IT'S IN THE SYLLABUS

This message brought to you by every instructor that ever lived.
WWW.PHDCOMICS.COM

WRDS 150: It's No Game: The Idea of Competition
Winter Term 2 (2020) – Dr. Michael Schandorf

Office: Buchanan Tower 203	**Class Schedule**: T/Th
Office Hours: Wednesdays by appointment	
Email: michael.schandorf@ubc.ca	11M – SOWK 224 14M – BUCH D207
Course website: mschandorf.ca	9:30am – 11:00am 2pm – 3:30pm

COURSE DESCRIPTION & POLICIES

WRDS 150 will introduce you to the ethical knowledge-making practices of scholarly communities, such as academic disciplines and research fields, with a focus on a central theme. You will begin to participate in scholarly discourse within such communities by performing the actions of apprentice academic researchers, scholarly communicators, and peer-reviewers. You will also produce work in several scholarly genres and familiarize yourself with the conventions of communication of specific academic disciplines. In doing so, you will begin to develop your own scholarly identity as a member of the broader academic research community.

Course Theme: *It's No Game: The Idea of Competition*. The idea of competition is so fundamental that we often take it for granted as a natural good. Nearly every aspect of our lives involves competition: we compete in school, we compete for jobs, we compete at work, we compete socially, we compete in games and sports for fun, and when we are not competing ourselves we spend much of our time enjoying watching others compete. But our obsession with competition has several potential complications. A world divided into winners and losers, for example, is an inherently inequitable world – and there will always be far more "losers" than "winners". Competition also has a variety of interesting relationships with our inescapable need for cooperation and social cohesion. Attempting to disentangle cooperation from competition, in fact, can undermine both sides of this pair: a lack of either can lead to unproductive stasis, and worse. But a complete integration of cooperation and competition can lead to "us versus them" thinking and even war, which US rhetorical scholar Kenneth Burke called "the ultimate disease of cooperation." To better understand the idea of competition, we will examine the ways that it has been investigated and conceptualized in different academic disciplines. For example, competition is fundamental to Business, Economics, and Political Science. But, because of its inescapable role in human society, competition is also an important topic in Psychology, in Anthropology, in Sociology, and even in the study and practice of Education. In this class, we will explore the ways that competition has been investigated in some of this recent research and scholarship, and students will complete research projects of their own contributing to that scholarly conversation.

If problems arise or if you encounter difficulties meeting the requirements of the course or any of the policies below, please come talk to me as soon as you can. Life is complicated – I get it. Don't wait until it's too late for us address complications.

> UBC's Vancouver campus is located on the traditional, ancestral, unceded (occupied) territory of the xwməθkwəy̓əm (Musqueam) people. The land it is situated on has always been a place of learning for the Musqueam people, who for millennia have passed on their culture, history, and traditions from one generation to the next on this site. I am thankful to the Musqueam people for extending their welcome to the University faculty, staff, and students to pursue academic research and education here. I, like many of us, commute in from other Coast Salish territories, to whom we should also be grateful for sharing their territories with us.

What you will learn in this class:
- A nuanced understanding of the idea of 'competition' in Western culture, and how that idea has been investigated in the social sciences
- A general introduction to scholarly discourse, rhetoric, argumentation, and evidentiary practices
- How to analyze arguments and evidence in a variety of different forms
- How to productively, ethically, and respectfully contribute to scholarly discourse
- How to locate, evaluate, and use scholarly sources to build your own relevant and credible arguments

What you will do in this class:
- You will participate as apprentice members of the academic research community by identifying and tracing the scholarly conversation around a research problem and by developing questions, collecting evidence, and constructing arguments through ethical and collaborative practices of scholarship.
- You will developing a research project that addresses a gap in knowledge relevant to our research community, and which implements relevant discursive features and rhetorical moves in a variety of genres.
- You will gathering relevant and credible sources using appropriate tools and methods, including UBC Library resources.
- You will engage responsibly with and within research communities, using appropriate citation practices that meet the expectations of academic integrity and adhering to ethical standards of data collection with research collaborators.

Course materials: Course readings will be made available online. Recommended text: *Better Presentations: A Guide for Scholars, Researchers, and Wonks* (2016) by Jonathan Schwabish. (There are copies of this in the UBC bookstore, and it is a good resource to have, but it is also available as an ebook through the UBC library web site.)

Statement Regarding English Language Proficiency: This course assumes reading, writing, and speaking proficiency in the English language. Students with limited English proficiency are welcomed to the class given the understanding that *this is not a course on the basic mechanics of English writing or speaking*. However, it does provide a very good opportunity to practice and improve English writing and speaking abilities. Students with limited English language proficiency who commit to using the course as a means to practice and improve are fully capable of achieving those goals and of doing well in the course. *Students whose limited proficiency limits their inclination to participate in the scholarly discourse that the class embodies will face significant challenges because of the course's participation requirement.*

Instructor Availability

If you have any questions about the class (check this syllabus first, but) feel free to ask me, whether by email or in person. I encourage everyone to set up some time to meet with with me on Wednesdays if you have any questions or concerns. I'm happy to listen, to talk, and to help with the course material and processes in any way that I can. (If Wednesdays don't work for you, send me an email and we'll work something out.)

On the Use of Tutors

Occasionally, some students hire tutors or use a tutoring service to help them with specific assignments, and this can sometimes be very helpful. However, some tutors can misdirect WRDS 150 students and hinder rather than help learning in the course. Sometimes, the use of inexperienced or external tutors can also lead, inadvertently, to questionable academic conduct. If you would like to get tutorial help with WRDS 150, we strongly recommend that you use:

> **The UBC Center for Writing & Scholarly Communication**
> The UBC writing center, part of the Chapman Learning Commons (on the 3rd floor of the Irving K. Barber Learning Center), has a wide variety of resources to help students with their writing and communication assignments, including writing tutors with whom you can book a consultation. For more information or to book an appointment, click here: learningcommons.ubc.ca/improve-your-writing/writing-consultations

Other Useful Resources

Arts Advising: students.arts.ubc.ca/advising/contact-us
Counselling Services: students.ubc.ca/health-wellness/counselling-services
Book a Group Study Space (eg, for group presentation practice): bookings.library.ubc.ca

Academic Integrity

At UBC and in the scholarly community at large, we share an understanding of the ethical ways in which knowledge is produced. A core practice of this shared value of academic integrity is that we acknowledge the contributions of others to our own work. It also means that we produce our own contributions that add to the scholarly conversation. We don't buy or copy papers or exams. We also don't falsify data or sources, or hand in the same work in more than one course. Because it is so

important that research be done ethically, we expect students to meet these expectations. Any instance of cheating or taking credit for someone else's work, whether intentionally or unintentionally, can and often will result in receiving at minimum grade of zero for the assignment, and these cases will be reported to the Department Head or Chair, the First-Year Programs Chair, and the Faculty of Arts Associate Dean, Academic. See the UBC Calendar entries on "Academic Honesty," "Academic Misconduct," and "Disciplinary Measures," see the UBC policy on Scholarly Integrity, and check out the Student Declaration and Responsibility. More information on Academic Integrity and avoiding plagiarism is available from the Chapman Learning Commons website here.

Well Being
University is demanding, and student life can be complicated. Be sure to take care of yourself and look out for each other. If you are struggling or need help, including emotional and physical support or following sexual harassment or assault, see UBC's counselling and support services: https://students.ubc.ca/health-wellness. If I am concerned for your well being, I will reach out. I may also report my concerns to Early Alert, which is a UBC program that quickly connects students with support services. The information I provide is kept confidential and is sent because I wish to support you and your academic success, which I can do best by helping connect you to helpful resources. If you have concerns about a fellow student, you may wish to bring them to me or also submit an Early Alert statement yourself. For more information on Early Alert, see: https://earlyalert.ubc.ca. If there are unforseen circumstances that impact your ability to, for example, meet deadlines, let me know as soon as possible so that we can work together to ensure that you successfully complete your classwork and receive any necessary support.

WRDS 150 ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADE BREAKDOWN

WRDS 150 – It's No Game: The Idea of Competition is a seminar/workshop-style class. There are no tests. Students will be assessed based on the effort demonstrated in engaging with the ideas we will be confronting this semester, and in putting those ideas to use effectively. Your individual engagement and contributions will have a decisive impact on the success of the course as a whole—we're all in this together. This means three things beyond simply turning in assignments on time: 1) you must attend class, 2) you must be prepared for class, and 3) you must actively participate both in class and online. Individual grades will be computed as follows:

> Participation (in class & online): 15%
> Reading responses: 10%
> Group presentation: 10%
> Peer Grading Assignment: 5%
> Research Project: 60%
>> Research project proposal: 10%
>> Literature review: 5%
>> Research paper draft: 5%
>> Oral research presentation: 10%
>> Research paper peer review: 5%
>> Final research paper: 25%

General Assignment Formatting Guidelines: These are general guidelines for everything you turn in anywhere in any class (unless you are given specific direction otherwise, such as our online reading responses to which these guidelines do not apply).

1. Every paper must include (either on a cover sheet or at the top of the first page):
   Who: *name*, **What**: *assignment*, **Where**: *class* (and section, if applicable), and **When**: *date* of submission
2. 1-inch page margins
3. Double-spaced (or, at least, 1.5 spacing) (This is easier for reading and for commenting.)
4. Header with last name and page number in the top right corner of every page.
5. Use a standard, 12-point serif font.
   • This is a serif font. (It is easier to read.)
   • This is a sans serif font. [Do not use a font like this for school work.]
6. Mark new paragraphs with either (NOT BOTH) first line indentation or extra line space.
7. Use hanging indentation for references.

File Naming Format: [section]-[last name, first initial]-[assignment]-[course]-[submission date]
       e.g.: 11M-SmithJ-ResearchProposal-WRDS150-20190327.[pdf, doc, docx, or odt]

PARTICIPATION: Participation includes engagement both in class and online. This encompasses attendance, tardiness, in-class discussion and activities, and online discussion. Your job is to read, to think, to engage (in both speaking and writing), and to learn. Do that—actively—and your grade will take care of itself. In order to participate in class discussions, you must attend class. Attendance is required. Absences and tardiness will negatively and significantly affect your participation grade. Sitting quietly in class and hoping others do the talking is not an option. (If you are not confident in your English language abilities, recognize this course as a safe place to practice and improve.) Don't be afraid of saying "something dumb". We are going to be reading materials that will often be entirely alien. The only way to get a grip on them will be to confront them openly together as a class. Go ahead and say something "dumb" – it probably won't be as dumb as you suspect (and you'll probably find that you're not the only one thinking it). At the same time, if it seems easy or simple, try to figure out what you're missing. Talk to each other. Ask questions. Your participation, both in class and online, will be evaluated in terms of relevance, depth, and consistency. For that reason, online discussions should be an ongoing process of engagement rather than just a weekly burst of activity after class. Let the in-class and online discussions reference and engage with one another in an ongoing dialogue. Ignoring others' posts and comments (failing to respond to comments) or a general lack of online interaction will significantly and negatively impact your participation grade. Do not expect to whip up a flurry of comments and activity in the last week or two of the semester in order to "make your points." *Engage*.

READING RESPONSES: All sections of *It's No Game: The Idea of Competition* share a website (mschandorf.ca) where students post reading responses and begin or continue the discussions they prompt. You will need to sign up for a WordPress account, if you don't have one already. Send me your WordPress username and the email you used to register/sign in to WordPress, and I will add you as an Author to the site (*you won't be able to post on the site until I make you an Author*). [You **do not** need to use your real name, but you **do** need to make sure I know who you are.] Students will be assigned to subsections for required reading responses. Reading response posts will be due by Monday evening of the assigned week (*before* we discuss the reading in class, not after.). **Assigned, required posts that are posted late will not be counted for a grade without making prior arrangements with me, in writing.**

While there is no minimum required length, each reading response post should do at least these six things:

1. Address the given prompt (if a prompt is provided).
2. Demonstrate that you have read the assigned material.
3. Demonstrate that you have thought about (both the form and content of) the reading in the context of the course.
4. Make connections among the week's reading and earlier course material and class discussions (as well as with related material and discussions in other courses, your own experience, or life in general, when appropriate and useful, ie relevant and credible).
5. Reference and link to at least one other classmate's post (with an explanation and justification of that reference).
6. And *tag each post* with your course number (e.g., #WRDS150), your section number (e.g., 11M), with the week's theme (e.g., #psychology), and with any other keywords that will situate your post in relation to other relevant posts and will help people to find your post.

Note that these requirements do not give you an argument structure.

A generative rubric for reading response posts is available on Canvas. Each reading response should be a well-considered, (loosely) essay-style discussion of the week's material that *makes a point*, *adds to previous class discussion*, and *promotes further discussion*. Your response posts should make connections among readings, ideas, and discussions from previous weeks. Your reading responses should demonstrate your active efforts to make connections and to question the ideas presented in the readings and class discussions. Your understanding of the material will be demonstrated in your application of the ideas presented to your own knowledge and experience. Remember that everyone in the class will be reading the assigned material: your reading response should NOT be a simple summary of the reading(s). A summary tells us (at most) *that* you read; it doesn't tell us that you've *thought about* what you read and very little about *what you think*.

You are expected to pay attention to your classmates' post and comments, and to engage one another by questioning, answering, and/or reinforcing each other's ideas and concerns on a regular basis throughout the week. **Each student is required to post at least one SUBSTANTIVE comment per week.** ("Great post!" is not a substantive comment.) If someone comments on your post, *respond to them*. You can post, as often as you like, anything that you feel is relevant and of interest to the class. (Online engagement is part of your participation grade.)

GROUP PRESENTATION: Students will be sorted into groups assigned to present a reading to the class. Working together closely, each group will choose (from supplemental readings available on Canvas for each week), analyze, and present to the class an article concerning their respective week's theme. (A caution: the shorter articles are often the most

complicated and difficult. Choose your reading carefully, and base your decision on something more relevant than length.) The goal of the group reading presentation is to teach the article you have chosen to the class with an emphasis on how it is relevant to us—how it contributes to our on-going discussion. In presentations of no more than 20 minutes, presentation groups will be expected to:

1. Identify the author(s).
2. Succinctly outline and explain the main argument and points of the reading.
3. Succinctly explain what the reading does and how it does it.
4. Position the reading in relation to the week's main reading, as well as to previous ideas and perspectives addressed in class.
5. **Meet with me twice (two consecutive Wednesdays) before your presentation: the first meeting will discuss your plan, the second will be a run-through of your presentation.**
6. **Submit a draft of your slides and presentation plan/outline to me** *the Wednesday the week before you are scheduled to present.*

Your presentation will not be a simple outline of the reading—you are to present and explain the reading's relevant argument. Consider the most appropriate way to present the argument and the relevance of the reading to the rest of the class. Your job is NOT to pretend that you are the authors and 'present the paper'. Your job is to explain why you believe the article you have chosen is important to us as a class. Simply going linearly through the reading itself is most likely not the best or clearest way to present the ideas of the reading and what it provides our discourse community of competition researchers. Presenters are encouraged to bring their readings into online discussions and supplement continuing discussion with the additional ideas and material. (A generative rubric for group reading presentations is available on Canvas.)

PEER GRADING ASSIGNMENT: The final required reading response is to be posted at the beginning of week 9 (Media, Technology, & Competition). Students will have been previously assigned to research groups based on their individual research topics. Within the research groups, students will select or assign themselves to provide a peer grade (10-point scale) and evaluation for a fellow group member's final reading response post. To determine the assigned grade, students can refer to the assignment directions above, to my own feedback on your previous reading responses, as well as to the generative rubric for reading response posts available on Canvas. Those being graded will receive the grade assigned by their peer grader. The grade for this assignment (for the grader) will be based on the thoroughness and usefulness of the feedback provided.

RESEARCH PROJECT: The primary aim of this class is to introduce you to academic discourse, scholarly research, and academic writing. To that end you will be designing your own research project for the course relevant to our theme of competition as a social form. The research project is more informative than argumentative—*you are not trying to "prove" something; you are trying to learn something*. What you learn—your evidence—will come from your research into what has already be learned about the topic. The research project is more than a "paper". The research project has several parts that build upon one another. It is ***extremely important*** that these steps are completed on time and in order. To that end, a 5% penalty will be assessed for every day that an assignment is late. Deadlines:

- Research project proposal **first** draft: week 5
- Date by which I expect research proposals to be approved: week 8
  (This is NOT the deadline for your *second* draft. Do NOT procrastinate in getting to an approved proposal.)
- Literature review: week 9
- Research paper draft: week 10
- Research paper peer review: week 12
- Research presentations: weeks 11 & 12
- Final research paper: One week after the last day of class.

Research Project Proposal: The research proposal may be the most difficult part of the project for a deceptively simple reason: *a proposal is not an essay*, and it does not constitute an argument in the way that you are likely to be used to. The goal of a proposal is to convince your audience/reader that your project is worthy of support. Think, for example, of a business proposal that aims to secure funding from investors. In the case of this class, your goal is to convince me that you have a relevant topic/problem that is of value that is focused enough to allow you to reach relevant, credible, and valuable conclusions in a short presentation and paper – and that you have a workable plan for doing so. To this end, **your research project proposal must do *these* things *in this order*:**

1. **Explain the problem** or knowledge gap you are interested in, as well as its relevance (relative to the class as our discourse community of competition researchers).
2. **Articulate the** clear, specific, and *answerable* **research question**—what is your goal/target, what are you attempting to learn? ("Answerable" is determined by the availability of evidence.)
3. **Propose a plan** that you expect to lead you to an answer to your specific research question, including a few initial, credible, scholarly sources you can begin working from (these can include course readings). (The proposed plan is NOT an outline of how you will answer the question—*you are not making an argument*. The plan is how you propose *to find* an answer. If you already know the answer to your research question, there is no point in proposing a plan to find that answer, and you need a new question.)
4. **Provide a hypothesis** about *what you expect to find* in your research (what you think the answer to the question will be based on the initial evidence you have found) and why such an answer (including the potential refutation—the *disconfirmation* of your hypotheses) is important (i.e., relevant).
5. **Provide a** concise **annotated bibliography** of your initial sources. (A minimum of 4 peer-reviewed scholarly sources is required for the research proposal.) Use your annotated bibliography to briefly explain how each of your initial sources is relevant to your research question.

The research project proposal usually does not need to be more than 800 words (excluding the annotated bibliography), but you will need to do a fair amount of research *before* you can develop a coherent and acceptable research project proposal. **Expect to go through several versions of your proposal before you get one approved.** Three revisions of the research proposal are typical, five are common. The value of this process is in the honing your ideas. Don't get discouraged when your proposal is not immediately approved. Keep in mind that the research proposal is not about answers—*it's all about questions*. The research proposal is about what you *don't know yet* and want to learn. The research proposal provides you with a direction and a goal. That direction (and even your research question itself) will very likely shift (maybe dramatically) as you move through the research process. That is also perfectly fine and normal. Keep asking questions. Keep learning. Follow the research.

Literature Review: The literature review is a very rough draft of the background section of the introduction to your research paper. (This means, among other things, that it is not a polished essay. It does not, for example, need an introduction or a conclusion.) The goal of the literature review is to demonstrate that you have credible evidence to work with, and that you have an idea of how that evidence is relevant to the problem, demonstrated in the way you are beginning to organize that evidence. The literature review IS NOT a set of summaries of your sources—the literature review is NOT an annotated bibliography. The literature review is *an explanation of the components of the problem* you are addressing, organized around and in relation to existing evidence, and shaped by your research question. The literature review should cite at least 8 peer reviewed sources, and typically does not need to be more than 800 words. The literature review must provide a complete and properly formatted reference list (NOT an annotated bibliography).

Research Paper Draft: The first draft of your research paper should be as complete as possible, and should be organized (very roughly) as a standard IMRD paper. (However, because your research will be based on scholarly sources, and you will not be reporting experimental results, your research paper will not have typical "Methods" or "Results" sections.) Course readings and your own research can and should be used as models of academic writing, argument structure, and formatting. Your draft should provide a thorough introduction to the topic and problem and their relevance shaped by the research question, should thoroughly present and explain the evidence you are drawing from, and should lead logically to your conclusions (i.e., the answer to your research question). The more complete your draft is, the better and more useful the feedback you will get both from your peer reviewers and from me, which will be invaluable for your final paper. The research paper draft will be used for double-blind peer review across course sections. For that reason, the draft must include a cover sheet that provides paper title, your name, course and section, and submission date. **Your name must not appear anywhere else in the paper** (including the metadata, i.e. document properties). The draft must following the formatting guidelines (listed above) and include a header with paper title and page number in the top right corner. In-text citations must be used correctly and effectively, and the References or Works Cited (NOT Bibliography) must be formatted properly and correctly (using either MLA, APA, or Chicago style). **Bring two hard copies of your draft to class during the peer review workshops in week 10.**

- APA Style Guides: the UBC Library's APA Style Guide, the Purdue University OWL's APA Guide
- MLA Style Guides: the UBC Library's MLA Style Guide, the Purdue University OWL's MLA Guide
- Chicago Style Guides: the UBC Library's link to the Chicago Style Guide, the Purdue University OWL's Chicago Style Guide
- The UBC Library's reference and citation guides and sources

Individual Research Presentation: The research presentation presents and explains (possibly tentative) conclusions you have reached, based on the relevant and credible evidence you have found in your research process. The research presentation is not necessarily a presentation of your paper. The presentation and the paper, while products of the same research project and process, could potentially be very different in both form and content, for a variety of reasons. Presentations are typically no less than 5 minutes and no more than 7 minutes in length. (The particular circumstances of the class and semester may affect these limits, and more specific time limits may be set, if needed.) I will have to cut you off if you go longer the set maximum time limit. Rehearse carefully and thoroughly so that doesn't happen. The following structure is suggested: 1) an intro slide with your project/presentation title, your name, and (possible) contact information (e.g., email); 2) a slide that presents your research question; 3) 2-3 slides of evidence; and 4) a slide that presents your conclusion(s) as an answer to to your research question. *Always number your slides*. (This is a big help for your audience, and can be very useful during the Q&A.) The Jonathan Schwabish book, *Better Presentations*—cited at the top of this syllabus under Course Materials—is a *very good* resource for presentation design and skills. The research presentation days will be structured in the form of an academic conference panel: after all of the presentations, the audience will have an opportunity to ask questions of the presenters for purposes of clarification and further discussion. (The Q&A sessions are an important component of the participation grade for those in the audience.)

Peer Review: You will be provided with a research paper draft to review (unless you do not turn in a draft of your own in time to participate). Your review should amount to at least 600 words and should address all three levels of concerns (to be discussed in class) with the overarching goal of ***adding value***—of making the paper better. Provide a commented/marked up pdf version of the original paper; be sure that your name does not appear in the comments. Include your summary comments in the marked up version of the paper.

Final Research Paper: The final research paper should be ~1800 words (not including the cover sheet or references), following the course assignment formatting guidelines (see page 3 above). Your paper should make proper use of your chosen reference and citation style (MLA, APA, or Chicago). Your final research paper must also include, on the cover sheet, a summary explanation of how you have responded to my feedback and to your peer reviewer's feedback on your draft.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1 (T1/7, Th1/9) The Idea of Competition	Reading: Bateson – "The myths of independence & competition"
Week 2 (T1/14, Th1/16) The Rhetoric of Competition	Due: Reading response (section A) Reading: Rubin – "Emporiophobia"; Hutcheon – "Rhetoric & competition"
Week 3 (T1/21, Th1/23) Competition in Anthropology	Due: Reading response (section B) Reading: Molina et al – "Cooperation & competition in social anthropology"
Week 4 (T1/28, Th1/30) Competition in Psychology	Due: Reading response (section C) Reading: Garcia et al – "The psychology of competition"
Week 5 (T2/4, Th2/6) Competition in Education	**Due: Research proposal first draft** Due: Reading response (section A) Reading: Nelson & Dawson – "Competition, education, & assessment"
Week 6 (T2/11, Th2/13) Business Competition	Reading: Berg et al – "Competition & cooperation" Due: Reading response (section B)
Spring break/Reading Week (Feb 18-21)	
Week 7 (T2/25, Th2/27) Economic Competition	Reading: Bönte et al – "Economics meets psychology" Due: Reading response (section C)
Week 8 (T3/3, Th3/5) Competition in Politics	Reading: Brunell & Clarke – "Who wants electoral competition and who wants to win?"
Week 9 (T3/10, Th3/12) Media, Technology, & Competition	**Due: Literature review** Readings to be assigned. Due: Final reading response (everyone) Peer Grading Assignment (in class)
Week 10 (T3/17, Th3/19) Peer editing workshop	**Due: Research paper draft** (Attendance is NOT optional.)
Week 11 (T3/24, Th3/26) Research presentations	
Week 12 (T3/31, Th4/2) Research presentations	**Due: Peer review**
Final Paper Due 4/9 (email or Canvas: as always, if you do not receive a confirmation from me, I did not receive it)	

COURSE READINGS

Week 1: The idea of competition	Bateson, Mary Catherine. (2016). The myths of independence and competition. *Systems Research & Behavioral Science*, *33*, 674-677.
Week 2: Rhetoric of competition	- Rubin, Paul. (2014). Emporiophobia (fear of markets): cooperation or competition? *Southern Economic Journal*, *80*(4), 875-889. - Hutcheon, Linda. (2003). Rhetoric and competition. *Common Knowledge*, *9*(1), 42-49. **Supplemental:** - Gane, Nicholas. (2019). Competition: A critical history of a concept. *Theory, Culture, & Society*. DOI: 10.1177/0263276419878247 - Werron, Tobias. (2015). Why do we believe in competition? A historial-sociological view of competition as an institutionalized modern imaginary. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, *16*(2), 186-210. - Morgan, Mary. (1993). Competing notions of "competition" in late nineteenth-century American economics. *History of Political Economy*, *25*(4), 563-604.

Week 3: **Competition in** **Anthropology**	Molina, Jose, et al. (2017). Competition and cooperation in social anthropology. *Anthropology Today,* *33*(1), 11-14. **Supplemental:** • Kajanus, Anni. (2019). Mutualistic vs. zero-sum modes of competition – a comparative study of children's competitive motivations and behaviors in China. *Social Anthropology,* *27*, 67-83. • Cooper, Amy, & McGee, Lisa. (2017). "At such a good school, everybody needs it": Contested meanings of prescription stimulant use in college academics. *Ethos, 45*(3), 289-313. • Linney, Catherine, et al. (2017). Maternal competition in women. *Human Nature, 28*, 92-116. • Tognetti, Arnaud, et al. (2016). Men increase contributions to a public good when under sexual competition. *Nature Scientific Reports, 6*(29819). • Coucaud, Leo. (2015). Same-sex avoidance relations and what they say about male competition. *Anthropologial Forum, 25*(1), 42-65.
Week 4: **Competition in** **Psychology**	Garcia, Stephen, et al. (2013). The psychology of competition: A social comparison perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 8*(6), 632-650. **Supplemental:** • Kesebir, Selin, et al. (2019). Lay beliefs about competition: Scale development and gender differences. *Motivation & Emotion, 43*, 719-739. • Butera, Fabrizio, et al. (2018). Confirmation as coping with competition. *European Review of Social Pscyhology, 29*(1), 299-339. • Krupp, DB, & Cook, Thomas. (2018). Local competition amplifies the corrosive effects of inequality. *Psychological Science 29*(5), 824-833. • Yip, Jeremy, et al (2018). Trash talking: Competitive incivility motivates rivalry, performance, and unethical behavior. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 144*, 125-144. • Worrell, Frank, et al. (2016). Competition's role in developing psychological strength and outstanding performance. *Review of General Psychology, 20*(3), 259-271. • Toma, Claudia, & Butera, Fabrizio. (2015). Cooperation versus competition effects information sharing and use in group decision-making. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 9*(9), 455-467. • Vongas, John, & Al Hajj, Raghid. (2015). Competing sexes, power, and testosterone: How winning and losing affect people's empathic responses and what this means for organisations. *Applied Psychology, 64*(2), 308-337.
Week 5: **Competition in** **Education**	Nelson, Robert, & Dawson, Phillip. (2017). Competition, education and assessment: Connecting history with and recent scholarship. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 42*(2), 304-315. **Supplemental:** • Chen, Ching-Huei, et al. (2018). How competition in a game-based science learning environment influences students' learning achievement, flow experience, and learning behavioral patterns. *Educational Technology & Society, 21*(2), 164-176. • Naidoo, Rajani. (2018). The competition fetish in higher education: Shamans, mind snares, and consequences. *European Educational Research Journal, 17*(5), 605-620. • van Roy, Rob, & Zaman, Bieke. (2018). Unravelling the ambivalent motivational power of gamification: A basic psychological needs perspective. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies,* (in press). Doi: 10.1016/j.ihcs.2018.04.009 • Reitz, Thomas. (2017). Academic hierarchies in neo-feudal capitalism: How competition processes trust and facilitates the appropriation of knowledge. *Higher Education, 73*, 871-886. • Posselt, Julie, & Lipson, Sarah Ketchen. (2016). Competition, anxiety, and depression in the college classroom: Variations by student identity and field of study. *Journal of College Student Development, 57*(8), 973-989. • Cagiltay, Nergiz Ercil, et al. (2015). The effect of competition on learning in games. *Computers & Education, 87*, 35-41.

Week 6: Business competition	Berg, Roberta Wiig. (2010). Competition and cooperation: The wisdom to know when. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *73*(2), 176-189. **Supplemental:** • Haran, Uriel. (2019). May the best man lose: Guilt inhibits competitive motivation. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes*, *154*, 15-33. • Berdahl, Jennifer, et al. (2018). Work as a masculinity contest. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*(3), 422-448. • Heath, Joseph. (2018). "But everybody else is doing it": Competition & business self-regulation. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, *49*(4), 516-535. • Pazzaglia, Federica, et al. (2018). Keeping up with the Joneses: Industry rivalry, commitment to frames and sensemaking failures. *Human Relations*, *71*(3), 427-455. • Swab, Gabrielle, & Johnson, Paul. (2018). Steel sharpens steel: A review of multilevel competition and competitiveness in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *40*, 147-165. • Mollerstrom, Johanna, & Wrolich, Katherine. (2017). The gender gap in competitiveness: Women shy away from competing with others, but not from competing with themselves. *DIWE Economic Bulletin*, *22/23*, 219-225. • Rigdon, Mary, & D'Esterre, Alexander. (2017). Sabotaging another: Priming competitive behavior increases cheating behavior in tournaments. *Southern Economic Journal*, *84*(2), 456-473. • Mudrack, Peter, et al. (2012). Some ethical implication of individual competitiveness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *108*(3), 347-359.
Week 7: Competition in Economic Psychology	Bönte, Werner, et al. (2017). Economics meets psychology: Experimental and self-reported measures of individual competitiveness. *Personality & Individual Differences*, *116*, 179-185. **Supplemental:** • Kalwij, Adriaan. (2018). The effects of competition outcomes on health: Evidence from the lifespans of US Olympic medalists. *Economics & Human Biology*, *31*, 276-286. • Chang, Wei-Ching, & Fraser, Joy. (2017). Cooperate! A paradigm shift for health equity. *International Journal for Equity in Health*, *16*. • Barker, Jessica, & Barclay, Pat. (2016). Local competition increases people's willingness to harm others. *Evolution & Human Behavior*, *37*, 315-322. • Jauernig, Johana, & Luetge, Christoph. (2016). Competition-induced punishment of winners and losers: Who is the target? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *57*, 13-25. • Schurr, Amos, & Ritov, Ilana. (2016). Winning a competition predicts dishonest behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *113*(7), 1754-1759. • Dreber, Anne, et al. (2014). Gender and competition in adolescence: Task matters. *Experimental Economics*, *17*, 154-172.
Week 8: Political competition	Brunell, Thomas, & Clarke, Harold. (2012). Who wants electoral competition and who wants to win? *Political Research Quarterly*, *65*(1), 124-137. **Supplemental:** • Larrsson, Anders Olaf. (2019). Winning & losing on social media: Comparing viral political posts across platforms. *Convergence*. DOI: 10.1177/1354856518821589. • Balliet, Daniel, et al. (2018). Political ideology, trust, and cooperation: In-group favoritism among Republicans *and* Democrats during a US national election. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *62*(4), 797-818. • Henceroth, Nathan & Jensen, Christian. (2018). Confrontation and competition: The electoral benefits of regionalist parties' positions in parliamentary democracies. *Party Politics*, *24*(6), 629-639. • Konig, Pascal. (2017). The role of competitive advantage in party competition. *Politics & Policy*, *45*(1), 51-82. • Carlin, Ryan, & Love, Gregory. (2016). Political competition, partisanship and interpersonal trust in electoral democracies. *British Journal of Political Science*, *48*, 115-139.

	• Neundorf, Anja, & Adams, James. (2016). The micro-foundations of party competition and issue ownership: The reciprocal effects of citizens' issue salience and party attachments. *British Journal of Political Science*, *48*, 385-406. • Bowler, Shaun, & Donovan, Todd. (2011). Electoral competition and the voter. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *75*(1), 151-164.
Week 9: Media, technology, & competition	**Reading Options:** • Smeddinck, Jan, et al. (2019). Work hard, play hard: How linking rewards in games to prior exercise performance improves motivation and exercise intensity. *Entertainment Computing*, *29*, 20-30. • Dewart McEwan, Karen. (2018). Self-tracking practices and digital (re)productive labour. *Philosophy & Technology*, *31*, 235-251. • Stephanone, Michael, et al. (2018). A social cognitive approach to traditional media content and social media use: Selfie-related behavior as competitive strategy. *New Media & Society*, doi: 10.1177/1461444818795488. • Vanolo, Alberto. (2018). Cities and the politics of gamification. *Cities*, *74*, 320-326. • Barratt, Paul. (2017). Healthy competition: A qualitative study investigating persuasive technologies and the gamification cycle. *Health & Place*, *46*, 328-336. • Moore, Phoebe, & Robinson, Andrew. (2016). The quantified self: What counts in the neoliberal workplace. *New Media & Society*, *18* (11), 2774-2792. • Adachi, Paul, & Willoughby, Teena. (2013). Demolishing the competition: The longitudinal link between competitive video games, competitive gambling, and aggression. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *42*, 1090-1104.