# **Sociology 992-001 Instructor:** [**Chad Alan Goldberg**](https://chadalangoldberg.com/)

# **Fall 2022 E-mail:** [**cagoldberg@wisc.edu**](mailto:cgoldber@ssc.wisc.edu)

**8108 Social Sciences Office: 8116B Social Sciences**

**T 12:30 PM - 2:00 PM**

**Research: Social Organization Trainees Politics, Culture, and Society**

The Politics, Culture, and Society workshop (familiarly known as PCS) is a weekly training seminar of graduate students and faculty in the Sociology Department at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Most sessions are devoted to relatively informal faculty or student presentations of work in progress, followed by discussion. See [here](https://www.ssc.wisc.edu/soc/pcs/) for more information about PCS. If you would like to join the PCS email list, please ask the instructor.

**PCS will begin meeting in person this academic year on Tuesday, September 20.** In lieu of an organizing meeting on September 13, **please email the instructor** ([cagoldberg@wisc.edu](mailto:cagoldberg@wisc.edu)) **no later than Friday, September 16,** **if you would like to present at PCS this semester**. In the email, please indicate your preferred presentation date and two other options in case it is not available, ranked in order of preference. A title for your presentation would also be helpful.

As a **TRAINING seminar**, Sociology 992does not have a regularly arranged list of readings, though semester by semester there may be weeks when a presenter requires reading a paper before discussing it in class. Attendance, helpful suggestions and constructive criticism for presenters, and reading presenters’ papers as necessary are all parts of the expected work of the seminar to be completed by all participants**. Please note that one credit is the normal load and does not require** **consent; registering for 2 or 3 credits requires consent of the instructor.**

**Students registered for one credit** are expected to attend regularly and participate as a constructive critic of the work being presented by faculty, fellow students, and visiting scholars. They are also expected to choose from among the listed professional training exercises and make sure the coordinator for the seminar knows in a timely way which ones they are doing and with what additional faculty advising if any. The expected level of effort is the equivalent of an hour per week on these additional activities.

**Students registered for two credits** are expected, in addition to the requirements for one credit, to devote two to three additional hours per week outside the seminar in one or more of the following activities: (1) preparing and presenting their own research under development to the seminar; (2) taking a leadership role in administering the brownbag, including maintaining the seminar webpage, blog, or listserv, and scheduling presenters; (3) organizing and facilitating special sessions such as professionalization workshops or discussions of particular articles or coordinating a guest lecture; (4) additional training activities. **Registration for two credits** **requires consent of the instructor.**

**Students should not enroll for three credits without prior consultation with the instructor.** Students enrolled for three credits are, in addition to the work required for one and two credits, doing significant work every week in revising and developing a paper for presentation in the brownbag and submission to publication. Students seeking to enroll for three credits must have a professor who certifies that he or she is supervising the student’s work on a paper.

The schedule of presentations will be posted <https://www.ssc.wisc.edu/soc/pcs/>after the first week of classes, which is typically when final scheduling is done. **To get on the presentation schedule, please email the instructor.**

**Additional Training Activities**

**Learning about articles and journals**

1. Collect at least five (ten is better) empirical articles in your research area or that are similar to the type of research you are doing or planning to do. Lightly read the articles with a focus on the methods and results sections: how did they do the research and how do they present the findings? Do you see in them a model for how to write or revise your own papers?
2. Using Web of Science construct a “network” around one journal article in your subarea however you choose to define it. Who cites this and whose work did it cite? how broadly or narrowly across journals and books does this area spread—interdisciplinary or not? Use forward and backward searching, and the “related references” function of WoS to construct your picture of the network in which your article (and maybe your own work) fits.
3. What are “your” journals? Using citations, bibliographies in some recent articles you like, the *2014 ASA Guide to Publishing in Journals* and WoS Journal Citation Reports put together alist of journals in which you can imagine publishing your work (should be at least ten such journals listed) and annotate each as to its apparent selectivity and impact and (if available on the web) typical review times.
4. Review one journal: Look over the table of contents and abstracts for several recent issues and skim some of the papers to get an idea of what kind of research they publish. Qualitative, quantitative? Theory? Literature reviews? Do the articles seem “weighty” or modest? What field is the journal oriented to? Check the submission guidelines for the statement of the journal’s mission and matters such as manuscript length. Post your review on the brownbag Google doc
5. Reverse outline one published paper in your own field in the journal you are aiming for getting into. Take the “engine” apart and examine how it works – what are the headings, the number of words in each subsection, the way the figures or tables look. How do the authors discuss what they present in quotes or tables? What do you like and dislike about the prose? The uses of citation? The clarity of the results? Write an outline of it and a 500 word assessment of what it does well/poorly and discuss this with at least one faculty member of your choice.
6. Do a “shadow review” with your advisor or someone else with whom you closely work, who is reviewing a submission for some journal. Compare your review of the paper with theirs and discuss differences in content or tone. Ask later to see the full set of reviews for that paper
7. Research book publishers, starting with your own book shelves. What ranges of publishers in terms of type, prestige, location can you see as characterizing your purchases? How do you use ASA book exhibits to decide what to buy, how do you decide what to read from the library rather than buy? Do you research the cost of textbooks you assign to your students? Write up about 250 words of assessment of your book strategy and a question you can’t answer about publishers.

**Working on your research & writing**

1. Write a revision memo outlining how you have responded to the specific feedback you have gotten on any paper of your own. Feedback can be from fellow grad students, department faculty or outside reviewers. Discuss this memo with any faculty member of your choice.
2. Write a 500–800 word policy brief based on your current research.
3. **W**rite a blog post on some collaborative sociological blog, either associated with the department or not.
4. Volunteer to do a presentation at this training seminar or in another venue, on or off campus and/or develop a practice job talk.
5. Write and practice delivering your “elevator speech” about your current research. What are you doing and how are you doing it and what difference will it make, all in 1–2 minutes. Write up the one-page (double spaced) version that is your draft “script.”

**Brownbag support & activities**

1. Review your current cv in relation to your IDP and make sure that you have posted an accurate short bio to the seminar website.
2. Prepare to lead a presentation and discussion on methodological issues or developments in your subarea in the seminar. (Reflexivity in fieldwork or a new tool for mapping data or a novel approach to content analysis are examples of the specificity of topic expected, but any method issue or innovation is fair game).
3. Take the initiative to identify, invite, schedule and host an appropriate guest presenter (academic or otherwise) with the consent of the instructor

**Career planning**

1. Have a serious conversation with YOUR major advisor about your MA and your five-year plan. Discuss the research planned and how it will be used for publication (yours? Co-authored?) and the details of the next year’s work. Make sure you and your advisor share an understanding of your respective roles in funding, carrying out, writing up and publishing this research and place these in your IDP. Turn your IDP in officially to Graduate Advisor Charlotte Frascona, your major advisor, and unofficially share it here.
2. Get your IRB certification if you have not yet done so. Go through the website for submitting a proposal and see what is expected. See also UW resources & contacts on *IRB Insider* <https://kb.wisc.edu/sbsedirbs/68245>
3. Write up your current CV and an imaginary future CV (assuming 3–5 years have passed) geared to the type of job you are (or think you want to be) applying for. Put your own, professional looking CV online. Share with us a draft for your CV for 5 years from today. And do your future CV as realistically as you can be about intermediate steps/time line (year you first present a paper, year you submit for review, year it appears; where/what audiences you speak to; how you are drawing in faculty or peers as coauthors); how your research and teaching are combined.
4. Develop and post a five-year plan (see <http://theprofessorisin.com/2014/05/09/in-response-to-popular-demand-more-on-the-5-year-plan/>as a one-page model) Consider your current goals in terms of experience, skills, and research areas to be developed.