a case for examining central characteristics of American higher ed); teaching and teacher education (the ed school as an expression of the professional problems and public perceptions that shape these forms of professional practice), history of education (origins and evolution of the institution within the larger educational context; it meets the normative requirement for SUSE programs); sociology of education (the ed school as a window on status problems in education and the role of the teacher and teacher educator); and educational policy (ed schools as a contested space for working out problems of policy in both K-12 and higher education).

The Interpretive Framework

In this course, we will encounter a number of perspectives on education schools, as embodied in the following required books: David Labaree, *The Trouble with Ed Schools* (my own particular take on the institution, which frames the issues in the course); Geraldine Clifford and James Guthrie, *Ed School* (an analysis of the tension between the academic and professional roles of ed schools as a problem of history and policy); E.D. Hirsch, *The Schools We Need and Why We Don't Have Them* (a critique of the progressive "thoughtworld" of the ed school); Thomas Popkewitz, *Struggling for the Soul* (a Foucaultian analysis of the discourse and practice of teacher education); Linda Darling-Hammond, Arthur Wise, and Stephen Klein, *A License to Teach* (a look at the problem of teachers' professional knowledge and skill); and Willard Waller's *The Sociology of Teaching* (an analysis of the social role of the teacher).

However, like any course, this one is shaped not just by the authors who fill the syllabus but the instructor who constructed it. I have an argument to make in this course about the nature of education schools, one that I spell out in *The Trouble with Ed Schools*, the first book we will read in this class. My approach in developing an understanding of the American education school is both sociological and historical.

Sociologically, the aim is to define some of the most salient characteristics of the education school as a social institution, in the sociological meaning of that term. That is, I am seeking to establish general patterns that characterize education schools as a whole, that define them as a social type whose norms and structures serve as a model for the individual educational organizations that seek to function under the label of the education school. From this perspective, I focus primarily on the regularities that cut across the array of education schools rather than the particular qualities that distinguish individual instances of this type from each other. In addition, within this general framework I concentrate primarily on the structural constraints and incentives embedded within this institutional archetype, which shape the limits and possibilities for any unit within the university that seeks to function as an education school. This means that the course does not delve into the goals and practices of individual actors or the cultural norms and social patterns of individual education schools. In the same manner, this course does not concern itself very much with the nuts and bolts of how education schools variously carry out their programmatic work of preparing teachers, training researchers, and producing scholarship. These are all important topics that are worthy of close study, but to carry out such a study is not the intent of this course.

Historically, I focus on the factors that shaped the development of the education school over time in the context of the larger history of American teaching, teacher education, and higher education. This means looking at the evolution of the modern education school from two different sources, nineteenth century normal schools (which turned into teachers colleges and eventually regional state universities) and the education departments within major public and private universities at the turn of the 20th century (which turned into the leading research oriented colleges of education of today.) It also means examining the history of the education school's close ties to both wings of the movement for progressive education -- the administrative progressives, who came to dominate the practice of schooling, teacher education, and

educational research; and the pedagogical progressives, who came to dominate the language of educational practitioners and policymakers.

Within the general confines of this general approach, the interpretation I develop revolves around two main interlocking themes. One is the formative nature of the institution's professional status, and the other is the distinctiveness of the institution's social role.

Status of the Ed School: First, my argument is that the lowly status of the education school has been a critically important fact of life for this beleaguered institution. The consequences of its status have been enormous – shaping the quality and duration of its programs, the kinds of students and faculty that it can recruit, the way the university and public respond to the knowledge it produces, and its ability to shape its own destiny. Consider, for example, the latter effect. High status allows some educational institutions to buffer themselves from outside interference, develop their own educational vision, and impose this vision on their social environment. But institutions with low status, such as education schools, do not enjoy these luxuries. Instead, their most prominent organizational and programmatic characteristics are frequently imposed on them by a variety of interested parties in the social environment who feel no need to yield to the authority of an institution that has been drastically enfeebled by its position at the bottom of the academic status hierarchy. In light of the salience of status for the education school, it becomes critically important to understand the causes and the consequences of this status, both for the institution and for the main parties whose interests are affected by it.

Role of the Ed School: The second theme that characterizes the argument of this course and my book is that the nature of the work that the education school is assigned gives it a distinctive social role. The defining function of the education school is the preparation of teachers. This poses special instructional problems because teaching is a peculiarly complex and difficult form of professional practice. Teaching is grounded in the necessity of motivating cognitive, moral, and behavioral change in a group of involuntary and frequently resistant clients. It depends heavily on the teacher's ability to construct an effective and authentic teaching persona and use it to manage a complex and demanding emotional relationship with students for curricular purposes. It lacks a valid and reliable technology of instruction, a set of norms defining acceptable professional practice, clear goals for instruction, clear ways of measuring pedagogical effects, or even a clear definition of the clientele to be served. As a result, there is arguably no realm of professional education that faces a challenge more daunting than the challenge presented to teacher educators.

In addition to preparing teachers, the education school is responsible for the production of educational research. Key characteristics of educational knowledge both constrain and enable the work of educational researchers, as producers of this knowledge, in ways that distinguish them from other academic researchers. Educational knowledge is soft (vs. hard), applied (vs. pure), and provides use value (vs. exchange value). As a result, knowledge production in education is organized in a manner that is structurally egalitarian and substantively divergent. These conditions of intellectual work put a particular strain on the third function of the education school, the preparation of future researchers and teacher educators. And further complicating the task is the relatively weak liberal education that doctoral students in education

(as former teachers) tend to have, because of the deficiencies of teacher education and the professional (rather than academic) focus of master's programs in education.

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.**

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. (I strongly encourage students to participate in discussions in class, but 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."

Critical Reaction Papers (50%): Write **four short 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 a whole book or 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 submitted by e-mail no later than the start of class on Tuesday of the week that the particular reading(s) are assigned. Late papers will receive a reduced grade (e.g., a B+ will turn into a B).** They should be at least **900 words**. They can run longer, if you wish, but this is not necessary or even necessarily desirable. If you write more than four reaction papers, I will count the four with the best grades. You can only do one paper on a particular week's readings.

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 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 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 I give advance approval for this topic). I explain these options below.

1) Take-Home Final Exam: In class on **May 24**, I will hand out a list of 3 or 4 possible final exam questions. These questions will ask you to analyze broad issues in the history of American education 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 **3,500 words**. **All take-home final exams must be submitted to me by e-mail no later than May 31. Late papers will receive a reduced grade (e.g., a B+ will turn into a B).**

2) Final Paper: Write a paper on an issue loosely related to this course. (See below for details about the content of this paper.) These papers should be a minimum of **4,500 words**. The only restriction on topic is that I must approve this topic in advance. A one-page **proposal** for this paper is due on **April 19**. 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 to me as e-mail attachments in the form of MS Word documents.** I will send them back by the same route; I will use Word's tracking changes function to record comments in the text. Be sure to follow the "Guidelines for Analytical Writing," which are found in a section at the end of this syllabus. **All final papers must be submitted to me by e-mail no later than May 31. Late papers will receive a reduced grade (e.g., a B+ will turn into a B).**

You don't need to think of this paper as a "history" or "sociology" paper. My aim in this course is not to turn you into historians or sociologists of education. After all, most of you in the course are not here to become inducted into one of those cults. Instead, you're here to acquire a general framework to use in thinking about educational schools in connection with issues in your own area of interest in education, whatever that might be. Through the short reaction papers, I get a good sense of your ability to wrestle with the 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. 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 possibilities for framing a final paper:

a) Write a paper on any issue related to the education school. 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.

b) Write a proposal for a research study related to education schools or teacher education. You are not expected to carry out this study during the winter quarter, 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 loosely related to ed schools or teacher ed.

c) Write an empirical paper exploring an issue relating to education schools.

d) Write a review essay on some issue related to the history and sociology of the education school, using two or three books -- from the reading list or elsewhere -- as the basis for the review. In what ways are these books helpful in developing a useful understanding of this issue? What can you learn about this issue by comparing and contrasting the approaches taken by these authors? What are the implications of the authors' analyses for the issue you have selected? 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.

e) Write a synthesis paper -- an analytical essay in which you pull together ideas that emerged from this course. At minimum, this essay should draw upon at least two sets of readings assigned in the course. The point is to integrate your thinking about an issue that cuts across readings and perspectives, drawing upon authors read in the course (and other authors you have encountered elsewhere) along with your own professional experience.

Readings

Assigned Books: We will be reading the following books. Five of them (Clifford & Guthrie, Darling-Hammond, Labaree, Hirsch, and Popkewitz) have been ordered through the Stanford Book Store. One copy of each is on reserve at Cubberley Library. The Waller book is available in the photocopied course pack.

Clifford, Geraldine Joncich & Guthrie, James W. (1988). *Ed School: A brief for professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, Arthur E. Wise, & Stephen P. Klein. (1995/1999). *A license to teach: Raising standards for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hirsch, E. D. Jr. (1999). *The schools we need and why we don't have them*. NY: Doubleday.

Labaree, David F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. (1998). *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press. (Paper edition is out of stock at the publisher; but you can find a copy on the web.)

Waller, Willard. (1932/1965). *The sociology of teaching*. New York: Wiley. (Out of print; available in the photocopied course pack.)

Assigned Articles: Most of the rest of the required readings (including the full text of the Waller book) can be found in the photocopied course pack, which is available for purchase from CopyAmerica, 344 California Ave., Palo Alto (566-0344).

Other readings: A collection of other readings for the class are all available on the course web site, located on the L drive using the Stanford Novell system. To gain access to this site, please follow these instructions:

From you own computer, on campus or off:

Go to this web site: <http://webfolder.stanford.edu>

Click on Open Netstorage.

A Security Alert box will pop up; click Yes.

A login box will pop up:

Login: labaree

Password: suse2004

A NetStorage window will open.

Click on DriveL@LAB.

A lot of folders should appear; click on ED 352X.

Within this folder is a folder for each week of the class.

The folder is read-only. You can download any of these documents, one at a time.

From a computer at a SUSE computer lab:

Login according to instructions at the site.

Click on My Computer.

The ED 352X folder can be found in the L drive.

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 in the ED 352X folder on the web.**

1) 3/29: Introduction to Course

**Labaree, David F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Chapter 1 (Introduction).

2) 4/5: Overview

Labaree, David F. (2004). *The trouble with ed schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

4/12: No class

3) 4/18: History of Teacher Education: Its Status and Role in U.S. Higher Education

Turn in proposal for final paper (unless you plan to do the take-home exam)

- **Trow, Martin. (1988). American higher education: Past, present, and future. *Educational Researcher*, 17 (3), 13-23).
- *Warren, Donald. (1985). Learning from experience: History and teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 14:10, 5-12.
- *Collins, Randall. (1979). Colleges and universities. In *The credential society: An historical sociology of education and stratification* (pp. 118-130). New York: Academic Press.
- *Urban, Wayne. J. (1990). Historical studies of teacher education. In W. Robert Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 59-82). New York: Macmillan.
- *Meyer, John W. & Rowan, Brian. (1983). "The structure of educational organizations." In *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality* (pp. 71-97), edited by John W. Meyer and William R. Scott. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

4) 4/19: Ed Schools as a Problem of Academic Status and Professional Role

This class will meet in 115 Cubberley from 6:15-9:05

Clifford, Geraldine Joncich & Guthrie, James W. (1988). *Ed school: A brief for professional education*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

4/26: No class; rescheduled

5/3: No class; rescheduled

5) 5/10: Understanding the Position of the Classroom Teacher

- *Waller, Willard. (1932/1965). *The sociology of teaching*. New York: Wiley. (Out of print; reprinted in course pack.)
- *Cohen, David K. (1989). Willard Waller, on hating school and loving education. In D.J. Willower & W.L. Boyd (Eds.), *Willard Waller on education and schools* (pp. 79-107). San Francisco: McCutchan.

6) 5/17: Teacher Education From a Postmodern Perspective

Turn in draft of final paper (if you want a chance to revise and resubmit)

Popkewitz, Thomas S. (1998). *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher*. New York: Teachers College Press.

7) 5/23: Teacher Education as a Knowledge Problem with a Standards Solution

This class will meet in 115 Cubberley from 6:15-9:05

Darling-Hammond, Linda, Arthur E. Wise, & Stephen P. Klein. (1995/1999). *A license to teach: Raising standards for teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**Labaree, David F. (1992). Doing good, doing science: The Holmes Group reports and the rhetorics of educational reform. *Teachers College Record*, 93:4 (Summer), 628-640.

8) 5/24: The Problem of Producing Educational Research and Preparing Educational Researchers

*Neumann, Anna, Pallas, Aaron & Peterson, Penelope. (1999). Preparing education practitioners to practice education research. In Ellen Condliffe Lagemann & Lee S. Shulman, *Issues in education research: Problems and possibilities* (pp. 247-288). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

**Phillips, Denis. A quixotic quest: Philosophical issues in assessing the quality and rigor of educational research.

**Special Issue of *Educational Researcher* (2002, 31:8) about the 2002 National Research Council report, *Scientific research in education*. Also available at: <http://www.aera.net/publications/?id=438>

9) 5/31: The Ed School's Ideological Commitment to Pedagogical Progressivism

Turn in final papers and take-home exams by start of class

Hirsch, E. D. Jr. (1999). *The schools we need and why we don't have them*. NY: Doubleday.

*Hofstadter, Richard. (1963). The child and the world. In *Anti-intellectualism in American life* (pp. 359-390). New York: Knopf.

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. Who says? This is the validity issue: On what (data, literature) are the claims based?
3. What's new? This is the value-added issue: What does the author contribute that we don't already know?
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 point 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.
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 ed schools. 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. 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. It can also be done 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 often 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 in the Stanford bookshelf along with required texts. 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. (1990). *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.