

Sociology 271A – Introduction to Methods of Sociological Research
Fall 2020 – Tuesday-Thursday, 10am-12noon – Online

Professor Samuel R. Lucas
Office: 438 Barrows Hall
Phone: 642-4765 or 642-4766
E-mail address: lucas@berkeley.edu
Office hours: By Appointment
Home-page: <http://www.samuelroundfieldlucas.com/>

This introductory graduate level course in research methods is designed to sensitize you to fundamental principles of systematic investigation of the social world. But, you may ask, *which* so-called fundamental principles? Good question! As post-Kuhnian scholars, we know that so-called fundamental principles are neither universal nor self-evident. Yet, lacking a coherent shared language of research—I am sure you each have *some* such language, but it is unlikely that we all share it—it is imperative that we take some steps forward to establish, and then critique, a shared language. Of course, there are other ways we might proceed, and, frankly, I believe that if we had a full year (or more), and not much else to do, a more inductive approach would be effective and, perhaps, even more fun. *But*, perhaps unfortunately, time demands and bureaucratic university organizational design prevent this immersion approach, so I am proposing a more deductive approach for our work this term.

Course Aim

My aim in this course is exposure and understanding—I want to expose you to research design as a language, and help you understand its (differing) logic(s). I ask your indulgence, in that it is very tough to get off the ground of language study if the very phonemes of the language are immediately problematized. However, our increasing shared sense of that language will soon make critical assessment possible.

If, by the end of the course, you find the logics we address useful in your own research and in your effort to assess other research, great! Alternatively, if you find the logics problematic, and you blaze a different path, great!—perhaps I’ll be able to be credited someday for so clearly revealing the logic and weaknesses of current practice to you (perhaps doing so inadvertently, with my own research efforts :-) !), that you were stricken with such a blazing insight that you were able to reveal a better, more effective, set of logics and approaches. Should that occur, I will happily bask in your reflected glory!

This term, however, my aim is considerably more modest—I only want you to *see* the logic others have used or *not* used. Your acceptance or rejection of those logics is up to you, and, actually, I would be disappointed if you did not expose these claims to critical assessment at some point. I posit, however, that at the outset our work to articulate a shared language will aid your future trajectory, whether it leads to critical re-assessment, reasoned acceptance, or both.

Evaluation

Hmm. Well, if we can reject this stuff, then how will grades be assigned? Good question!

Grades are not really the stuff of graduate education, but they are bureaucratically required. So, the assignments will call on you to demonstrate understanding. That is, you should demonstrate that you understand a position, even if you disagree with it. This will entail adopting a critical posture toward positions with which you do not agree *and* toward positions with which you do agree. Not every argument in favor of a position may be coherent.

As for the assignments, they have two main purposes that are far more important than grades. One purpose of the assignments is to help you solidify your understanding of various methods and logics. The second, equally important, purpose is to help you proceed forward in your developing research agenda.

There are two types of assignments, each of which emphasizes one of the two important purposes more than the other. One type of assignment can be called “proposals and pieces thereof.” The other type of assignment can be called “design reviews.”

The Proposal and Pieces Thereof

By the end of the term you will have drafted a research proposal. During the term you will need to draft and hand in for comment various pieces of the proposal. These pieces, due at different moments during the term, are first drafts of the segments of the proposal. The pieces are graded on a S/U scale. The proposal, due at the end of the term, is graded on an A-F scale.

Also, you will have an opportunity to obtain feedback from your peers on your research plans near the end of the term. To facilitate that process, you will need to submit a 3-page (max) Provisional Methods memo on your project two days before the feedback process.

The expectation is that final proposals will be of high quality, worthy of submission for grants (e.g., National Science Foundation funding) and/or to be taken into the field and used to conduct research—with the proviso that budgetary limitations can be ignored for the proposals you will prepare for this class. Assignments explicitly leading to and composing the final proposal are marked with an asterisk (*) when noted in the schedule.

Design Reviews

Design Reviews place you into dialogue with a variety of research approaches. On five Tuesdays I will require a short design review of an assigned reading. Each design review is graded Pass/No Pass. If you receive a NP grade on a design review, you must submit a new design review using another paper that uses the same method that I will assign to you, due one week from when I returned the graded assignment. If you again receive an NP on that assignment, you have one more chance with a third paper I will assign, due one week after I return the second version. Whether or not the third design review is an NP, that will be the final chance to complete a design review for that method. In order to pass the class you must obtain a passing grade on 5 design reviews, one for each of the major methods that are the focus of the course.

As the semester goes forward, the knowledge you can bring to bear to prepare your design

reviews should vastly increase. Throughout the term, however, it will be necessary for you to link your analysis directly to the other material we have covered to that point in class (e.g., please use citations, refer to the concepts covered). Parenthetically, reviews may contain negative or positive assessments, but, either claim requires an accompanying analysis. In other words, merely asserting “The author was wrong (or right) to do X” is insufficient. We need to know what makes it wrong (or right) for the author to do X, and what is the cost (or benefit) of this analytic transgression (or feature), and, ideally, what the author should have done.

Below I provide a “Calendar of Written Assignments.” Note that one assignment is in bold. Outside the final proposal, this assignment is the **most important written assignment of the term!** One cannot write a strong proposal without being able to write a strong methods section. We will conduct an important exercise in class that day so that no reading is required that day.

Calendar of Written Assignments

Assignment	Proposal	Other	Due
Empirical Research Question	X		Sep 3
Design Review, Experiment		X	Sep 22
Design Review, Survey Research		X	Oct 6
Design Review, Qualitative Interviewing		X	Oct 20
Literature Review Section	X		Oct 27
Design Review, Ethnography		X	Nov 3
Design Review, Comparative Historical		X	Nov 17
Methods Section	X		Nov 24
Provisional Methods Memo	X		Dec 6
Final Proposal	X		Dec 15

Deadlines

No late work will be accepted, and no incompletes will be given in this class.

Texts

Most of the reading material is available via Google Scholar or JSTOR, some can be accessed by using OskiCat, the University database of materials, to find an electronic location accessible via the University of California-Berkeley library. Two readings are available in a Reader you may buy at Copy Central, 2411 Telegraph Ave (<https://copycentral.com/2411-telegraph-ave/>) or rent through their deal with RedShelf (<https://copycentral.redshelf.com/>). If you buy the Reader you may pick it up at the store or ask them to mail it to you. If you rent the Reader you will have access to the material for 180 days; afterward you will lose access to any mark-ups you may have

made to your electronic copy.

In addition, the following seven books are required. Ones marked **OskiCat** are available in electronic form through the library web-site. Others should be purchased via amazon.com, some other online source, or directly from the publisher:

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin

Carmines, Edward G., and Richard A. Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Converse, Jean M., and Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Hand, David J. 2016. *Measurement: A Very Short Introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. **OskiCat**

Kalton, Graham. 1983. *Introduction to Survey Sampling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Shapiro, Susan P. 2019. *Speaking for the Dying: Life-and-Death Decisions in Intensive Care*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **OskiCat**

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York, NY: The Free Press. (Pp. 1-14; 39-181).

Except for the 3 books above that do not seem to be available electronically, below you will find a source (JSTOR, Google Scholar, OskiCat, Reader) listed in bold after each citation.

For Those Who Have Never Taken Sociological Methods

This is a graduate level introduction to methods. As such, it assumes persons have taken undergraduate sociological methods. If you have not taken such a course, you may stay in the course. However, you should expect to spend time getting up to speed; this is the only alternative as this is the only required methods course in the Ph.D. program, and thus it has much to cover that is beyond what is covered in undergraduate methods classes.

READING and ASSIGNMENT SCHEDULE

PART I – INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

>>Week 1, Aug 27 – Introduction

August 27 -- Introduction: Basics and Purposes of Research

PART II – FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES

>>Week 2, Sep 1-3 – Measurement, Reliability, and Validity

September 1 – Measurement

Hand, David J. 2016. *Measurement: A Very Short Introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. **OskiCat**

Bollen, Kenneth A. 1980. "Issues in the Comparative Measurement of Political Democracy." *American Sociological Review* 45: 370-390. **JSTOR**

September 3 – Reliability and Validity

Carmines, Edward G., and Richard A. Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Bannigan, Katrina, and Roger Watson. 2009. "Reliability and Validity in a Nutshell." *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 18: 3237-3243. **Google Scholar**

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH QUESTION DUE SEPTEMBER 3 (S/U)*

>> Week 3, Sep 8 - 10 – Case Selection and Inferential Transfer

September 8 – Case Selection

Kruskal, William, and Frederick Mosteller. 1980. "Representative Sampling, IV: the History of the Concept in Statistics, 1895-1939." *International Statistical Review* 48: 169-195. **JSTOR**

Kalton, Graham. 1983. *Introduction to Survey Sampling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

September 10 – Case Selection and Inferences

Berk, Richard A. 1983. "An Introduction to Sample Selection Bias in Sociological Data." *American Sociological Review* 48: 386-398. **JSTOR**

Firestone, William A. 1993. "Alternative Arguments for Generalizing From Data as Applied to Qualitative Research." *Educational Researcher* 22; 4: 16-22. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2014. "Beyond the Existence Proof: Ontological Conditions, Epistemological Implications, and In-Depth Interview Research." *Quality & Quantity* 48: 387-408. **Google Scholar**

PART III – BASIC DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

>> Week 4, Sep 15-17 – Experiments and Quasi-Experiments

September 15 – Design of Experiments and Threats to Proper Inference

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin

September 17 – Examples of Experiments

Rosenthal, Robert, and Lenore F. Jacobson. 1968. "Teacher Expectations for the Disadvantaged." *Scientific American* 218; 4: 19-23. **Google Scholar**

Yinger, John. 1986. "Measuring Racial Discrimination with Fair Housing Audits: Caught in the Act." *American Economic Review* 76: 881-893. **JSTOR**

Heckman, James J., and Brook S. Payner. 1989. "Determining the Impact of Federal Anti-Discrimination Policy on the Economic Status of Blacks: A Study of South Carolina." *American Economic Review* 79: 138-177. **JSTOR**

>> Week 5, Sep 22-24 – Survey Research

September 22 – Survey Research

Converse, Jean M., and Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Groves, Robert M. 2011. "Three Eras of Survey Research." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75: 861-871. **JSTOR**

Mize, Trenton D. 2016. "Sexual Orientation in the Labor Market." *American Sociological Review* 81: 1132-1160. **JSTOR**

Design Review due **September 22** of: Experiment

Calnitsky, David, and Pilar Gonalons-Pons. In Press. "The Impact of an Experimental Guaranteed Income on Crime and Violence." *Social Problems*.

September 24 – Selected Issues in Survey Research

Loftus, Elizabeth F., Mark R. Klinger, Kyle D. Smith, and Judith Fielder. 1990. "A Tale of Two Questions: Benefits of Asking More Than One Question." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 54: 330-345. **JSTOR**

Kreuter, Frauke, Stanley Presser, and Roger Tourangeau. 2008. "Social Desirability Bias in CATI, IVR, and Web Surveys: The Effects of Mode and Question Sensitivity." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72: 847-865. **JSTOR**

Krosnick, Jon A., Allyson L. Holbrook, Matthew K. Berent, Richard T. Carson, W. M. Hanneman, Raymond J. Kopp, Robert C. Mitchell, Stanley Presser, Paul A. Ruud, V. K. Smith, Wendy R. Moody, Melanie C. Green, and Michael Conaway. 2002. "The Impact of "No Opinion" Response Options on Data Quality: Non-Attitude Reduction or an Invitation to Satisfice?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 66: 371-403. **JSTOR**

Moore, Jeffrey C., Linda L. Stinson, and E. J. Welniak. Jr. 2000. "Income Measurement Error in Surveys: A Review." *Journal of Official Statistics* 16: 331-62. **Google Scholar**

>> Week 6, Sep 29-Oct 1 – Survey Research: Extensions and Critique

September 29 – Extensions of Survey Research

Lax, Jeffrey R., Justin H. Phillips, and Alissa F. Stollwerk. 2016. "Are survey respondents lying about their support for same-sex marriage? Lessons from a list experiment." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80: 510-533. **Google Scholar**

Corstange, Daniel. 2009. "Sensitive questions, truthful answers? Modeling the list experiment with LISTIT." *Political Analysis* 17: 45-63. **JSTOR**

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly, and Reed Larson. 2014. "Validity and reliability of the experience-sampling method," pp. 35-54 in *Flow and the Foundations of Positive Psychology: The Collected Works of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi*. Dordrecht: Springer **OskiCat**

October 1 – Selected Complexities and Critical Assessments of Survey Research

Huang, Min-Hsiung. 2009. "Race of the Interviewer and the black-white test score gap." *Social*

Science Research 38: 29-38. **OskiCat**

Suchman, Lucy, and Brigitte Jordan. 1990. "Interactional Troubles in Face-to-Face Survey Interviews." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 85: 232-241. **JSTOR**

Fienberg, Stephen F. 1990. "Comment on 'Interactional Troubles in Face-to-Face Survey Interviews'." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 85: 241-244. **JSTOR**

Hahn, Robert A. 1990. "Comment on 'Interactional Troubles in Face-to-Face Survey Interviews'." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 85: 244-246. **JSTOR**

>> **Week 7, Oct 6 - 8 – Qualitative Interviewing**

October 6 – Qualitative Interviewing

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York, NY: The Free Press. (Pp. 1-14; 39-181).

Sykes, Jennifer, Katrin Križ, Kathryn Edin, and Sarah Halpern-Meekin. 2015. "Dignity and Dreams: What the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) Means to Low-Income Families." *American Sociological Review* 80: 243-267. **Google Scholar**

Design Review due **October 6** of: Survey Research

Charron-Chénier, Raphaël. 2020. "Predatory Inclusion in Consumer Credit: Explaining Black and White Disparities in Payday Loan Use." *Sociological Forum* 35: 370-392. 2020. **Google Scholar**

October 8 – Selected Complexities of Qualitative Interviewing

Herzog, Hanna. 2012. "Interview Location and Its Social Meaning," pp. 207-218 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Cook, Kay E. 2012. "Stigma and the Interview Encounter," pp. 333-344 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Lillrank, Annika. 2012. "Managing the Interviewer Self," pp. 281-294 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

>> Week 8, Oct 13-15 – Qualitative Interviewing: Analysis and Critique

October 13 – Analyzing Qualitative Interview Data

Charmaz, Kathy, and Linda Liska Belgrave. 2012. “Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis,” pp. 347-366 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Riessman, Catherine Kohler. 2012. “Analysis of Personal Narratives,” pp. 367-380 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Seale, Clive, and Carol Rivas. 2012. “Using Software to Analyze Qualitative Interviews,” pp. 427-440 from *The Sage Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*, edited by Jaber F. Gubrium, James A. Holstein, Amir B. Marvasti, and Karyn D. McKinney. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

October 15 – Selected Critical Assessments of Qualitative Interviewing

Jerolmack, Colin and Shamus Khan. 2014. “Talk is Cheap: Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 43: 236-247. **Google Scholar**

Cerulo, Karen A. 2014. “Reassessing the Problem: Response to Jerolmack and Khan.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 43: 219-226. **Google Scholar**

DiMaggio, Paul. 2014. “Comment on Jerolmack and Khan, ‘Talk is Cheap’: Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 43: 232-235. **Google Scholar**

Lamont, Michelle, and Ann Swidler. 2014. “Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing.” *Qualitative Sociology* 37: 153-171. **Google Scholar**

Jerolmack, Colin and Shamus Khan. 2014. “Toward an Understanding of the Relationship Between Accounts and Action.” *Sociological Methods and Research* 43: 236-247. **Google Scholar**

>> Week 9, Oct 20- 22 – Ethnography

October 20 – Ethnographic Research

Shapiro, Susan P. 2019. *Speaking for the Dying: Life-and-Death Decisions in Intensive Care*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Design Review due **October 20** of: Qualitative Interview
 Campeau, Holly, Ron Levi, and Todd Foglesong. In Press. "Policing, Recognition, and the Bind of Legal Cynicism." *Social Problems*. **Google Scholar**

October 22 – Selected Varieties and Challenges of Ethnography

Tavory, Iddo, and Stefan Timmermans. 2009. "Two Cases of Ethnography: Grounded Theory and the Extended Case Method." *Ethnography* 10: 243-263. **Google Scholar**

Snow, David. 1980. "The Disengagement Process: A Neglected Problem in Participant Observation Research." *Qualitative Sociology* 3:100-122. **Google Scholar**

Luvaas, Brent. 2019. "Unbecoming: The aftereffects of autoethnography." *Ethnography* 20: 245-262. **OskiCat**

Reyes, Victoria. 2018. "Three models of transparency in ethnographic research: Naming places, naming people, and sharing data." *Ethnography* 19: 204-226. **OskiCat**

>> Week 10, Oct 27-29 – Ethnography: Analysis and Critique

October 27 – Recording and Analyzing Ethnographic Data

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I Fretz, and Linda Shaw. 2001. "Participant Observation and Fieldnotes," pp. 352-368 in *Handbook of Ethnography*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Angrosino, Michael. 2007. "Analysing ethnographic data," pp. 67-77 in *Doing Ethnographic and Observational Research* by Michael Angrosino. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd. **Google Scholar**

Brown, Kate Pride. In Press. "Rumor has it: Strategies for ethnographic analysis in authoritarian regimes." *Ethnography*.
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1466138120923713>

LITERATURE REVIEW SECTION DUE OCTOBER 27 (S/U)*

October 29 – Selected Critical Assessments of Ethnography

LeCompte, Margaret D., and Judith Preissle Goetz. 1982. "Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic Research." *Review of Research in Education* 52: 31-60. **Google Scholar**

Klinenberg, Eric. 2006. "Blaming the Victim: Hearsay, Labeling and the Hazards of Quick-Hit Disaster Ethnography." *American Sociological Review* 71: 689-698. **JSTOR**

Fine, Gary Alan. 1993. "Ten Lies of Ethnography: Moral Dilemmas of Field Research." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 22: 267-294. **Google Scholar**

>> **Week 10, Nov 3-5 – Comparative/Historical Research**

November 3 – Comparative/Historical Research

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Mahoney, James. 1999. "Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1154-1196. **JSTOR**

Design Review due **November 3** of: Ethnography

Streib, Jessi. 2011. "Class Reproduction by Four Year Olds." *Qualitative Sociology* 34: 337-352. **Google Scholar**

November 5 – Selecting and Collecting Comparative/Historical Data

Emigh, Rebecca Jean. 1997. "The power of negative thinking: The use of negative case methodology in the development of sociological theory." *Theory and Society* 26: 649-684. **Google Scholar**

Haydu, Jeffrey. 1998. "Making Use of the Past: Time Periods as Cases to Compare and Sequences of Problem-Solving." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 339-371. **JSTOR**

Hill, Michael R. 1993. "Archival Sedimentation," pp. 8-19 in *Archival Strategies and Techniques*, by Michael R. Hill. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. **OskiCat**

Myers, Daniel J. and Beth S. Caniglia. 2004. "All the Rioting That's Fit to Print: Selection Effects in National Newspaper Coverage of Civil Disorders, 1968-1969." *American Sociological Review* 69: 519-543. **JSTOR**

>> **Week 11, Nov 10-12 – Critique of Comparative Historical Methods & Ethics**

November 10 – Selected Critical Assessments of Comparative/Historical Research

Lieberson, Stanley. 1991. "Small *N*'s and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." *Social Forces* 70: 307-320. **JSTOR**

Savolainen, Jukka. 1994. "The Rationality of Drawing Big Conclusions Based on Small Samples: In Defense of Mill's Methods." *Social Forces* 72:1217-1724. **JSTOR**

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2: 131-150. **JSTOR**

Sewell, William H., Jr. 1996. "Three Temporalities: Toward an Eventful Sociology," pp. 245-280 in *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*, edited by Terrence J. McDonald. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. **READER**

November 12 – Ethics: Principles and Practicalities

Levine, Robert J. 1979. "Clarifying the Concepts of Research Ethics." *The Hastings Center Report* 9: 21-26. **JSTOR**

Freedman, Benjamin. 1987. "Scientific Value and Validity as Ethical Requirements for Research: A Proposed Explication." *IRB: Ethics and Human Research* 9: 7-10. **JSTOR**

Rosenthal, Robert, and Peter David Blanck. 1993. "Science and Ethics in Conducting, Analyzing, and Reporting Social Science Research: Implications for Social Scientists, Judges, and Lawyers." *Indiana Law Journal* 68: 1209-1228. **Google Scholar**

Bosk, Charles L. and Raymond G. De Vries. 2004. "Bureaucracies of Mass Deception: Institutional Review Boards and the Ethics of Ethnographic Research." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 595: 249-263. **Google Scholar**

Taylor, Steven J. 1987. "Observing Abuse: Professional Ethics and Personal Morality in Field Research." *Qualitative Sociology* 10: 288-302. **OskiCat**

PART IV – COMPLEXITIES OF CASE SELECTION, CAUSALITY, & ETHICS

>>Week 12, Nov 17-19 – Sampling/Case Selection

November 17 – Case Selection Strategies and Analysis Strategies Under Challenging Circumstances: A Closer Inspection

Gile, Krista J., Lisa G. Johnston, and Matthew J. Salganik. 2015. "Diagnostics for respondent-driven sampling." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 178: 241-269. **Google Scholar**

Kanouse, David E., Sandra H. Berry, Naihua Duan, Janet Lever, Sally Carson, Judith F. Perlman, and Barbara Levitan. 1999. "Drawing a Probability Sample of Female Street Prostitutes in Los Angeles County." *Journal of Sex Research* 36: 45-51. **JSTOR**

Blair, Johnny. 1999. "A probability sample of gay urban males: The use of two-phase adaptive sampling." *Journal of Sex Research* 36: 39-44. **Google Scholar**

Enríquez, Laura J. 2017. "Everyday Violence in Central America as Seen Through the Life of One Woman." *Qualitative Sociology* 40: 377-402. **Google Scholar**

Design Review due **November 17** of: Comparative/Historical

White, Alexandre IR. 2018. "Global Risks, Divergent Pandemics: Contrasting Responses to Bubonic Plague and Smallpox in 1901 Cape Town." *Social Science History* 42: 135-158. **Google Scholar**

November 19 – Noted? Accurate? Advice on Case Selection

Small, Mario Luis. 2009. "‘How Many Cases Do I Need?’ On Science and the Logic of Case Selection in Field-Based Research." *Ethnography* 10: 5-38. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2014. "Beyond the Existence Proof: Ontological Conditions, Epistemological Implications, and In-Depth Interview Research." *Quality & Quantity* 48: 387-408. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2014. "An Inconvenient Dataset: Bias and Inappropriate Inference with the Multilevel Model." *Quality & Quantity* 48: 1619-1649. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2016. "Where the Rubber Meets the Road: Probability and Nonprobability Moments in Experiment, Interview, Archival, Administrative, and Ethnographic Data Collection." *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 2: doi:10.1177/2378023116634709 **Google Scholar**

>>Week 13, Nov 24-26 – Synthesizing Methods

November 24 –

No Reading

METHODS SECTION DUE NOVEMBER 24 (S/U)*

November 26 – THANKSGIVING

>> Week 14, Dec 1-3 – Less Common, Powerful Methods and Causality

December 1 – Three Less Common but Potentially Illuminating Methods

Breslow, Norman. 1982. "Design and Analysis of Case-Control Studies." *Annual Review of Public Health* 3: 29-54. **Google Scholar**

Macy, Michael W., and Robert Willer. 2002. "From Factors to Actors: Computational Sociology and Agent-Based Modeling." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 143-166. **JSTOR**

Schelling, Thomas C. 1969. "Models of Segregation." *American Economic Review* 59: 488–493. **JSTOR**

Hayes, Adrian C. 1984. "Formal Model Building and Theoretical Interests in Sociology." *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 10: 325-341. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2009. "Stratification Theory, Socioeconomic Background, and Educational Attainment: A Formal Analysis." *Rationality and Society* 21: 459-511. **Google Scholar**

December 3 – Causality: An Introduction

Holland, Paul W. 1986. "Statistics and Causal Inference." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 396: 940-970. **JSTOR**

Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. "Rethinking Causality," pp. 174-198 in *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*, by Stanley Lieberson. Berkeley: University of California Press. **OskiCat**

Manski, Charles F. 1995. "Introduction," pp. 1-9 in *Identification Problems in the Social Sciences*, by Charles F. Manski. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **READER**

>>Week 15, Dec 6-10 – Wrap-Up

Sunday, December 6 – PRELIMINARY METHODS MEMO DUE (TO ALL) 11:59PM DECEMBER 6 (S/U)*

December 8 – Student Presentations

Reading–Peers' Preliminary Methods Memos

December 10 – Wrap-up

No Reading: Thematic Discussion

>>Week 16, December 15 – Final Proposal due