**SOCL 313: THE SOCIOLOGY OF**

**‘GLOBALIZATION’ AND ‘DEVELOPMENT’**

Instructor: Amy A. Quark

Office: 214 Morton Hall

Office Phone: 221-2597

Email: aaquark@wm.edu

Office Hours: MW 3:00 to 4:45pm or by appointment

(24-48 hours notice required for appointments)

**COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES**

This GER 4B course focuses on the intertwined phenomena of “globalization” and “development.” People around the world are increasingly integrated into a global market economy. Local and national economies are becoming interconnected in new ways, with implications for our daily lives and life trajectories.

In many ways, an alternative title for this course could be “The History of Development Thought.” More than anything, “development” theory is a contest over how to interpret and define the past—why some countries have ‘succeeded’ and become prosperous and others have not. In this course we will trace the history of different conceptual approaches to development in order to understand how development has been defined in different ways at different historical moments, with implications for how the benefits and costs of different forms of “globalization” are shared. Our objective is to rethink the meaning of “development” in a context of increased global interdependency and increased global inequality.

In order to fulfill the GER 4B requirement, a key goal of the course is to push you to think critically about global issues from multiple perspectives. The course is organized to emphasize two axes along which differing perspectives on international development can be explored. First, the course is organized around three historical time periods: the colonial era from 1870-1945, the postwar era from 1945-70, and the contemporary era from 1970-present. This historical approach emphasizes how development has been conceptualized differently across time and in relation to the particular historical circumstances in which the theories were developed. Within each period, we will consider an additional axis of comparison: differing perspectives across space. Specifically, we begin each period by considering the dominant or mainstream theory of development that prevailed in the West and then juxtapose it with competing theories—and often critiques—of dominant paradigms. This approach aims to develop your critical thinking skills as you consider the different assumptions underlying competing theories. Moreover, it allows you to consider how scholars situated differently within the global political economy have crafted different theories of development.

**REQUIRED TEXTS**

Hochschild, Adam. 1998. *King Leopold’s Ghost: A story of greed, terror and heroism in colonial*

*Africa.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

McMichael, Philip. 2012. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective.* Los Angeles:

Sage.

Collins, Jane. 2003. *Threads: Gender, Labor and Power in the Global Apparel Industry*.

Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Additional readings are posted on the course’s Blackboard page.

**ASSIGNMENTS/EVALUATION**

**Discussion Questions (5%) and Critique Papers (25%)**

A critical component of this class—and of your final grade—is the work you do in preparation for the class—that is, doing the reading, posing questions, and composing critical reading responses.

*Discussion Questions:* You must email me 2 questions for discussion on the readings by class on Wednesday (except on the weeks you submit critique papers—see below). The subject line of the email should be ‘Discussion Questions.’ You get credit simply for submitting the questions; however, if it appears from your questions that you have not actually completed the readings, you will not get credit for them.

*Critique Papers:* The objective of the critique papers is to teach you to write an academic critique of both scholarly articles and more popular writings, as our course readings include both. Throughout the semester, you are required to write 4 critique papers (1 page single-spaced) pertaining to the week’s assigned readings. Two of these must be before the mid-term and two must be after the mid-term. Responses should NOT regurgitate what the reading said. Rather they should demonstrate critical engagement with the reading. The goal is to make an *argument* about the week’s readings/theoretical perspectives discussed in class. You MUST limit your response to about one page single spaced. Expressing your ideas in a concise way is a critical skill for you to develop. If you regularly submit comments that exceed this limit, you will be penalized.

\*Note: The critique papers and the discussion questions are by class period on Wednesdays. You do not have to have to submit discussion questions on the weeks that you submit reading responses.

While you can organize the response paper however you choose, in general, the first paragraph should briefly summarize the author’s main argument and clearly state *your* argument about the readings. The rest of the paper should support the argument you are making, using evidence from the readings. There is not one right way to do the reading responses, but there are “tricks of the academic trade” or standard ways of evaluating readings. Some possible approaches include:

* Identify a logical problem or weakness in the argument made by one of the authors and make an argument regarding why this undermines the author’s argument.
* Use readings/concepts from a different week/different theoretical perspective to critique or demonstrate the strengths of the current week’s readings.
* Identify an issue/question that the author failed to account for and explain *why this would change the author’s conclusions.*

There are several articles posted on Blackboard with the syllabus that provide some background on how to read an academic article and write an academic critique. These may be useful to read if you are not familiar with this type of academic critique.

**Class Participation (10%)**

You are expected to participate in small and large group discussions during class. I will monitor participation. If you come to class with the readings completed, this should not be a problem. The goal of the responses is to help you prepare for class discussion, so you will have questions and comments to raise during class. That said, please do not dominate discussions. The goal is to balance your own participation with that of others. This also involves active listening and giving full consideration and respect to other students’ ideas and opinions. I have included a participation rubric at the end of the syllabus which explains the grading criteria for your participation grade.

**Mid-term Examination (30%)**

The course includes a take-home essay-based mid-term exam. The mid-term exam will evaluate your understanding of key theories and concepts covered in class, as well as your ability to apply these theories to empirical material from the readings and to other real-world examples.

**Final Examination (30%)**

The course includes a take-home essay-based final examination. The final exam allows you to demonstrate your mastery of the course material in a comprehensive manner. Emphasis will be placed on your ability to synthesize course material and apply theories and concepts discussed in class.

**Late Policy:** Exams/assignments are to be submitted as specified on the syllabus or as specified by the professor. It is your responsibility to know the dead-lines for assignments and exams and to turn in all materials on time. Unauthorized late assignments will not be accepted. Unless you have authorization from the Dean of Students, you must arrange for an extension before the assignment’s due date in order to turn it in late. I reserve the right to grant or deny extensions.

**OTHER ISSUES**

*Prerequisites*: Although there are no official prerequisites for this course, students should be aware that it is a 300 level course. Therefore, having had at least one course either in sociology (especially a class w/ an international focus) or international development is highly recommended. The course is not recommended for freshman.

*Honor Code*: The honor code is an essential component of our academic community. Violation of the honor code—as determined by the instructor—on any of the assignments will result in a failing grade in the course.

**TENTATIVE COURSE SCHEDULE**

Note: Coverage of topics, examination and assignment due dates are subject to change. Changes to the course schedule will be announced in class. It is your responsibility to stay apprised of changes to the course schedule.

**Week 1: August 29, 31 Introduction to Course**

**Week 2: September 3, 5, 7, Foundational Concepts**

Peet, Richard and Elaine Hartwick. 2009. Pp. 23-45 in *Theories of Development: Contentions,*

*Arguments , Alternatives,* 2nd edition. New York: The Guildford Press.

Polanyi, Karl. 1957. The Self-Regulating Market and the Fictitious Commodities: Labor, Land

and Money. Ch 6 in *The Great Transformation*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, pp. 68-76.

**Week 3: September 10, 12, 14, Theories of the Economy and Development during Colonialism**

Hochschild, Adam, prologue, ch 2, ch 5, ch 8, ch 10, c h11, ch 12, ch 15, pg. 279-283, ch 19

(This is a lot of pages, but it is not difficult to read. If you have the time and interest, I would suggest reading the entire book but it is not required for the course.)

**Week 4: September 17, 19, 21, Modernization Theory vs. Dependency Theory**

Rostow, W.W. 2007[1960]. The Stages of Economic Growth. In (eds.) J.T. Roberts and A.B.

Hite, *From modernization to globalization: Perspectives on development and global change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 47-55.

Inkeles, A. 2007[1969]. Making Men Modern. In (eds.) J.T. Roberts and A.B.

Hite, *From modernization to globalization: Perspectives on development and global change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 134-143.

Frank, Andre Gunder. 2007[1969]. The Development of Underdevelopment. In (eds.) Timmons

Roberts and Amy Hite. *The Globalization and Development Reader.* Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 76-84.

**Week 5: September 24, 26, 28, World-Systems Approach**

McMichael, Philip. 2012. Pp. 38-54 (starting at ‘Decolonization’) and Chapter 3 in *Development*

*and Social Change: A Global Perspective,* 5th edition. Los Angeles: Sage

**Week 6: October 1, 3, 5, Case study: Coffee**

Talbot, John M. 2004. Pp.31-37 AND chapter 3 in *Grounds for Agreement: The Political*

*Economy of the Coffee Commodity Chain*. Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield.

**Week 7: October 8, 10, 12, Post-Structuralism**

Ferguson, James. 1994. The Anti-Politics Machine. The Ecologist, 24(5):176-181.

Pigg, Stacy. 1997. “Found in Most Traditional Societies”: Traditional Medical Practitioners

between Culture and Development. In (eds.) F. Cooper and R. Packard, International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge. Berkeley, CA: University of California, pp. 259-290.

**Week 8: October 15 (Fall Break), 17, 19**

**\*\*MID-TERM TAKE-HOME ESSAY EXAM DUE FRIDAY, OCTOBER 19 BY 2PM.**

No reading.

**Week 9: October 22, 24, 26, Neoliberalism, Debt and Structural Adjustment**

Klein, Naomi. 2008. *The Shock Doctrine*. New York: Metropolitan Books. Ch 8, 9, 13.

McMichael, Philip. 2012. Pp. 104-125 in *Development and Social Change: A Global*

*Perspective*, 5th edition. Los Angeles: Sage.

**Week 10: October 29, 31, November 2, Neoliberalism and International Institutions**

McMichael, Philip. 2012. Pp. 125-149 and chapter 6 in *Development and Social Change: A*

*Global Perspective*, 5th edition. Los Angeles: Sage.

**Week 11: November 5, 7, 9, Neoliberalism, Global Sourcing and Struggle**

Collins, Jane, Threads, ch 1-4

**Week 12: November 12, 14, 16, Global Sourcing and Struggle**

Collins, Jane, Threads, ch 5-7

**Week 13, November 19, *Thanksgiving Break,* Feminist Theories of Development: The Case of Microfinance**

No reading, catch-up

**Week 14: November 26, 28, 30, Feminist Theories of Development: The Case of Microfinance, continued**

Karim, Lamia. 2011. *Microfinance and Its Discontents: Women in Debt in Bangladesh.*

Minneapolis: University of Minnesota. Preface, Chapters 1 and 3

**Week 15: April 24, 26, December 3, 5, 7, Post-Development/Participatory Action Research**

Menon, Gayatri A. 2009. Recoveries of Space and Subjectivity in the Shadow of Violence: The

Clandestine Politics of Pavement Dwellers in Mumbai. In (ed.) P. McMichael, *Contesting Development: Critical Struggles for Social Change.* New York: Routledge, pp. 151-164.

McMichael, Philip. 2012. Chapter 8 in *Development and Social Change: A Global*

*Perspective*, 5th edition. Los Angeles: Sage.

**Participation Rubric**

Courtesy of Prof. Manna, Government Department

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grade range** | **General description** |
| A/A- | Has something to say essentially every day in the large group. Active and engaged in small groups and paired discussions, too.  Comments grounded in the readings; demonstrate depth of understanding or attempts to grapple with them; ideas help to build momentum in discussions.  *Without these people, the quality of discussion would be diminished markedly.* |
| B+/B/B- | Frequent commenter in class. Active and engaged in small groups or pairs; tends to excel slightly more there than in the large group. Not quite involved every single day, perhaps, but most days.  Comments draw upon readings, but less consistently so or comments are more grounded in intuition, which nevertheless makes sense.  *Without these people, the quality of discussion would be diminished.* |
| C+/C/C- | Infrequent participant in large group, although may be reasonably engaged in small groups. Often a big imbalance between small group effort and large group effort.  Comments may be but not necessarily grounded in the readings; more reliant on intuition. Perhaps a great substantive or readings comment one day, but then a long run of silence.  *Without these people, the quality of large group discussion would be occasionally (but not frequently) diminished, and small group discussion would likely suffer.* |
| D+/D/D- | Attends class essentially every day, but extremely rare or essentially no participation each day in large group. Attentive, but not involved. May or may not be involved much in small groups.  Hard to tell to what extent this person is trying to engage the readings before class because comments are so infrequent, or nonexistent.  *Without these people, the quality of large group discussion would be essentially unchanged, but small group discussions might suffer occasionally or somewhat.* |
| F | Missing several days of class without a reasonable explanation. No engagement in large group discussion. During small group or paired time, tends to still work alone.  Impossible to tell to what extent the person has tried to engage the readings.  *Without these people, the quality of large and small group discussion would be unchanged.* |