Education 265/165, History 158C, Amstud 165
History of Higher Education in the U.S.
Winter, 2013
Thursday, 3:15-6:05 p.m. – Green Earth Sciences Building, Room 150
3 to 5 units

Professor David Labaree
Office: 312 Cubberley
E-mail: dlabaree@stanford.edu
Web: www.stanford.edu/~dlabaree
Office hours: by appointment
Section: Bldg. 200-303, W 2-3:05

Teaching Assistant:
Ethan Ris
Office: 25A Cubberley
Cell phone: (401) 225-3276
E-mail: eris@stanford.edu
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, Perkin's account of the world history of the university, and my own overview of the role of the market in shaping the history of American higher education. In week two, we examine an overview of the history of American college and university in the 18th and 19th centuries from Frederick Rudolph, a chapter from Brown, and my paper on the emerging nature of the college system. In week three, we focus on the rise of the university in the latter part of the 19th century using the second half of Rudolph and consider David Brown's credentialist interpretation of the expansion of colleges at the end of the century. In week four, 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 five, we examine the history of professional education, with special attention to schools of business, education, and medicine. In week six, there is no class. In week seven, we read Donald Levine's book about the rise of mass higher education after World War I and my piece about the rise of the community college. In week eight, we look at the huge expansion of higher education after World War II using Christopher Loss's new book. In week nine, we look at the evolution of the research university, drawing on Clark Kerr's classic account of the subject, and a series of interpretive overviews by Roger Geiger and other scholars. In week 10, we read Jerome Karabel's book about the struggle by elite universities to stay on top of a dynamic and expanding system of higher education.

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 <u>letter grade</u>. Except in cases of medical emergency, no one will be granted an incomplete grade for this course. You can take it for either 3, 4, or 5 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.

Format for Submitting Papers: Please submit all papers by email to your section head. Papers should be Word documents, single-spaced and left justified. Label reaction papers with your last name and the due date, e.g., Labaree 1-17-13. Label final paper or final exam with your last name and either Final Paper or Final Exam.

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 your section head as e-mail attachments in the form of MS Word documents. We will be using Word's "tracking changes" function to record comments in the text. We 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 Monday, March 18. Late papers will receive a reduced grade (e.g., a B+ will turn into a B).

1) Take-Home Final Exam: On Thursday, February 28, 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 on Monday, March 18. Please send them to your section head 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 January 24. The paper itself is due on March 18. If you turn in a draft by March 7, you will be permitted to revise the paper (after receiving my comments) and submit it for re-evaluation. Please send proposals and papers to your section head as e-mail attachments, preferably in the form of MS Word documents. We 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; they have all been ordered through the Stanford Book Store. One copy of each is on reserve at Cubberley Library:

Rudolph, Frederick. (1962/1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Levine, David O. (1986). *The American college and the culture of aspiration, 1914-1940* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Loss, Christopher P. (2011). *Between citizens and the state: The politics of American higher education in the 20th century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Karabel, Jerome. (2005). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. New York: Mariner Books.

Supplementary Resources: There is a terrific online archive of primary and secondary readings on higher education, which is a supplement to *The History of Higher Education*, 3rd ed., published by the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE): http://www.pearsoncustom.com/mi/msu_ashe/ .

Course Outline

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

* = Readings that are available on Blackboard: http://bb8.stanford.edu/. For some PDF documents, it may be necessary to save the document on your computer and then rotate it for easier reading.

<u>Week 1</u>
Introduction to course
Thursday 1/10

*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. (Forthcoming 2013). A system without a plan: Emergence of an American system of higher education in the twentieth century. *Bildungsgeschichte: International Journal for the Historiography of Education*.
*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.

<u>Week 2</u>
Overview of the Early History of Higher Education in the U.S.
Thursday 1/17

Rudolph, Frederick. (1962/1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press (introductory essay and chapters 1-12).
*Brown, David K. (1995). *Degrees of control: A sociology of educational expansion and occupational credentialism*. New York: Teachers College Press (chapter 4).
*Labaree, David F. (Forthcoming 2013). The power of the parochial in shaping the American system of higher education. In Paul Smeyers and Marc Depaepe (Eds.). *Educational research: Institutional spaces of educational research*. Dordrecht: Springer.

<u>Week 3</u>
Roots of the Growth of the University in the Late 19th and 20th Century
Thursday 1/24

Rudolph, Frederick. (1962/1990). *The American college and university: A history*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press (chapters 13-22 and epilogue).
*Brown, David K. (1995). *Degrees of control: A sociology of educational expansion and occupational credentialism*. New York: Teachers College Press (foreword; chapters 5-6).

Proposal for final paper due

<u>Week 4</u>
Educating and Not Educating the Other: Blacks, Women, and Jews
Thursday 1/31

*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.

<u>Week 5</u>
History of Professional Education
Thursday 2/7

*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.

* Bledstein, Burton J. (1976). The culture of professionalism. In The culture of professionalism: The middle class and the development of higher education in America (pp. 80-128). New York: W. W. Norton.

*Grubb, W. Norton & Lazerson, Marvin. (2004). Redirecting higher education: The triumph of professionalism. In *The education gospel: The economic power of schooling* (chapter 2). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

*Labaree, David F. (2006). Mutual subversion: A short history of the liberal and the professional in American higher education. *History of Education Quarterly*, 46:1 (Spring).

*Starr, Paul. (1984). Transformation of the medical school. In *Social transformation of American medicine* (pp. 112-127). New York: Basic.

* Labaree, David F. (2008). An uneasy relationship: The history of teacher education in the university. In Cochran-Smith, Marilyn, Feiman Nemser, Sharon, & McIntyre, D. John (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring issues in changing contexts*, 3rd ed. (pp. 290-306). Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.

<u>Week 6</u>
<u>Thursday 2/14 – No Class</u>

<u>Week 7</u>
Emergence of Mass Higher Education
Thursday 2/21

Levine, Donald O. (1986). *The American college and the culture of aspiration, 1915-1940*. 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.

<u>Week 8</u>
Thursday 2/28
The Huge Surge of Higher Education Expansion after World War II

Christopher P. Loss, *Between citizens and the state: The politics of American higher education in the 20th century* (Princeton University Press, 2012).

Hand out final exam questions

<u>Week 9</u>
Understanding the Evolution of the Research University
Thursday 3/7

*Kerr, Clark. (2001). *The uses of the university*, 5th ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (chapter 1).

*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).

*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.

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

<u>Week 10</u>
The Struggle by Elite Universities to Stay on Top
Thursday 3/14

Karabel, Jerome. (2005). *The chosen: The hidden history of admission and exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Final papers and final exams due <u>March 18</u>

***

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.