

Education 325C
Doctoral Proseminar 3
Spring 2011
Wednesday 11:30-1:30, CERAS 204
2 units

Instructors:

David F. Labaree

E-mail: dlabaree@stanford.edu

Office: 312 Cubberley

Office hours: by appointment

Web: <http://www.stanford.edu/~dlabaree/>

Francisco O. Ramirez

E-mail: ramirez@stanford.edu

Office: 335 Cubberley

Phone: 723-8421

Office hours: by appointment

Teaching Assistant:

Larry Samuels

E-mail: larrysam@stanford.edu

Office: 158 Cubberley

Phone: (408) 313-6300

Office hours: by appointment

Course Description:

This course is the third in the proseminar sequence required for all first year doctoral students in the School of Education. It focuses on two fundamental questions in the domain of educational research, which are woven throughout the course:

How are educational systems organized?

What are the roles of education in society?

The course begins with theories of school and society: functionalism, conflict theory, institutionalism, and postmodernism. Then we turn to the roles of education in society, including: the role of education in relation to human, cultural, and social capital; the role of education in nation building; and the role of education in social mobility and social reproduction. The next focus is the organization of education, the organization of schools, the organization of higher education, and the ways in which the educational system changes over time. The final topic is the relationship between educational research and educational policy.

Course Evaluation:

Final Exam or Research Paper: 50%

Reflection Papers: 50%

Reflection Papers: (900 words each / 4 total)

You must turn in four reflection papers that discuss the required readings for a given week. You may choose the specific focus of each of these papers. You may write a paper in response to readings for any of the 10 classes. If you turn in *five* papers, only the highest four grades will count.

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. It's perfectly ok, even desirable, for you to draw on your own experience with schools, as long as you use this experience as a case in point in an analytical argument that is related to the reading. Also keep in mind that these short papers can be more informal in style and structure than the final paper in the course, which should adhere more closely to academic norms for analytical writing. You will be evaluated on the basis of the thoughtfulness, depth of understanding, and analytical insight that is reflected in your paper.

All papers should be submitted electronically to Larry Samuels at the start of class. Save the paper as a Word document and send it to Larry as an e-mail attachment. The two professors will take turns reading and grading your papers. **All papers must be submitted no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the class for which the readings were assigned.**

For the other half of the course grade, you can either submit a final exam or a research paper.

Final Exam:

The take home final will consist of a small number of questions that will cover all required readings and lecture material. You need to answer one of these. **The questions will be handed out to you on May 25. The exam must be turned in by 5:00 PM on June 6.** All papers should be submitted electronically to Larry Samuels. Save the paper as a Word document and send it to Jack as an e-mail attachment. The finals will count for 50% of your grade. The maximum length for the final exam should be 12 pages (3600 words). Longer exams and tardy exams will result in a lower grade.

Final Paper:

All students may write a research paper dealing with a theme from the course. This research paper is an alternative to the final exam and counts for 50% of the grade. This option gives students the opportunity to explore a research topic in greater depth.

Research papers should be about 20 pages (6000 words) in length (double-spaced with 12 point font). Students are free to choose the specific topic, but they must discuss the project with one of the instructors. **If you plan to pursue the research paper option, you should submit a one-page proposal AND meet with an instructor by April 21. If you do not have a paper**

project approved by this date you MUST take the take home final. All proposals should be submitted electronically to Larry Samuels. Save the paper as a Word document and send it to Larry as an e-mail attachment.

The research paper may have one of two formats. A student can write a project proposal – a paper with a thesis, a literature review, and a proposed methodology for carrying out an original research study. Alternatively, a student may write a more “traditional” research paper, consisting of a thesis and an exploration of research that has addressed the topic of interest to you. Regardless of the option you choose, the research paper should address the theories and articles discussed in the course.

Please note that students are not expected to collect and analyze original data for this paper.

All research papers should be submitted electronically to Larry Samuels. Save the paper as a Word document and send it to Larry as an e-mail attachment. **All papers must be submitted no later than 5:00 p.m. on June 6.** Late papers will result in a lower grade.

Students with documented disabilities: Students who may need an academic accommodation based on the impact of a disability must initiate the request with the Student Disability Resource Center (SDRC) located within the Office of Accessible Education (OAE). SDRC staff will evaluate the request with required documentation, recommend reasonable accommodations, and prepare an *Accommodation Letter* for faculty dated in the current quarter in which the request is being made. Students should contact the SDRC as soon as possible since timely notice is needed to coordinate accommodations. The OAE is located at 563 Salvatierra Walk (phone: 723-1066, 723-1067 TTY).

Readings

Book: The following book is required for the course; it is available through the Stanford Book Store. A copy is also on reserve at Cubberley Library:

Hirschman, Albert O. (2006). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Assigned Articles: All of the other readings for the class are available on the web. They can be found on the Stanford Blackboard system at <http://bb.stanford.edu/>.

Course Outline

Week 1 – March 30 (Ramirez and Labaree)

Introduction

I. Theories of Education and Society

A. Social Order and Class Reproduction; Functionalism

Dreeben, Robert. (1968). *On what is learned in school* (pp. 1-6, 63-111). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bowles, Samuel & Gintis, Herbert. (1976). Education, inequality, and the meritocracy. Chapter 4 in *Schooling in capitalist America* (pp. 102-124). New York: Basic Books.

Bernstein, Basil. (1977). Social class, language and socialization. In Jerome Karabel & A. H. Halsey (eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 473-486). New York: Oxford University Press.

Week 2 – April 6 (Labaree)

B. Conflict and Resistance

Collins, Randall. (1971). Functional and conflict theories of educational stratification. *American Sociological Review*, 35:6 (December), 1002-1019.

Giroux, Henry. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53, 257-293.

C. Institutional Theory

Meyer, John. (1977). The effects of education as an institution. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83:1, 55-77.

Metz, Mary. (1989). Real school: A universal drama and disparate experience. *Politics of Education Association Yearbook*, (pp. 75-91).

D. Postmodernism

Popkewitz, Thomas S. (1998). The spatial politics of urban and rural education. Chapter 1 in *Struggling for the soul: The politics of schooling and the construction of the teacher* (pp. 8-33). New York: Teachers College Press.

Week 3 – April 13 (Ramirez)

II. Role of Education in Society

A. Role of Education in Nation Building

Tyack, David. (1966). Forming the national character. *Harvard Education Review*, 36:1, 29-41.

Ramirez, Francisco. (1997). The nation-state, citizenship, and educational change: Institutionalization and globalization. In William Cummings & Noel McGinn (eds.), *International handbook of education and development: Preparing schools, students, and nations for the twenty-first century* (pp. 47-62). New York: Pergamon.

Cummings, William. (1997). Patterns of modern education. In William Cummings & Noel McGinn (eds.), *International handbook of education and development: Preparing schools, students, and nations for the twenty-first century* (pp. 63-85). New York: Pergamon.

Week 4 – April 20 (Ramirez)

Research Paper Proposal Must Be Approved by this Date

B. Education and Human, Cultural, and Social Capital

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1986). The forms of capital. In John G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.

Schultz, Theodore W. (2000/1961). Investment in human capital. In Arum, R. & Beattie (eds.), I. *The structure of schooling* (pp. 46-55). Mountain View: Mayfield Publishing.

Lisa Delpit. (1995). The silenced dialogue. In *Other people's children* (pp. 21-47). New York: New Press.

Coleman, James. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology* 94, Supplement: S95-S120.

Rubinson, Richard & Browne, Irene. (1996). Education and the economy. In Neil Smelser and Richard Swedborg (eds.), *The handbook of economic sociology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Week 5 – April 27 (Ramirez)

C. Role of Education in Social Mobility and Social Reproduction

Boudon, Raymond. (1986). Education, mobility, and sociological theory. In John G. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 261-274). New York: Greenwood.

Turner, Ralph. (2000/1960). Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system. In Arum, R. & Beattie, I (eds.). *The structure of schooling* (pp. 22-35). Mountain View: Mayfield.

Rubinson, Richard. (1986). Class formation, politics, and institutions: Schooling in the United States. *American Journal of Sociology* 9, 519-548.

Week 6 – May 4 (Labaree)

III Organization of the Educational System

Hirschman, Albert O. (2006). *Exit, voice, and loyalty: Responses to decline in firms, organizations, and states*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Chubb, John E. & Moe, Terry M. (1988). Politics, markets, and the organization of schools. *American Political Science Review*, 82:4 (December), 1065-1087.

Week 7 – May 11 (Labaree)

Schools

Katz, Michael. (1971). Alternative proposals for American education: The nineteenth century. on four models of school organization. In *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools* (pp. 3-55). New York: Praeger.

Labaree, David F. (1997). Public good, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal* 34: 1 (Spring), 39-81.

Controversies:

Hallinan, Maureen. (1994). Tracking: From theory to practice; Jeannie Oakes, More than misapplied technology: A normative and political response to Hallinan on tracking; Maureen Hallinan, Further thoughts on tracking; Jeannie Oakes, "One more thought. *Sociology of Education* 67: 2, 79-91.

Week 8 – May 18 (Labaree)

How Does the System Change?

Elmore, Richard F., & McLaughlin, Milbrey W. (1988). *Steady work*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Tyack, David, & Tobin, William. (1994). The “grammar” of schooling: Why has it been so hard to change? *American Educational Research Journal*, 31:3, 453-479.

Binder, Amy. (2000). Why do some curricular challenges work while others do not?: The case of three Afrocentric challenges. *Sociology of Education*, 73:2, 69-91.

Week 9 – May 25 (Ramirez)

Final Exam Questions Distributed in Class

Universities

Labaree, David F. (2010). Understanding the rise of American higher education: How complexity breeds autonomy (translated into Chinese). *Peking University Education Review*, 8:3, 24-39.

Gumport, Patricia J. (2000). Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, 39, 67-91.

Ramirez, Francisco O. (2006). The rationalization of universities. In Marie-Laure Djelic & Kerstin Shalin-Andersson (Eds.), *Transnational governance: Institutional dynamics of regulation* (pp. 224-245). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Douglass, John Aubrey. (2009). The race for human capital. In John Aubrey Douglass, C. Judson King, and Irwin Feller (Eds), *Globalization's muse: Universities and higher education systems in a changing world* (pp. 45-66). Berkeley: Berkeley Public Policy Press.

Week 10 – June 1 (Labaree)

What Can Schools Do? What Can Educational Research Do?

Stokes, Donald E. (1997). *Pasteur's Quadrant: Basic Science and Technological Innovation*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press. (Chapter 1, Stating the problem; chapter 5, Basic science and American democracy).

Augier, Mie & March, James G. (2007). The pursuit of relevance in management education. *California Management Review*, 49:3 (Spring), 129-146.

Cohen, David K. & Garet, Michael S. (1975). Reforming educational policy with applied social research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 45, 17-43.

Hess, Frederick M. & Henig, Jeffrey R. (2008). Scientific research and policymaking: A tool not a crutch. *Commentary, Education Week* 27:22 (Feb. 6), 26, 36.

June 6 – Final Exams and Research Papers Due by 5:00 p.m.

Guidelines for Critical Reading

As a critical reader of a particular text (a book, article, speech, proposal), 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 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?

If this is the way critical readers are going to approach a text, then as an analytical writer you need to guide readers toward the desired answers to each of these questions.

Guidelines for Analytical Writing

In writing papers for this (or any) course, keep in mind the following points. They apply in particular to the final research paper or take-home exam for this class. Many of the same concerns apply to response papers as well, but these short papers can be more informal than the final paper.

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., (Ravitch, 2000, 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.