

Milestone 2: Annotated Bibliography

My Name
Course number
Date

Cover sheet [10 pts]

(Bullet points are recommended; 1 point for clarity/organization of writing)

1. What is the topic you are focusing on? (75-125 words) [2pts]
2. *Optional:* Are there any significant changes to your topic/approach since the last milestone? (max 50 words)
3. How do you plan to approach writing your term paper? (100-150 words) [3pts]
4. What citation management system are you using? (e.g. BibTeX, should not exceed 1 line) [1pt]
5. Which citation system are you using? (e.g. Chicago --- should not exceed 1 line) [1pt]
6. What specifically do you want feedback on? (50-150 words) [2pts]

Annotated Bibliography

Instructions start here ---- delete them for submission.

You should have 9 (EDEC) or 12 (COMP) papers in this document.

At least 3 (EDEC) or 4 (COMP) papers must be from the course syllabus. You may use papers from future weeks or that were assigned to other sections.

For each paper, start a section titled with a well-formatted citation for the paper, with points on:

1. How much of it have you read? [1pt]
2. How did you find this paper? [1pt]
3. What do you think this paper is about? [2pts]
4. Why do you think this paper will help you? [2pts]
5. How certain are you that it will be useful? Why? [2pts]
6. Why did you include this paper in the bibliography rather than something else? [2pts]

Some examples, for an imaginary paper about role of curriculum in the gendering of physics education:

Datnow, Amanda, and Vicki Park. **"Conceptualizing policy implementation: Large-scale reform in an era of complexity."** In *Handbook of education policy research*, pp. 364-377. Routledge, 2012.

1. Fully read.
2. Was an assigned reading in LHAE 3045 (Education policy analysis), another course I took.
3. Presents four major frameworks/traditions for policy analysis:
 - a. Technical/rational, which reflects a Taylorist/structural functionalist/positivist view of management
 - b. Mutual adaptation, which looks at policy from the "ground up" and is more interpretivist
 - c. Sensemaking, which is more rooted in organizational psychology
 - d. Co-construction, which is rooted in conflict theories and looks at power issues and networks/groups of individuals in the policy process
4. Helpful because I'm writing a paper about curriculum, and curriculum is a political issue / political documents.
5. Reasonably certain, I think I'll categorize my literature review around the frameworks.
6. From what I can tell this is a foundational text in education policy analysis, with the most authoritative list of frameworks/traditions in the field. (NB: it's from AERA's Handbook of education policy research.)

Hazari, Zahra, Geoff Potvin, Robynne M. Lock, Florin Lung, Gerhard Sonnert, and Philip M. Sadler. **"Factors that affect the physical science career interest of female students: Testing five common hypotheses."** Physical Review Special Topics-Physics Education Research 9, no. 2 (2013): 020115.

1. Just read the abstract
2. Was suggested to me by Allison Gonsalves
3. Tests five commonly considered factors for why physics education is gendered. Found that discussing the underrepresentation of women in physics class was the only factor that was significant.
4. Helpful because this is a curriculum change that could impact the gendering of physics education.
5. On the fence, it isn't explicitly about policy and I'm judging it based on the abstract.
6. Largest sample size I could find in my literature review. I'm not sure I buy their methods but I need to read them more carefully.

Van den Brink, Marieke, and Lineke Stobbe. **"The support paradox: Overcoming dilemmas in gender equality programs."** Scandinavian Journal of Management 30, no. 2 (2014): 163-174.

1. Read the abstract, introduction, table of results, skimmed the section titles and last few pages
2. Google scholar search for "physics gender critical discourse analysis"
3. Discusses the double-bind of policy interventions to improve gender equity in physics.
 - Women in physics programmes can help women but there's also a stigma for women to receive "extra help".
 - Critical discourse analysis of a Dutch funding agency's efforts, identifying important discourses
 - Recommendations on how to reframe the policy discussion
4. Helpful because it gives a critical view of attempts to change the system and how we need to be careful about how we do it.
5. Moderately certain. They have a table of common discourses about women in physics that I think is relevant to policy discussions, even if the paper isn't about curriculum policy specifically.
6. I wanted to have a poststructuralist work in this lit review. I considered including Anna Danielsson's discourse-analytic work (e.g. Exploring woman university physics students 'doing gender' and 'doing physics', 2010), but I wanted to have a more policy/structure-focused paper and she's much more focused on individual agency.

----- end examples