

Sociology 271A
Methods of Sociological Research
Spring 2019 – Tuesday-Thursday, 10am-noon, 402 Barrows

Professor Samuel R. Lucas
Office: 438 Barrows Hall
Phone: 642-4765 or 642-4766
E-mail address: lucas@berkeley.edu
Office hours: Tuesdays, 12:15-1:45pm and 4:15-5:45pm (**but check web-site for updates**)
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, there will be assignments that 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 “exercises.”

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.

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.

Exercises

Exercises, the other type of assignment, are designed to place you into dialogue with a variety of research approaches. On selected Tuesdays I will require a short methodological evaluation of an assigned reading.

As the semester goes forward, the knowledge you can bring to bear to prepare your methodological evaluations should vastly increase. Throughout the term, however, it will be necessary for you to link your critique directly to the other material we have covered to that point in class (e.g., please use citations, refer to the concepts covered). Parenthetically, critiques 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		Jan 31
Methodological Evaluation, Aronson, et. al. 1998		X	Feb 12
Methodological Evaluation, Feliciano & Lanuza 2017		X	Feb 19
Methodological Evaluation, Steensland 2006		X	Feb 26
Methodological Evaluation, Merriman 2017		X	Mar 5
Methodological Evaluation, Mullen 2009		X	Mar 12
Literature Review Section	X		Mar 19
Methods Section	X		Apr 18
Final Proposal	X		May 13

Deadlines

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

Texts

Much of the reading material is available via 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, and some can be accessed by using Google Scholar to access electronically (perhaps also using a connection through the University). If electronic access proves impossible, most such items can also be obtained by going to the library and making a hardcopy. Other articles and chapters are in a Reader that you may purchase at Copy Central, 2411 Telegraph Avenue. And, a few will be handed out the class before we discuss them. In addition, the following seven books are required, and should be purchased via amazon.com, some other online source, or directly from the publisher:

Allison, Paul D. 2002. *Missing Data*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

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.

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

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

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

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

Whyte, William Foote. 1943. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum, fourth edition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Note that Hand will be discussed January 29, Carmines & Zeller will be discussed January 31, Campbell & Stanley will be discussed February 5, and Converse & Presser will be discussed February 12. These are the first four books we will discuss, and they are needed fairly early, such that one should not delay in ordering them. Except for the 8 books above, 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, Jan 22 – Introduction

January 22 -- Introduction: Basics and Purposes of Research

PART II – FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES

>>Week 1, continued, Jan 24 – Measurement

January 24 – Measurement

Hand, David J. 2016. *Measurement: A Very Short Introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. (Chs 1 thru 3, pp. 1-59)

Epstein, Lee, and Andrew Martin. 2005. "Coding Variables." *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement* 1: 321-327. **Google Scholar**

>> Week 2, Jan 29 - 31 – Measurement, Reliability, and Validity

January 29 – Measurement

Hand, David J. 2016. *Measurement: A Very Short Introduction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. (Ch 4-7, pp. 60-116)

Hambleton, Ronald K., and Russell W. Jones. 1993. "Comparison of Classical Test Theory and Item Response Theory and Their Applications to Test Development." *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practices* 12: 38-47. **Google Scholar (see all results, or it may not show up)**

Weiss, David J., and Michael E. Yoes. 1991. "Item Response Theory," pp. 69-95 in *Advances in Educational and Psychological Testing: Theory and Applications*, edited by Ronald K. Hambleton and Jac N. Zaal. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers. **READER**

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

January 31 – Reliability and Validity

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

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

Creswell, John W., and Dana L. Miller. 2000. "Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry." *Theory into Practice* 39: 124-130. **Google Scholar**

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH QUESTION DUE JANUARY 31 (S/U)*

PART III – BASIC DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

>> Week 3, Feb 5-7 – Experiments and Quasi-Experiments

February 5 – 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

February 7 – Different Examples of Possible Experiments

Lovaglia, Michael T., Jeffrey W. Lucas, Jeffrey A. Houser, Shane R Thye, and Barry Markovsky. 1998. "Status Processes and Mental Ability Test Scores." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 195-228. **JSTOR**

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 4, Feb 12-14 – Survey Research

February 12 – Survey Research

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

Houle, Jason N., and Cody Warner. 2017. "Into the Red and Back to the Nest? Student Debt, College Completion, and Returning to the Parental Home among Young Adults." *Sociology of Education* 90: 89-108. **Google Scholar**

Freedman, Deborah, Arland Thornton, Donald Camburn, Duane Alwin, and Linda Young-DeMarco. 1988. "The Life History Calendar: A Technique for Collecting

Retrospective Data.” *Sociological Methodology* 18:37-68. **JSTOR**

Methodological evaluation due **February 12** of:

Aronson, Joshua, Michael J. Lustina, Catherine Good, and Kelli Keough. 1998. "When White Men Can't Do Math: Necessary and Sufficient Factors in Stereotype Threat." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 35: 29-46. **Google Scholar**

February 14 – Selected Critical Assessments of Survey Research

Abbott, Andrew. 1988. “Transcending General Linear Reality.” *Sociological Theory* 6: 169-186. **JSTOR**

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**

Anderson, Barbara A., Brian D. Silver, and Paul R. Abramson. 1988. “The Effects of the Race of the Interviewer on Race-Related Attitudes of Black Respondents in SRC/CPS National Elections Studies.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 52: 289-324. **Google Scholar**

Huang, Min-Hsiung. 2009. “Race of the Interviewer and the black-white test score gap.” *Social Science Research* 38: 29-38. **OskiCat**

>> Week 5, Feb 19-21 – Comparative/Historical Research

February 19 – 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. 2004. “Comparative-Historical Methodology.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 81-101. **JSTOR**

Methodological evaluation due **February 19** of:

Feliciano, Cynthia, and Yader R. Lanuza. 2017. "An Immigrant Paradox? Contextual Attainment and Intergenerational Educational Mobility." *American Sociological Review* 82: 211-241. **Google Scholar**

February 21 – Selected Critical Assessments of Comparative/Historical Approaches

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

Reuschmeyer, Dietrich. 2003. "Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?," pp. 305-336 in *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. **READER**

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**

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

>> Week 6, Feb 26-28 – Ethnographic Research

February 26 – Ethnographic Research

Whyte, William Foote. 1943. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*, fourth edition. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cho, Jeasik and Allen Trent. 2006. "Validity in Qualitative Research Revisited." *Qualitative Research* 6: 319-340. **OskiCat**

Lofland, John. 1995. "Analytic Ethnography: Features, Failings, and Futures." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 24: 30-67. **OskiCat**

Methodological evaluation due **February 26** of:

Steensland, Brian. 2006. "Cultural Categories and the American Welfare State: The Case of Guaranteed Income Policy." *American Journal of Sociology* 111: 1273-1326. **JSTOR**

February 28 – 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**

Rist, Ray C. 1980. "Blitzkrieg Ethnography: On the Transformation of a Method into a Movement." *Educational Researcher* 9: 8-10. **Google Scholar**

Fine, Gary Alan. 1993. "Ten Lies of Ethnography: Moral Dilemmas of Field Research." *Journal*

of Contemporary Ethnography 22: 267-294. **Google Scholar**

Hammersley, Martyn. 1990. "What's Wrong with Ethnography? The Myth of Theoretical Description." *Sociology* 24: 597-615. **OskiCat**

>> **Week 7, Mar 5-7 – In-Depth Interviewing**

March 5 – In-Depth Interviewing

Orrange, Robert M. 2003. "Individualism, Family Values, and the Professional Middle Class: In-Depth Interviews with Advanced Law and MBA Students." *Sociological Quarterly* 44: 451-480. **JSTOR**

Birch, Maxine, and Tina Miller. 2000. "Inviting Intimacy: The Interview As Therapeutic Opportunity." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 3: 189-202. **Google Scholar**

Paulus, Trena, Megan Woods, David P. Atkins, and Rob Macklin. 2017. "The discourse of QDAS: Reporting practices of ATLAS.ti and NVivo users with implications for best practices." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 20: 35-47. **Google Scholar**

Methodological Evaluation due **March 5** of:

Merriman, Ben. 2017. "The Editorial Meeting at a Little Magazine: An Ethnography of Group Judgment." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 46: 440-463. **Google Scholar**

March 7 – Selected Critical Assessments of In-Depth 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**

PART IV – COMPLEXITIES OF CASE SELECTION

>>Week 8, Mar 12-14 – Sampling/Case Selection

March 12 – The Concept and Logic of Sampling/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.

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

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**

Methodological Evaluation due **March 12** of:

Mullen, Ann L. 2009. “Elite Destinations: Pathways to Attending an Ivy League University.” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 30: 15-27. **Google Scholar**

March 14 – Whether and When Sampling/Case Selection Goes Awry

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

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. 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**

Sykes, Bryan, Anjuli Verma, and Black Hawk Hancock. 2018. “Aligning sampling and case selection in quantitative-qualitative research designs: Establishing generalizability limits in mixed-methods studies.” *Ethnography* 19: 227-253. **Google Scholar**

PART IV – ADVANCED CHALLENGES

>> Week 9, Mar 19-21 – Identification

March 19 – The Concept of Identification

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**

Glenn, Norval D. 2003. "Distinguishing Age, Period, and Cohort Effects." *Handbook of the Life Course* VI, A, 465-476. **Google Scholar**

LITERATURE REVIEW SECTION DUE MARCH 19 (S/U)*

March 21 – Selected Slightly More Complex Identification Challenges

Manski, Charles F. 1995. "The Reflection Problem," pp. 127-136 in *Identification Problems in the Social Sciences*, by Charles F. Manski. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **READER**

Uecker, Jeremy E. 2015. "Social context and sexual intercourse among first-year students at selective colleges and universities in the United States." *Social Science Research* 52: 59-71. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R., Phillip N. Fucella, and Mark Berends. 2011. "A Neo-Classical Education Transitions Approach: A Corrected Tale for Three Cohorts." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 29: 263-285. **Google Scholar**

>>Spring Break Week, March 26-28

>> Week 11, Apr 2-4 – Missing Data & Causality I

April 2 – Missing Data

Allison, Paul D. 2002. *Missing Data*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lewis, Jonathan. 1991. "When We Generalize or Compare, Can We Always Rely on the 'Absence of Evidence'? A Sociologist Looks at Historical Methodology." *The History Teacher* 24: 455-469. **JSTOR**

Kossinets, Gueorgi. 2006. "Effects of Missing Data in Social Networks." *Social Networks* 28: 247-268. **Google Scholar**

April 4 – Counterfactual Framework for Causal Inference

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

>> Week 11, Apr 9-11 -- Causality II & Approaches Less Commonly Used in Sociology, I

April 9 – Causal Symmetry, Asymmetry, and Its Establishment

Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. “Asymmetrical Forms of Causation,” pp. 63-87 in *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*, by Stanley Lieberson. Berkeley: University of California Press. **READER**

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. **READER**

George Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. “Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation,” pp. 205-233 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. **READER**

April 11 – Less Common Approaches I: Case Control Studies and Propensity Score Matching

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

Manski, Charles F. 1995. “Response-Based Sampling,” pp. 73-87 in *Identification Problems in the Social Sciences*, by Charles F. Manski. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **READER**

Rosenbaum, Paul R., and Donald B. Rubin. 1983. “The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects.” *Biometrika* 70: 41-55. **Google Scholar**

Caliendo, Marco, and Sabine Kopeinig. 2008. “Some Practical Guidance for the Implementation of Propensity Score Matching.” *Journal of Economic Surveys* 22: 31-72. **Google Scholar**

Winkelmayer, Wolfgang C., and Tobias Kurth. 2004. “Propensity Scores: Help or Hype?” *Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation* 19: 1671-1673. **Google Scholar**

>>Week 12, Apr 16-18 – Approaches Less Commonly Used in Sociology II & Additional Considerations

April 16 – Less Common Approaches II: Bayesian Analysis

Lucas, Samuel R. 2012. "The Road to Hell . . . : The *Statistics Proposal* as Final Solution to the Sovereign's Human Rights Question." *Wisconsin International Law Journal* 30: 259-343. **Google Scholar**

Lilford, R. J., and D. Braunholtz. 1996. "The statistical basis of public policy: a paradigm shift is overdue." *BMJ* 313: 603. <http://www.bmj.com/content/313/7057/603.full>

Western, Bruce. 2001. "Bayesian Thinking about Macrosociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 107: 353-378. **JSTOR**

April 18 –

No Reading

METHODS SECTION DUE APRIL 18 (S/U)*

>>Week 13, Apr 23-25 – Approaches Less Commonly Used in Sociology III & IV

April 23 – Less Common Approaches III: Formal (Mathematical, as Distinct from Quantitative) Analysis

Edling, Christopher R. 2002. "Mathematics in Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 197-220. **JSTOR**

Breen, Richard, and John H. Goldthorpe. 1997. "Explaining Educational Differentials: Towards a Formal Rational Action Theory." *Rationality and Society* 9: 275-305. **Google Scholar**

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

April 25 – Less Common Approaches IV: Agent-Based Models

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

Macal, Charles M., and Michael J. North. 2010. "Tutorial on agent-based modelling and simulation." *Journal of Simulation* 4: 151-162. **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**

Bruch, Elizabeth E., and Robert D. Mare. 2006. "Neighborhood Choice and Neighborhood Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 112: 667-709. **JSTOR**

PART VI—ETHICS

>>Week 14, Apr 30-May 2 – Approaches Less Commonly Used in Sociology V & Ethics

April 30 – Less Common Approaches V: Fuzzy Set Social Science

Ragin, Charles C., and Paul Pennings. 2005. "Fuzzy Sets and Social Research." *Sociological Methods and Research* 33: 423-430. **Google Scholar**

Ragin, Charles C., and Benoît Rihoux. 2004. "Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA): State of the Art and Prospects." *Qualitative Methods* 2: 3-13. **Google Scholar**

Ragin, Charles C. 2006. "The Limitations of Net-Effects Thinking," pp. 13-41 in *Innovative Comparative Methods for Policy Analysis: Beyond the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide*, edited by Benoît Rihoux and Heike Grimm. New York, NY: Springer. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R., and Alisa Szatrowski. 2014. "Qualitative Comparative Analysis in Critical Perspective." *Sociological Methodology* 44: 1-79. **Google Scholar**

Ragin, Charles C. 2014. "Comment: Lucas and Szatrowski in critical perspective." *Sociological Methodology* 44: 80-94. **Google Scholar**

Lucas, Samuel R. 2014. "Rejoinder—Taking Heat and Giving Light: Reflections on the Early Reception of 'Qualitative Comparative Analysis in Critical Perspective'." *Sociological Methodology* 44: 127-158. **Google Scholar**

May 2 – 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 2004 595: 249-263. **Google Scholar**

De Vries, Melissa S. Anderson, and Brian C. Martinson. 2006. "Normal Misbehavior: Scientists Talk About the Ethics of Research." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics* 1: 43-50. **Google Scholar**

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

>>Week 15, May 7-9 – Wrap-Up

May 7 – Presentations

No Reading: Student Presentations of Research Question and Method

May 9 – Wrap-up

No Reading: Thematic Discussion

>>Week 16, May 13 – Final Proposal due*