

POLS 5810-002 Research Seminar: Power & Resistance

Spring 2012
 Schwartz-Shea
 Office: 256e OSH
 phone mail: 581-6300
psshea@poli-sci.utah.edu

Office Hours: 10:45-11:30 am TH
 & by appointment
 Class: BU C 203, 9:10-10:30 am TH
 3 credit hours, CW credit

Course Description and Objectives

POLS 5810 is a research seminar in political science that satisfies the upper division communication/writing (CW) graduation requirement. Its purpose is to introduce students to the research process by having them complete a major research project in the topic area of the particular professor.

In this course, we will focus on the theoretical and practical problems of “power and resistance” for specific groups of people: peasants and landlords, slaves and slave holders, racial minorities and majorities, women and men, employees and employers, gays and straights, disabled and abled. More specifically, we will examine the relationship between individuals' “consciousness” (i.e., their understanding of the relationship between their lives and politics) and their willingness to participate politically in social movements, interest groups, or less organized forms of “everyday” resistance. The strategies of social action to achieve political change will be examined using Dennis Chong's (1991) theoretical analysis of the civil rights movement and James C. Scott's (1990) broad-ranging analysis of domination and resistance.

I welcome research papers on any of these topics (or others) so long as the “theoretical resources” available in course readings are utilized.

Americans with Disabilities Act: Reasonable Accommodations for Qualified Students

The University of Utah seeks to provide equal access to its programs, services and activities for people with disabilities. If you will need accommodations in the class, reasonable prior notice needs to be given to the Center for Disability Services, 162 Olpin Union Building, 581-5020 (V/TDD). CDS will work with you and the instructor to make arrangements for accommodations. All written information in this course can be made available in alternative format with prior notification to the Center for Disability Services.

No Class

March 12-16	Spring Break
March 21-24	Western Political Science Association Conference

Required Texts

Dennis Chong, *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement*, 1991.
 James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, 1990.
 Patricia O'Conner, *Woe is I: The Grammarphobe's Guide To Better English in Plain English*,
 Third edition, 2009.
 Marriott e-reserve

Teaching Philosophy

[The purpose of education in industrialized societies is] to socialize students to be compliant, to follow instructions, and to value certain kinds of information and types of authority (Browner, 1989).

The public institutions of higher education in the United States have undergone profound changes in the last fifty years. On the positive side, they have opened their doors to greater numbers of students with more diverse backgrounds than in the past. On the negative side, public funding (and support) has decreased—even as the cost borne by students has increased—and not all students are sufficiently prepared for rigorous curricula. What is and what should be the role of “liberal education” in a polity? Is the higher education system simply part of the increasing “corporatization” of American society—producing the compliant “workers” the globalizing economy needs? Or is it (still—was it ever) a space in which the independent, questioning citizens of a democracy are cultivated?

In *Teaching with Your Mouth Shut* Donald Finkel (2000) argues that effective learning is consistent with preparing students to be democratic citizens because, in both cases, the individual takes responsibility for outcomes rather than relying on external authority. Passive, didactic approaches—what Finkel terms “telling”—assume that knowledge can be transferred from an authority, the teacher, to the student. In contrast, active learning in the form of individual and group activities encourages “self government.” Research on learning shows that when the factors examined are retention of information after a course is over, transfer of knowledge to novel situations, development of skill in thinking or problem solving, and motivation for additional learning, dialogical processes that connect individual experiences to general ideas are more likely to engage students than listening to an authority’s lecture.

Even if Browner’s assessment in the epigraph is largely correct, such an approach to education can be *resisted* and a research seminar capped at thirty students is one space in which Finkel’s ideals might be enacted. As the professor, I can set up the conditions for active learning, but students must do their part by treating the seminar as a place of learning rather than as just another course needed to obtain a credential valued by employers.

Course Requirements

Participation and concepts test	10%
“Mini” writing assignments (e.g., microthemes)	10%
Oral presentation of research paper	10%
Participation at others’ oral presentations	5%
Research paper	65%
Proposal	-- 15%
Draft	-- 25%
Final	-- 60%

WARNING: Late assignments will be penalized one-half letter grade each day past the due date. If you are having difficulties, please keep me informed via email.

Participation is essential to the success of the research seminar because enrolled students constitute a “research community” that shares a literature (the course readings) and a general interest. This research community will be the audience for your research presentations at the end of the semester. Thus, active participation is not merely a course requirement based on the professor-student relationship, but an obligation to your peers as well.

The participation grade will be based on two indicators. First, your active participation in in-class exercises is expected. These exercises may involve initial individual work, intra-group work, and inter-group discussion among designated group spokespersons. Second, you will be asked to reflect with class members on the writing process—everything from sharing your grammatical “pet peeves” to explaining your strategies for editing drafts to responding critically to others’ writing and ideas.

The purpose of “**mini**” **writing assignments** is to keep you writing regularly and to provide a means for feedback from me. In some cases, such assignments will be completed during class time as part of an in-class exercise. In other cases, the writing will be done ahead of time on assigned readings. For example, a *microtheme* is a 100 - 150 word paragraph that summarizes or analyzes an article, text chapter, or concept. None of these writing assignments will be graded individually. I will simply record whether or not they are completed *on time* in order to assign a grade for the 10%.

For the **oral presentation** of your research paper you will have **seven** minutes. You should stand, speak extemporaneously from a written outline, and use handouts as appropriate. There will be **three** minutes for questions. Because we are a “research community” attendance at others’ oral research presentations is strongly encouraged and, indeed, I will penalize failure to support others in this particular instance.

You may request either an “EARLY” (April 12, 14) or “LATE” (April 19, 26) schedule for oral presentations. I will do my best to accommodate your requests within the constraint of dividing the class in half. **Assignments will be made on March 20.** If, later, you want to change your presentation date, you will need to negotiate an exchange with a fellow student. Let me know about any such changes.

I welcome **research papers** on any topic within the purview of the class, but whatever the substantive *research question*, the paper should address the question by combining the *conceptual resources* (theory) from course readings and *empirical evidence* (broadly defined). Class members will have a common theoretical basis and language (as represented in the major texts and reserve readings) and I expect students to use either Scott or Chong in their papers and their oral presentations. Final papers should be at least 20 pages long (not counting tables or references) and no longer than 35 pages (based on standard margins and 12 point font). *Please turn in papers, including drafts, which are stapled and numbered. No covers please.*

There are two parts to the *proposal*. Part I: (a) identify your substantive topic and tell me why this topic interests you (one paragraph); (b) generate two research *questions* relevant to your topic; (c) indicate whether you will use Chong or Scott and explain why you think this theorist is appropriate to your topic (one paragraph). Part II: Write a narrative in which you identify your substantive *research question* (one of the two from part I), justify its importance, and then lay out how you intend to address this question (*methodology*) using relevant *theory* (Chong or Scott) and *evidence*. The narrative should be two to three paragraphs and should begin on a separate page with a tentative title at the top of the page.

The *draft* of the research paper should be a minimum of five pages, beginning with an introduction, a theory section and, where appropriate, a background or methodology section (based on feedback from the formal proposal).

In the *final* version of the research paper you should strive to produce a coherent “package,” that is, a paper that addresses its research question in a systematic way in order to provide thoughtful answers based on analysis of evidence. In the course overview below, you will see that after turning in the draft, you will have six weeks until the final version is due. Whether this independent work will be successful depends on your engagement with the materials and your peers during first ten weeks of the course.

A word on writing. Whereas it is true that the final research paper “reports” the results of your research and thinking, it is critical to remember that writing is, *itself*, an analytical method. As we write, we clarify our own thinking and we move from “writer-centered” prose (in which the meaning seems self-evident to the writer) to “reader-centered” prose in which analysis and implications are spelled out for the audience. Thus, you should expect to revise your written work for your final paper throughout the semester based on feedback from me and from your peers.

Research participants. Before conducting any interviews, observation or surveys, please consult with me. In the U.S., before researchers embark on research that involves “human subjects,” their research ethics must be reviewed and approved by an Institutional Review Board (IRB). Although student research that will not be published is exempt from such review, we should talk individually about any potential problems before you generate evidence in any of these ways.

Expectations and Policies

1. I expect you to attend class. This means arriving on time and staying until class is dismissed.
2. According to University policy, an incomplete can only be given if a student has a passing grade and has completed 80% of the course.
3. Extra credit is not an option in this course.

Academic Honesty and Dishonesty

Academic honesty is expected. An act of academic dishonesty will result in a course grade of E and a recommendation of additional disciplinary action. In the event of suspected academic dishonesty, I may substitute a quiz, examination, or assignment for the work in question.

These are my guidelines concerning what constitutes a violation of ethical standards for course work. Any of these violations will be considered academic dishonesty and treated as such. These guidelines are in addition to any University-wide guidelines concerning academic honesty or dishonesty that may be in effect.

1. Cheating. The giving or receiving of any unauthorized assistance on any academic work.
2. Plagiarism. Presenting the language, structure or ideas of another person or persons as one's own original work.
3. Falsification. Any untrue statement, either oral or written concerning one's own academic work, work of another student, or the unauthorized alteration of any academic record.
4. Original work. Unless specifically authorized by the instructor, all academic work undertaken in a course must be original; i.e., it must not have been submitted in a prior course or be submitted in a course being taken concurrently.

COURSE OVERVIEW

The numbers in parentheses are *estimated* number of pages of reading for the chapters or article. Write a microtheme on articles marked with an asterisk (*).

Part I – Theoretical Alternatives / Generating Research Questions

January 10	Introduction – power and paradigms
January 12	Chong, Chapters 1-2 (30)
January 17	Scott, Chapters 1-2 (44)
January 19	*Allen (17); O’Conner, Chapters 1-4 (77)
January 24	Scott, Chapters 3-4 (63)
January 26	Chong, Chapters 3-5 (71)
January 31	O’Conner, Chapters 5-7 (81); Concepts Review
February 2	Concepts Test and in-class discussion of proposal

Part II – Theoretical Engagement / Refining Research Questions

February 7	Library tutorial, Peter Kraus, Marriott Library TBD
	Paper Proposal Due
February 9	*Pierce (26); *Weldes (11)\

- February 14 Chong, Chapters 6-8 (88)
Proposal Returned
- February 16 Scott, Chapters 5-6 (75)
- February 21 Scott, Chapters 7-8 (45)
 February 23 Chong, Chapters 9-10 (49)
- February 28 O’Conner, Chapters 8-10 (45)
 March 1 *Sparks (36)

Part III – Transition to Individual Work

- March 6 In-class writing workshop – The Introduction
 O’Conner, Chapter 11 (26)
- March 8 In-class writing workshop – The Theory Section
- March 13 Spring Break – Keep working!
 March 15 Spring Break – Keep working!
- March 20 In-class writing workshop – Evidence; Conclusions
Partial Draft Due
 Choose EARLY or LATE Presentation Dates
 Set up consultation appointments for March 29 & 31 and April 5 & 7
Feedback emailed as a function of consultation/presentation dates
- March 21 NO CLASS WPSA Conference

Part IV – The Hard Work and the Payoff

- March 27 Occupy Salt Lake – Guest Speaker, Sharry Buhanan
 March 29 Draft consultations
- April 3 Draft consultations
 April 5 Draft consultations
- April 10 Draft consultations
 April 12 EARLY Oral presentations
- April 17 EARLY Oral presentations
 April 19 LATE Oral presentations
- April 24 LATE Oral presentations

Finals Week: **Final draft due Tuesday, May 1 at noon**

Required Reserve Readings

American Political Science Association Style Manual

Electronic Sources: APA Style of Citation

Allen, Amy. 1998. "Rethinking Power." *Hypatia* 13(1): 22-40.

Pierce, Jennifer. 1995. "Articulating the Self in Field Research." In *Gender Trials: Emotional Lives in Contemporary Law Firms*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 189-214.

Sparks, Holloway. 1997. "Dissident Citizenship: Democratic Theory, Political Courage, and Activist Women," *Hypatia* 12(4): 74-110.

Weldes, Jutta. 2006. "High Politics and Low Data: Globalization Discourses and Popular Culture." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 176-186.

Previous 5810 Papers, refined for publication

DiAna, Ashley E. 2002/2003. "The Utah State Senate: Effects of Tokenism and Implications for Future Gender Parity." *Hinckley Journal of Politics* 4:21-31.

Vazquez, Richard A. 1998. "Discourse in Action: The Mobilization of the Million Man March." *Hinckley Journal of Politics* Autumn:67-74.

Additional Reserve Readings

Depending on your research topic you might be referred to particular readings from the list below. Most are available on reserve. If not, check with me.

Clair, Robin P. 1993. "The Bureaucratization, Commodification, and the Privatization of Sexual Harassment through Institutional Discourse: A Study of the 'Big Ten' Universities," *Management Communication Quarterly*, 7 (2): 123-157.

Clark, Peter B. & James Q. Wilson . 1961. "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 6:129-66.

Falk, Richard, and Andrew Strauss. 2001. "Toward Global Parliament." *Foreign Affairs*, January/February, 212-20.

Herndon, April. 2002. "Disparate But Disabled: Fat Embodiment and Disability Studies." *NWSA Journal* 14 (3) 120-137.

Kaufman, Debra R. 1989. "Patriarchal Women: A Case Study of Newly Orthodox Jewish Women," *Symbolic Interaction*, 12(2):299-314.

Kanter, Rosebeth Moss. 1977. "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." *American Journal of Sociology*, 82:965-990.

Lau, Kimberly J., "On the Rhetorical Use of Legend: U.C. Berkeley Campus Lore as a Strategy for Coded Protest," *Contemporary Legend*, n.s. Volume 1 (1998) 1-20.

Marquez, Benjamin. 1990. "Organizing the Mexican-American Community in Texas: The Legacy of Saul Alinsky," *Policy Studies Review* 9(2):355-73.

Miller, Laura L. 1997. "Not Just Weapons of the Weak: Gender Harassment as a Form of Protest for Army Men," *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60 (1) 32-51.

Olson, Susan M., and Christina Batjer. 1999. "Competing Narratives in a Judicial Retention Election: Feminism versus Judicial Independence," *Law & Society Review*, 33 (1) 123-60.

Sapiro, Virginia. 1990. "The Women's Movement and the Creation of Gender Consciousness: Social Movements As Socialization Agents." In O. Ichilov, ed., *Political Socialization, Citizenship Education, and Democracy*. New York: Teacher's College Press, 266-80.

Schreiber, Ronee. 2003. "Injecting a Woman's Voice: Conservative Women's Organizations, Gender Consciousness, and the Expression of Women's Policy Preferences," *Sex Roles*, 47(7/8), 331-342.

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, and Debra Burrington. 1990. "Free Riding, Alternative Organization and Cultural Feminism: The Case of Seneca Women's Peace Camp." *Women & Politics*, 10:1-37.

Shehata, Samer. 2006. "Ethnography, Identity, and the Production of Knowledge." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 244-263.

Soss, Joe. 2006. "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered View of Interviewing for Interpretive Research." In Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 127-160.

Dear Professor Schwartz-Shea,
Your course reserve list for POLS 5810-002 is in the system.

Here is the link which you can put in Canvas, WebCT, Blackboard, your website, or send to your students;

http://thoth.library.utah.edu:1701/primo_library/libweb/action/search.do?dscnt=0&frbg=&scp.scps=scope%3A%28course_reserves%29&tab=course_reserves&dstmp=1325108792022&srt=title&ct=search&mode=Basic&dum=true&vl%2842954513UI0%29=any&tb=t&indx=1&vl%28freeText0%29=schwartz-shea+pols+5810-002&vid=UUU&fn=search

Students can access course reserves by selecting the course reserves tab in the Marriott Library catalog, <http://search.library.utah.edu>.

Additional information on using course reserves can be found in our Course Reserve “How to Guide.” Please share this link with your students. It provides a walkthrough that will explain searching courses, filtering courses and finally how to access copyrighted material from off campus.

http://campusguides.lib.utah.edu/course_reserves_guide