

Sociology 271A – Introduction to Methods of Sociological Research
Fall 2023 – Tuesday-Thursday, 10am-12noon – 420 Social Sciences Building

Professor Samuel R. Lucas
Office: 438 Social Sciences Building
Phone: 642-4765 or 642-4766
E-mail address: lucas@berkeley.edu
Office hours: Mondays 8:00-10:00am
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. 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 2 powerpoint slides on your project two days before the feedback process begins.

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 (*) 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 what the author(s) should have done while using the *same* method.

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 5
Design Review, Experiment		X	Sep 12
Design Review, Survey Research		X	Sep 26
Design Review, Qualitative Interviewing		X	Oct 10
The Case for Your Study	X		Oct 17
Design Review, Ethnography		X	Oct 24
Design Review, Comparative Historical		X	Nov 7
Methods Section	X		Nov 21
2 Slide Assignment (1=Question, 1=Method)	X		Dec 3 (Sunday)
Final Proposal	X		Dec 11

Deadlines

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

Texts

A few works are available in a **COURSEPACK** 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 rent the coursepack you will have access to the material for awhile, after which you will lose access to any mark-ups you may have made to your electronic copy.

In addition, the following eight books are required. The six marked **UC Library Search** were

supposed to be available in electronic form through the library web-site. Unfortunately, something seems glitchy. So I placed all of six of them at the Cal Student Store. The other two, marked **BOOK** in the syllabus, are not available in the library. They can be purchased at the Cal Student Store bookstore, Amazon.com, some other online source, or directly from the publisher:

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

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

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

Goffman, Alice. 2014. *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. **BOOK**

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

Kalton, Graham. 2021. *Introduction to Survey Sampling, second edition*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. **UC Library Search**

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

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). **BOOK**

For all other non-book material, some can be accessed via **Google Scholar**, some via **JSTOR**, and some by using **UC Library Search**, the University database of materials. You will find a source in bold after each citation in the syllabus.

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 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 24 – Introduction

August 24 -- Introduction: Basics and Purposes of Research

PART II – FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES

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

August 29 – Measurement

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

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

August 31 – Reliability and Validity

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

Goodwin, Laura D., and William L. Goodwin. 1984. "Are Validity and Reliability 'Relevant' in Qualitative Evaluation Research?." *Evaluation & the Health Professions* 7: 413-426. **Google Scholar**

PART III – BASIC DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS AND RELATED ISSUES

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

September 5 – Design of Experiments and Threats to Proper Inference

Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Pages 1-27, 34-42, and 61-64. **COURSEPACK**

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH QUESTION DUE SEPTEMBER 5 (S/U)*

September 7 – Examples of Experiments

Steele, Claude M., and Joshua Aronson. 1995. "Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test

Performance of African Americans." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69: 797-811. **Google Scholar**

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

Agan, Amanda, and Sonja Starr. 2018. "Ban the box, criminal records, and racial discrimination: A field experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133: 191-235. **Google Scholar**

Calnitsky, David, and Pilar Gonalons-Pons. 2021. "The Impact of an Experimental Guaranteed Income on Crime and Violence." *Social Problems* 68: 778-798. **Google Scholar**

>> Week 4, Sep 12-14 – Survey Research

September 12 – Survey Research

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

Lanuza, Yader R. 2020. "Giving (Money) Back To Parents: Racial/Ethnic and Immigrant–Native Variation in Monetary Exchanges During the Transition to Adulthood." *Sociological Forum* 35: 1157-1182. **Google Scholar**

Design Review due **September 12** of: Experiment

Quadlin, Natasha. 2018. "The Mark of a Woman's Record: Gender and Academic Performance in Hiring." *American Sociological Review* 83: 331-360. **Google Scholar**

September 14 – Selected Issues in Survey Research

Thomas, Kyla. 2022. "The psychology of distinction: How cultural tastes shape perceptions of class and competence in the US." *Poetics* 93: 101669. **Google Scholar**

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**

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**

Fronstin, Paul. 2000. "Counting the uninsured: a comparison of national surveys." Available at SSRN 258302 (2000). **Google Scholar**

>> Week 5, Sep 19-21 – Survey Research Critique & Case Selection

September 19 – 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. **UC Library Search**

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**

September 21 – Case Selection and Inference

Kalton, Graham. 2021. *Introduction to Survey Sampling, second edition*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. (Pp 1-83; 91-95, aka Chapters 1-8 and Chapter 10) **UC Library Search**

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

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

>> Week 6, Sep 26-28 – Qualitative Interviewing

September 26 – 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). **BOOK**

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 **September 26** of: Survey Research

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

September 28 – 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. **UC Library Search**

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. **UC Library Search**

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. **UC Library Search**

Gibbs, Graham R. 2014. "Using Software in Qualitative Analysis," pp. 277-294 in *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*, edited by Uwe Flick. New York, NY: Sage Publications. **UC Library Search**

>> Week 7, Oct 3 - 5 – Critique of Qualitative Interviewing & Research Ethics

October 3 – Critique 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**

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**

October 5 – Research 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**

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

>> Week 8, Oct 10-12 – Ethnography

October 10 – Ethnographic Research

Goffman, Alice. 2014. *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. **BOOK**

Design Review due October 10 of: Qualitative Interviewing

Askelson, Natoshia M., Cristian Meier, Barbara Baquero, Julia Friberg, Doris Montgomery, and Christine Hradek. 2018. "Understanding the Process of Prioritizing Fruit and Vegetable Purchases in Families with Low Incomes: 'A Peach May Not Fill You up as Much as Hamburger'." *Health Education & Behavior* 45: 817-823. **JSTOR**

October 12 – Selected Varieties and Challenges of Ethnography

Lefkowich, Maya. 2019. "When Women Study Men: Gendered Implications for Qualitative Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 18: 1609406919872388. **Google Scholar**

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**

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

>> Week 9, Oct 17-19 – Critical Assessments of Ethnography & Introduction to Causality

October 17 – 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**

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

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

Zussman, Robert. 2016. "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland: On the Run and Its Critics: Alice Goffman, *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014. \$25.00. 288 pp. ISBN: 978-0,226,136,714." *Society* 53: 436-443. **Google Scholar**

Burawoy, Michael. 2019. "Empiricism and its fallacies." *Contexts* 18: 47-53. **Google Scholar**

THE CASE FOR YOUR STUDY SECTION DUE OCTOBER 17 (S/U)*

October 19 – Causality: An Introduction

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. **UC Library Search**

Manski, Charles F. 2006. "Preface," pp. xiii-xiv in *Identification Problems in the Social Sciences, Revised Edition*, by Charles F. Manski. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **COURSEPACK**

Manski, Charles F. 2006. "Introduction," Excerpt, pp. 1-8 in *Identification Problems in the Social Sciences, Revised Edition*, by Charles F. Manski. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. **COURSEPACK**

Holland, Paul W. 1986. "Statistics and Causal Inference." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 396: 945-960. **JSTOR**

>> Week 10, Oct 24-26 – Comparative/Historical Research

October 24 – Comparative/Historical Research & Collecting Archival Data

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

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

Design Review due **October 24** of: Ethnography

Frost, Jacqui. 2023. "Ritualizing Nonreligion: Cultivating Rational Rituals in Secular Spaces." *Social Forces* 104: 2013-2033. **Google Scholar**

October 26 – 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**

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

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

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 10, Oct 31 - Nov 2 – Critique of Comparative Historical Methods & Clarifying Case Selection

October 31 – 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**

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. **COURSEPACK**

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**

November 2 – Clarifying Case Selection

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

Kalton, Graham. 2021. *Introduction to Survey Sampling, second edition*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. (Pp 117-121; 135-146 aka Chapter 13 and Chapter 15) **UC Library Search**

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**

>> **Week 11, Nov 7-9 – Creativity in Case Selection & Missing Data**

November 7 – Creativity in Case Selection

Goel, Sharad, and Matthew J. Salganik. 2010. "Assessing respondent-driven sampling." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107: 6743-6747. **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**

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

Larson, Reed and Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi. 2014. "The experience sampling method," pp. 21-34 in *Flow and the Foundations of Positive Psychology: The Collected Works of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi*. Dordrecht: Springer **UC Library Search**

Design Review due **November 7** of: Comparative/Historical
Knight, Carly R. In press. "Classifying the corporation: the role of naturalizing analogies in American corporate development, 1870–1930." *Socio-Economic Review*
Google Scholar

November 9 – Missing Data

Kalton, Graham. 2021. *Introduction to Survey Sampling, second edition*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications. (Pp 85-89; 97-105 aka Chapter 9 and Chapter 11) **UC Library Search**

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

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**

>> **Week 11, Nov 14-16 – Two “New” Methodological Contributions**

November 14 – The Graphical Causal Model

Rohrer, Julia M. 2018. "Thinking Clearly About Correlations and Causation: Graphical Causal Models for Observational Data." *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science* 1: 27-42. **Google Scholar**

November 16 – Qualitative Comparative Analysis: A Cautionary Tale

Ragin, Charles C. 2008. *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Pp. 1-43; 71-84; 124-144) **COURSEPACK**

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**

Bowers, Jake. 2014. "Comment: Method Games—A Proposal for Assessing and Learning about Methods." *Sociological Methodology* 44: 112-117. **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**

PART IV – BRINGING IT ALL TOGETHER

>>Week 13, Nov 21-23 – Synthesizing Methods

November 21 – Synthesizing Methods

METHODS SECTION DUE NOVEMBER 21 (S/U)*

November 23 – THANKSGIVING

>> Week 14, Nov 28-30 – Selected Less Common Methods & A Look Back at “the” Qualitative/Quantitative Divide

November 28 – Four Less Common but Powerfully Illuminating Methods/Perspectives

One

Setia, Maninder Singh. 2016. "Methodology Series Module 2: Case-control Studies." *Indian Journal of Dermatology* 61: 146-151. **UC Library Search**

Two

Ferreira, David, Mael Barthoulot, Julien Pottecher, Klaus D. Torp, Pierre Diemunsch, and Nicolas Meyer. 2020. "Theory and practical use of Bayesian methods in interpreting clinical trial data: a narrative review." *British Journal of Anaesthesia* 125: 201-207.
Google Scholar

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

Three

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**

Four

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

November 30 – A Look Back at “the” Qualitative/Quantitative Divide: Fundamentally Different Approaches, or Essentially the Same?

Reichardt, Charles S. and Thomas D. Cook. 1979. "Beyond Qualitative *Versus* Quantitative Methods," pp. 7-32 in *Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research*, edited by Thomas D. Cook and Charles S. Reichardt. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
COURSEPACK

Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Political Analysis* 14: 227-249. **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 15, Dec 5-7 – Wrap-Up

Sunday, December 3 – 2 SLIDE ASSIGNMENT DUE (TO ALL) 11:59PM DECEMBER 3 (S/U)*

December 5 – Student Presentations Part I & Wrap-up Part I

Reading–Peers' 2 Slide Assignments

December 7 – Student Presentations Part II & Wrap-up Part II

No Reading: Thematic Discussion

>>Week 16, December 11 – Final Proposal due