

Chapter 11

Exercise 1

Imagine a reader from outside the academic community encountering the two passages below. How could you prepare that reader for contact with these examples of scholarly expression? How would you explain the features of the passage so the imagined reader would understand them as functional expressions of the academic community's routines and procedures? (It might help to imagine a particular reader—a friend, family member, neighbour, co-worker, or maybe yourself at an earlier stage of your education.)

PASSAGE 1

The aim is to test Arend Lijphart's suggestion that statistically there is a 'slightly better performance of the consensus democracies' regarding low levels of political violence (Lijphart 1999, 271) and Bingham Powell's similar suggestion (Powell 1982). We do this by contrasting—and correlating—measures such as District Magnitude, the Laver-Hunt Index of Opposition Influence, Gallagher's Disproportionality Index and the Laakso-Taagepera Effective Number of (Parliamentary) Parties. These measures are typically used as proxies for consensus government (Lijphart 1999).

The overall hypothesis is that domestic terrorism in large measure (but not exclusively) is a result of a perceived disenfranchisement of a minority group, and that this sense of disenfranchisement can be remedied through introducing more inclusive and consensus-oriented political institutions such as, above all, proportional representation with a low district magnitude.

Focusing on domestic terrorism, the article thus adds to research recently published in this journal (Thomas 2010; Miller (forthcoming)), which considered other—and complementary—aspects of disenfranchisement of minority groups and the relationship between terrorism and democracy, though this piece is decidedly more 'positivist' in aims, objectives and philosophical inclination.

Matt Haunstrup Qvortrup 2012 "Terrorism and Political Science." *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 14 (4): 503-17, 504.

PASSAGE 2

For the purposes of this book we are using a feminist perspective that draws mainly on liberal and radical feminism rather than Marxist or socialist feminism. More generally we draw on recent calls to post-structuralist feminism. We have focused on imbalances between males and females in teaching (a classic liberal feminist tactic) and critiqued the knowledge base of research on teaching (a classic radical feminist tactic). We also believe in a reality that gender and power are (re)constructed through discursive practices and are subject to shifts and changes. We draw on a definition of feminism articulated by Donna Haraway (1989:290).

Feminist theory and practice ... seek to explain and change historical systems of sexual difference, whereby 'men' and 'women' are socially constituted and positioned in relations of hierarchy and antagonism.

Our overall aim in this book is to undertake a feminist analysis of the work and everyday realities of the (school) teacher. Inevitably much of our focus is on the life and work of women (and feminist) teachers. However the empirical data and analytic discussions we present have a broader relevance. Over the course of the book we are seeking to ascertain the extent to which women teachers specifically—and the feminist project more generally—have contributed to theoretical understandings and practical accomplishments of teaching. As a contribution to the body of work on gender and education, we are concerned with the educational discourses of gender—that is, how gender is constructed and performed through discursive and material practices.

Amanda Coffey and Sara Delamont 2000 *Feminism and the classroom teacher: Research, praxis, and pedagogy*. London: Routledge/Falmer: 1-2.