

Sociology 113
Sociology of Education

Fall 2011 -- Tuesday, Thursday 8:00-9:30, 126 Barrows

Professor Samuel R. Lucas
Office: 438 Barrows Hall
Phone: 642-4765 or 642-4766
E-mail address: lucas@demog.berkeley.edu
Web-site: <http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/lucas>
Office hours: Tuesdays, 1:30-3:30pm (**but check web-site for updates**)

In this course we will investigate the contradictions and possibilities of education. Throughout the course students will learn some basic facts of education and its organization in the United States, orienting perspectives and theories for understanding the way education works, and then a selection of specific issues in education.

The aim of these efforts is threefold. As one might imagine, one course aim is that students learn particular substantive facts about education. A second aim is that students learn a range of theoretical perspectives analysts have developed for considering education and society. A third aim is that students become adept at evaluating evidence bearing on the relation between substantive facts and theoretical perspectives. The first aim is important, but it is the second and third aim that sets our work apart and makes it a college-level course. Consequently, the point is not only to learn facts, but also and most important, to be able to marshal those facts to evaluate other claims, and to sensitively weigh evidence.

Assignments

There are three kinds of written assignments: Quizzes, Papers, and a Final Exam.

Quizzes

Pop quizzes will be assigned throughout the term. A quiz may occur at any time during class. Further, a quiz may occur in parts during a single class or multiple classes—part 1 might be assigned at one point during the class period, while part 2 might be assigned at another point, and third, fourth, or additional parts might be assigned later. Part 1 one might occur in one class, and a subsequent part might be assigned in another class. Failure to complete all parts of a quiz result in a zero score for that quiz for the student. Further, continuing to work on the quiz when time is up is also reason for the grade on the quiz to be zero. Other rules to assure the fairness of the quiz for all students may be applied as the term unfolds.

Papers

You are required to write three papers. They are due September 20, October 18, and November 22. Late papers will not be accepted. Papers must be submitted at class—papers placed in the professor's mailbox, under the professor's office door, or in any other way except at class by the end of class on the day the paper is due will not be accepted.

Substantively, for each paper you will develop an answer to a specific set of questions provided to you a few weeks before the paper is due. Each paper will require you to use readings from the course to address the questions.

Exam

The final exam will be administered during the time assigned for our final exam, during which you will be asked to answer one or more essay questions *using a set of documents provided to you* at the exam. This format is similar to that used in the document question on the U.S. History Advanced Placement exam and others.¹ The content of the exam is cumulative.

Due Dates and Grade Percentages for each Type of Assignment

Each paper counts 15% for a total of 45%. Collectively the quizzes count 15%. The final exam counts 30%. And, class participation counts 10%.

Dialogue

This is a lecture class. Lectures will generally elaborate or extend the reading, not repeat it. I anticipate that one will get more out of the lecture if one has already completed the reading assignment for the date.

At the same time, while this is a lecture class, it is a *college* lecture class, which means (to me, as a sociologist of education) that students in the class must be engaged—verbally—in the class throughout the term. The course essentially serves to insert us into an already-occurring, long-running dialogue with the material and those who have studied education. Entering this course is simultaneously committing to entering that dialogue, committing to contributing, verbally, to that running dialogue.

Thus, 10% of the grade will be based on whether you do, indeed, engage in that dialogue, publicly, here. Logistics for that will be described at the first class, and implemented in and after the fifth class of the term.

Social Support

In the old days different schools (e.g., Harvard, Yale, Michigan, Wisconsin, Haverford,

¹The College Board states “The AP program in United States History is designed to provide students with the analytical skills and enduring understandings necessary to deal critically with the problems and materials in United States history. The program prepares students for intermediate and advanced college courses by making demands upon them equivalent to those made by full-year introductory college courses. *Students should learn to assess historical materials—their relevance to a given interpretive problem, their reliability, and their importance—and to weigh the evidence and interpretations presented in historical scholarship.* An AP United States History course should thus *develop the skills necessary to arrive at conclusions on the basis of an informed judgment and to present reasons and evidence clearly and persuasively in an essay format.*

Swarthmore, Berkeley) had different cultures but each, in various ways, supported learning. In our era, of post-modernity, of multi-cultural diversity, and of hyper-technological development, no widely-shared culture of support for learning exists. Thus, there are dozens of ways a class may be organized, all differing in ways Bourdieu might find interesting. Making no judgment about how other classes are arranged nor how diverse styles may be (seemingly?) accommodated in other campuses or classes at Berkeley, certain requirements do exist for this course. Many of the requirements are related explicitly below.

Computers

Computers of various kinds (e.g., laptops, pdas, cellphones) are to be off during class time. If you require a computer for note-taking as part of an accommodation you must bring to the professor a letter of accommodation from the Office of Disabled Student Services (ODSS). If you do receive the professor's consent to use a computer as part of an ODSS accommodation, but you are caught using the computer for something other than note-taking (e.g., using e-mail, surfing for airline tickets), then the professor's agreement to the accommodation will be revoked for the remainder of your enrollment in the course. If you require a clock for budgeting your time during a quiz or exam, I suggest you wear a watch because cellphones, pdas, and laptops will have to be off during class time and during exams.

Obtaining Handouts

I will from time to time hand material out during class. If you miss class and a handout is handed out, I advise you to obtain that material (although, admittedly, there will be no way for you to gain access to the discussion that may have attended the handout). One solution for obtaining missed handouts that many students find efficacious is to borrow the handout from a friend and make a copy. What is not efficacious is approaching the professor before or after a subsequent class and asking for the handout that was handed out at some earlier class. Obviously, I cannot carry multiple copies of every handout of the term to every class. However, I am happy to give you the handout if you come to office hours, but please note: peeking your head in and interrupting the conversation I am having with another, or taking another person's time by trying to slide in "between" appointments, are not advisable approaches.

Office hours

My office hours are listed on the syllabus, above. There is a sign-up sheet outside my door with 15 minute blocks of time. Please do not sign up for a slot if you do not think you will make it, because that prevents others from taking that time. That is not in your best interest, because if you take a time slot they could have taken, they'll be pushed to some other time slot. Then, when you cancel (and if, on some rare occasion, you find you cannot make a slot after signing up for it, you *should* cancel), they could be sitting on the very time-slot you need. Thus, please sign up for office hours—but, also please see this as a public commitment you are making to me and one you are preventing others from making. Please assure you are able to meet at the time you select, and then do so.

Sometimes no one signs up for a slot. If no one has signed up for a slot, the slot is available and

anyone may use it on a walk-in basis.

Occasionally, a late development may mean I am forced to move the office hour time. At the same time, given all that you have going on in your life, it is quite possible that you may fail to memorize my office hours. Thus, my office hours are posted on my web-site, listed above; any changes will be posted on that site. So, I encourage you to check my web-site if you wonder about my office hours for a particular week.

E-mail

E-mail is a wonderful tool. Despite appearances, however, it is no substitute for raising substantive, theoretical, or logistical questions in class. An example of a substantive question is “Did Mare mean that educational attainment has gone down since the 1950s?” An example of a theoretical question is “What does Coleman’s claim that social capital is an obligation mean?” An example of a logistical question is “Will we receive information about the paper assignment next week?” These kinds of questions are good questions—the first two are the point of the course, and the third is often necessary for the work of the course. Given their centrality, many people have such questions. Thus, were the professor to commit to answering such questions via e-mail the professor would be 1)draining the class of the task for which it is designed and 2)committing to potentially answering the same question 70 times. Because a better example of inefficiency masquerading as technological sophistication I cannot imagine, I will not answer any e-mail I receive that contains such questions.

What questions sent via e-mail *will* I answer? Not many, as far as I can see. Any issues pertaining to your own personal situation (e.g., family emergency) should be addressed face-to-face in office hours, not via impersonal e-mail or on the fly before or after class. Any intellectual dialogue in which we might engage (e.g., asking about literature you might read to follow-up on a point discussed in this or some other class) is, again, much better addressed face-to-face, where the full pleasure of the intellectual task can be obtained. Upon receiving such e-mail, I will probably simply ask you to sign up to see me in office hours, even as I will acknowledge the matter (e.g., family emergency, theories of interest).

Thus, I am not ruling out the possibility that I may respond to e-mail messages. But, it is likely that any response is simply going to ask you to stop by to discuss the matter in office hours.

Grade Re-Evaluations

Many times a person may not like an evaluation they have received. As a fair person I am committed to fair evaluation. However, it is also true that there is no end to the possibility of debating the merits of an evaluation because, typically, some parts of an evaluation may be more stringent but other parts of the evaluation may be less stringent. These usually balance out, and all is well. One could, however, focus one’s attention only on the items that are more stringently graded, and become very concerned about the fairness of the evaluation.

The wider public works to assure that only the most serious issues are likely to lead to formal

appeal. For example, to bring a case to court one must pay court costs. To contest a parking citation one must go through a formal process that, once one considers the time involved and one's own wage rate, is usually hardly worth the fine one is seeking to avoid. Like it or not, these procedures produce closure, and get people to move on to the next important parts of their life. Thus, it is believed by many that these requirements make persons only bring forth serious claims.

Obviously, I will not charge you if you want an assignment re-evaluated. However, I do have the following requirements and policy concerning re-evaluations:

1) To ask for a re-evaluation of an assignment you must submit the original copy of the graded assignment with the comments and grade on it, as well as a non-handwritten one-page (single-sided, single-spaced, 1 inch margins, font *no smaller than this one*) statement explaining your claim and identifying the part of the assignment in which you believe the evaluation was unfairly made.

2) The deadline for that submission is the start of the class immediately following the one during which the assignment was returned. Filings later than the start of that class will not be accepted.

3) You must submit the material in hardcopy form (no electronic filings will be accepted) in person to the professor (I will not accept a filing from a friend, nor will I accept a filing in my mailbox, under my door, or any filing that is not placed directly into my hand by the student seeking a re-evaluation of their work).

I will evaluate the filing as follows. I will re-grade the entire assignment. If the "re-grade" is higher than the old grade, I will correct the previous evaluation by replacing the old grade with the "re-grade," and offer you my apologies for the error. I will also thank you for bringing the error to my attention. However, if the "re-grade" is less than or equal to the old grade, I will replace the old grade with a grade that is up to one full letter grade lower than the old grade. I will use my discretion concerning how much lower, based upon my assessment of the degree to which the formal request is based in a reasonable reading of the material covered in class, signs of student conscientiousness (e.g., completion of quizzes; low signs of conscientiousness will likely lead to higher penalties), and the difference between the old grade and the re-grade (an old grade that is a great deal higher than the re-grade is likely to lead to a higher penalty).

One may wonder why I will replace the old grade by a lower grade if the re-grade equals the lower grade. The reason is that, based on my observation of our society, it appears that we often read an evaluation and see very clearly all the places where we believe we were graded more stringently, but we fail to see all the places where we were actually graded less stringently. In truth, however, these tend to balance out. Because I want to correct any situations that do *not* balance out, I am willing to re-grade an assignment. After all, arithmetic errors have been known to occur. However, that effort to re-evaluate evaluations is not costless, and one cost is of paramount importance. An evaluation system with no end and no dis-incentives for continuation

can easily embroil us in a damaging dynamic of interaction. In an effort to be available for considering serious issues of error, but in an effort to also preserve the social camaraderie necessary for our work to succeed, I want to encourage you to *carefully* consider the *totality* of the evaluation before you submit a request for a re-evaluation. Ask yourself—if one considers the entire assignment, would changing both the areas in which you are concerned and the other areas in which you may have received the benefit of the doubt clearly raise the grade?

Quiz Grade Re-Evaluations

The same procedures apply, but the grade-penalty for no change in the grade is different. If I re-grade the quiz and the grade does not go up, then the quiz grade is recorded as an F. If the quiz grade is already an F, and a re-grade does not make the grade go up, then that quiz will count double.

The reason for these different rules is that there will be several quizzes during the term, and each will count very little. However, if every quiz becomes a focus for pushing up grades, it will quickly consume all of the professor's energy, leaving little energy for actually teaching the class. Thus, the more severe penalty is meant to more clearly dissuade questionable re-evaluation requests. However, if some arithmetic or other error is clear and no off-setting other error is apparent, my interest in fairness entails a willingness to re-grade the quiz.

Reading

Much of the reading is available online. However, if you read it online you are unlikely to be able to “read with a pen,” i.e., you are unlikely to be able to mark the material for important information of interest. Reading with a pen increases retention of the material. Thus, I encourage you to print out the reading material that is online, read it offline prior to class, and bring it to class. Of course, this is your choice, but you will not have electronic access to the material during class. I believe you will find it useful to have access to the reading during class.

Books and Articles for the Course

Much of the reading material is available via JSTOR, Google Scholar, or via OskiCat, and some of the other material is available at specific web-sites (e.g., my web-site). The readings that are at specific non-JSTOR sites are generally available to the public. The general public does not have access to JSTOR or much of OskiCat, but if you are a student at UC-Berkeley you have access to both. JSTOR and OskiCat are accessible from university computers; if you prefer to access these sites from home you need set up a proxy server. University web-sites contain information on how to do that for the different types of computers one might use.

I strongly encourage you to become familiar with JSTOR, as it will serve you well. Of course, anything available via JSTOR is also available in hardcopy in the various libraries at UC-Berkeley. Thus, you need not have JSTOR access to obtain the material.

Papers that are on publicly available web-sites have the url in the syllabus, while papers on JSTOR or OskiCat are noted in the syllabus with a bold **JSTOR** or **OskiCat** after the citation.

For the JSTOR and OskiCat papers you'll need to use the search tools of the site to find the paper. For JSTOR the author or title are needed. For OskiCat first find the journal, then find the appropriate electronic location of that issue, and then a search using some information from the citation (e.g., author, title) will be needed.

Some articles are not available electronically; those papers are in a Reader for purchase at Copy Central, 2560 Bancroft. Papers that are in the Reader are noted in the syllabus with a bold **READER** after the citation. These articles may be less common on the syllabus, but they are essential (or I would not assign them given the extra drudgery of making them available). Thus, I encourage you to obtain the Reader as it is likely by far the easiest way of obtaining access to these materials.

There are also three books on the syllabus:

Arum, Richard, and Josipa Roksa. 2011. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning To Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

The first book, Arum and Roksa, is available at University Press Books on Bancroft. We will discuss this book starting on August 30 and continuing on September 1. It frames everything that follows.

PART I – INTRODUCTION

Week 1, Aug 25

Aug 25 -- Introduction

>> Week 2, Aug 30-Sep 1 – Prerequisites for Education

Aug 30 – Prerequisites for Education

Arum, Richard, and Josipa Roksa. 2011. *Academically Adrift: Limited Learning on College Campuses*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sep 1 – Prerequisites for Education

Merritt, Deborah J. 2008. "Bias, the Brain, and Student Evaluations of Teaching." *St. John's Law Review* 82: 235-287. **Google Scholar**

Flacks, Richard, and Scott L. Thomas. 2007. "'Outsiders,' Student Subcultures, and the Massification of Higher Education." *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research* 22: 181-218. **Google Scholar**

>> Week 3, Sep 6-8 – Purpose(s) of Schools and Schooling

Sep 6 – What Purpose? Whose Purpose?

Boli, John, Francisco O. Ramirez, and John W. Meyer. 1985. "Explaining the Origins and Expansion of Mass Education." *Comparative Education Review* 29:145-170 **JSTOR**

Labaree, David F. 1997. "Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle over Educational Goals." *American Educational Research Journal* 34: 39-81. **JSTOR**

Miller, David C., Anindita Sen, Lydia Malley, and Eugene Owen. 2007. Appendix A: The Education Systems of the G-8 Countries," pp. 59-80 of "Comparative Indicators of Education in the United States and Other G-8 Countries: 2006". Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. **Google Scholar**

Sep 8 – Purposes amidst Changing Populations and Conditions

Campbell, Ronald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, Raphael O. Nystrand, and Michael D. Usdan. 1990. *Organization and Control of American Schools, The 6th Edition*. New York, NY: Merrill, Macmillan Publishing Company. Chapter 16, pages 407-427 **READER**

Trow, Martin. 1961. "The Second Transformation of American Secondary Education." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 2: 144-166. **Google Scholar**

Labaree, David F. 2008. "The Winning Ways of a Losing Strategy: Educationalizing Social Problems in The United States." *Educational Theory* 58: 447-460. **Google Scholar**

>>Week 4, Sep 13-15 – Structures of Education and Schools as Organizations

Sep 13 -- Existing Structures of Education in the United States

Campbell, Ronald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, Raphael O. Nystrand, and Michael D. Usdan. 1990. *Organization and Control of American Schools, The 6th Edition*. New York, NY: Merrill, Macmillian Publishing Company. Chapters 1-11, pages 1-296 **READER**

Sep 15 – Competing Theories of Schools as Organizations

Chubb, John E., and Terry M Moe. 1988. "Politics, Markets, and the Organization of Schools." *American Political Science Review* 82: 1065-1087. **JSTOR**

Weick, Karl E. 1976. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21: 1-19. **JSTOR**

PART II – KEY ORIENTING PERSPECTIVES

>>Week 5, Sep 20-22 – Human and Social Capital Theory

Sep 20 – Human Capital Theory

Becker, Gary. 1962. "Investment in Human Capital: A Theoretical Analysis." *Journal of Political Economy* 70 (Supplement) 9-49. **JSTOR**

****PAPER 1 DUE, SEPTEMBER 20****

Sep 22 – Social Capital Theory

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of Sociology* 94: S95-S120. **JSTOR**

Robison, Lindon J., A. Allan Schmid, and Marcelo E. Siles. 2002. "Is Social Capital Really Capital?" *Review of Social Economy* 60: 1-21. **Google Scholar**

>> Week 6, Sep 27-29 – Cultural Capital Theory and Capital Theories

Sep 27 – Cultural Capital Theory

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. "The Forms of Capital," pp. 241-258 in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by John Richardson. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

http://home.iitk.ac.in/~amman/soc748/bourdieu_forms_of_capital.pdf

Sep 29 – Capital Theories Compared

No additional reading

>> Week 7, Oct 4-6 – A Structural Marxist Account

Oct 4-6 – A Structural Marxist Account

Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

>> Week 8, Oct 11-13 – A Cultural Marxist Account

Oct 11-13 – A Cultural Marxist Account

Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning To Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

PART III – SELECTED ISSUES IN EDUCATION

>> Week 9, Oct 18-20 – Educational Attainment and Achievement

Oct 18 – Some Facts and Theories of Educational Attainment

Miller, David C., Anindita Sen, Lydia Malley, and Eugene Owen. 2007. pp. 1-57 of "Comparative Indicators of Education in the United States and Other G-8 Countries: 2006". Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2008. "Educational Attainment," pages 115-122 in *Encyclopedia of the Life Course and Human Development*, edited by Deborah Carr. Farmington Hills, MI: Macmillian Reference, USA. **READER**

****PAPER 2 DUE, OCTOBER 18****

Oct 29 – Some Facts and Theories of Educational Achievement

Schmidt, William H., and Curtis C. McKnight. 1998. "What Can We Really Learn from TIMSS?" *Science* 282:1830-1831. **Google Scholar**

Aronson, Joshua, Michael J. Lustina, Catherine Good, Kelli Keough, Claude M. Steele, and Joseph Brown. 1999. "When White Men Can't Do Math: Necessary and Sufficient Factors in Stereotype Threat." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 35: 29-46. **Google Scholar**

Huang, Min-Hsiung. 2009. "Race of the Interviewer and the Black-White Test Score Gap." *Social Science Research* 38: 29-38. **Google Scholar**

>> **Week 10, Oct 25-27 – Tracking and Pedagogy**

Oct 25 – Dimensions of Curriculum Differentiation and Effects of Tracking

Sørensen, Aage Bøttger. 1970. "Organizational Differentiation of Students and Educational Opportunity." *Sociology of Education* 43: 355-376. **JSTOR**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2008. "Tracking," pages 405-411 in *Encyclopedia of the Life Course and Human Development*, edited by Deborah Carr. Farmington Hills, MI: Macmillian Reference, USA. **READER**

Pallas, Aaron M., Doris Entwistle, Karl L. Alexander, and M. Francis Stluka. 1994. "Ability-Group Effects: Instructional, Social, or Institutional." *Sociology of Education* 67: 27-46. **JSTOR**

Cogan, Leland S., William H. Schmidt, and David E. Wiley. 2001. "Who Takes What Math and in Which Track? Using TIMSS to Characterize U.S. Students' Eighth-Grade Mathematics Learning Opportunities." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 23: 323-341. **Google Scholar**

Oct 27 – Authentic and Other Pedagogies

Newman, Fred M., Helen M. Marks, and Adam Gamoran. 1996. "Authentic Pedagogy and Student Performance." *American Journal of Education* 104: 280-312. **JSTOR**

Tsui, Lisa. 2007. "Cultivating Critical Thinking: Insights from an Elite College." *Journal of General Education* 56: 200-227. **Google Scholar**

>> **Week 11, Nov 1-3 –The Experience of Teaching and Selected Teacher Responses**

Nov 1 – The Experience of Teaching

Campbell, Ronald F., Luvern L. Cunningham, Raphael O. Nystrand, and Michael D. Usdan. 1990. *Organization and Control of American Schools, The 6th Edition*. New York, NY: Merrill, Macmillian Publishing Company. Chapter 12, pages 297-328 **READER**

Acker, Sandra. 1995. "Gender and Teachers' Work." *Review of Research in Education* 21: 99-162. **JSTOR**

Nov 3 – Selected Teacher Responses

Sizer, Theodore. 1992. "Prologue: Horace's Compromise," pp. 9-21 in *Horaces' Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. **READER**

McNeil, Linda M. 1983. "Defensive Teaching and Classroom Control," pp. 114-142 in *Ideology and Practice in Schooling*, edited by Michael W. Apple and Lois Weis. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. **READER**

Finley, Merilee K. 1984. "Teachers and Tracking in a Comprehensive High School." *Sociology of Education* 57: 233-243. **JSTOR**

>>Week 12, Nov 8-10 –The Political Economy of Education

Nov 8 – The Provision of Resources

Chew, Kenneth S.Y. 1992. "The Demographic Erosion of Political Support for Public Education: A Suburban Case Study." *Sociology of Education* 65: 280-292. **JSTOR**

Plutzer, Eric, and Michael Berkman. 2005. "The Graying of America and Support for Funding the Nation's Schools." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69: 66-86. **Google Scholar**

Nov 10 – Effects of Resources on Education

Ehrenberg, Ronald G, Dominic Brewer, Adam Gamoran, and J. Douglas Willms. 2001. "Does Class Size Matter?" *Scientific American* 285, n5: 79-85. **OskiCat**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2003. "Implications of the Stratification of Structural Learning Opportunities in California Schools: Re-Analyses of Evidence on School Resource Effects in *Williams v. California*," report submitted as a rebuttal expert witness for plaintiffs, pp. 13-103 at http://www.decentschools.org/expert_reports/lucas_rebuttal.pdf

>>Week 13, Nov 15-17 – Immigration and Education

Nov 15 – The Wider Context of Immigration

Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M. 2001. "Globalization, Immigration, and Education: The Research Agenda." *Harvard Education Review* 71: 345-365 **Google Scholar**

Cherry, Robert. 2003. "Immigration and Race: What We Think We Know." *Review of Black Political Economy* 31: 157-184. **Google Scholar**

Nov 17 – Immigration and Education

Hakuta, Kenji, Ellen Bialystok and Edward Wiley. 2003. "Critical Evidence : A Test of the Critical-Period Hypothesis for Second-Language Acquisition." *Psychological Science* 14: 31-38. **Google Scholar**

Betts, Julian R. 1998. "Educational Crowding Out: Do Immigrants Affect the Educational Attainment of American Minorities?," pages 253-281 in *Help or Hindrance: The Economic Implications of Immigration for African Americans*, edited by Daniel S. Hammermesh and Frank D. Bean. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. **READER**

>>Week 14, Nov 22-24 – Education and Social Change

Nov 22 – Challenges of Making Social Change and Education

Lucas, Samuel R. 2008. "Constructing Equal Pathways in an Effectively Maintained Inequality Society" in *Beyond Tracking: Multiple Pathways to College, Career, and Civic Participation*, edited by Jeannie Oakes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **READER**

****PAPER 3 DUE, NOVEMBER 22****

Nov 24 – Thanksgiving

>>Week 15, Nov 29-Dec 1– Last Week of Classes, Review and Wrap-up

Nov 29 – Review

No Reading

Dec 1 – Wrap-up

No Reading

>>Final Exam, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2011 3-6PM