

Sociology 271A  
Methods of Sociological Research

Fall 2011 – Tuesday-Thursday, 10am-noon, 402 Barrows

Professor Samuel R. Lucas

Office: 438 Barrows Hall

Phone: 642-4765 or 642-4766

E-mail address: [lucas@demog.berkeley.edu](mailto:lucas@demog.berkeley.edu)

Office hours: Tuesdays, 1:30-3:30pm (**but check web-site for updates**)

Home-page: <http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/lucas/>

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 the identification of principles as fundamental is arbitrary. 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 teaching a language 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 saddened 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 lead 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		Sep 1
Methodological Evaluation, Aronson, et. al. 1998		X	Sep 13
Methodological Evaluation, Hamilton, Cheng, and Powell 2007		X	Sep 20
Methodological Evaluation, Morgan and Prasad 2009		X	Sep 27
Methodological Evaluation, Kellogg 2004		X	Oct 4
Methodological Evaluation of Bell & Hartmann 2007 <i>or</i>		X	Oct 11
Methodological Evaluation, Loury 1992			
Literature Review Section	X		Oct 18
<b>Methods Section</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>Nov 10</b>
Final Proposal	X		Dec 12

#### 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, 2560 Bancroft. 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.

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 Carmines and Zeller will be discussed August 30, Campbell and Stanley will be discussed September 1, and Converse and Presser will be discussed September 13. These are the first three books we will discuss, and they are needed fairly early, such that one should not delay in ordering them. Except for the 7 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 will have to 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 25 – Introduction**

#### **August 25 -- Introduction: Basics and Purposes of Research**

Vaupel, James W., and Anatoli I. Yashin. 1985. "Heterogeneity's Ruses: Some Surprising Effects of Selection on Population Dynamics." *American Statistician* 39: 176-185. **JSTOR**

### **PART II – FOUNDATIONAL PRINCIPLES**

#### **>> Week 2, Aug 30 - Sep 1 – Measurement, Reliability, and Validity**

#### **August 30 – 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**

#### **September 1 – Measurement**

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

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

Rossi, Giovanni Battista. 2009. "Cross-disciplinary concepts and terms in measurement." *Measurement* 42: 1288-1296. **Google Scholar**

Harvey, Robert J., and Allen L. Hammer. 1999. "Item Response Theory." *The Counseling Psychologist* 27:353-383. **OskiCat**

**EMPIRICAL RESEARCH QUESTION DUE SEPTEMBER 1 (S/U)\***

### PART III – BASIC DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

#### >> Week 3, Sep 6-8 – Experiments and Quasi-Experiments

##### September 6 – 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 8 – 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**

Correll, Shelley J., Stephen Benard, and In Paik. 2003. "Getting a Job: Is There a Motherhood Penalty?" *American Journal of Sociology* 112: 1297-1338. **OskiCat**

#### >> Week 4, Sep 13-15 – Survey Research

##### September 13 – Survey Research

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

Bodovskia, Katerina, and George Farkas. 2008. "'Concerted Cultivation' and Unequal Achievement in Elementary School." *Social Science Research* 37: 903-919. **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 **September 13** 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**

### **September 15 – 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. **Google Scholar**

### **>> Week 5, Sep 20-22 – Comparative/Historical Research**

#### **September 20 – 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 **September 20** of:

Hamilton, Laura, Simon Cheng, and Brian Powell. 2007. “Adoptive Parents, Adaptive Parents: Evaluating the Importance of Biological Ties for Parental Investment.” *American Sociological Review* 72: 95-116. **JSTOR**

#### **September 22 – 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**

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

Bollen, Kenneth A., Barbara Entwisle, and Arthur S. Alderson. 1993. "Macrocomparative Research Methods." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19: 321-351. **JSTOR**

## >> **Week 6, Sep 27-29 – Ethnographic Research**

### **September 27 – 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. **Google Scholar**

Methodological evaluation due **September 27** of:

Morgan, Kimberly J., and Monica Prasad. 2009. "The Origins of Tax Systems: A French-American Comparison." *American Journal of Sociology* 114: 1350-1394. **JSTOR**

### **September 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**

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, Oct 4-6 – In-Depth Interviewing and Formal Analysis**

### **October 4 – 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**
- Mullen, Ann L. 2009. "Elite Destinations: Pathways to Attending an Ivy League University." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 30: 15-27. **Google Scholar**
- Birch, Maxine, and Tina Miller. 2000. "Inviting Intimacy: The Interview As Therapeutic Opportunity." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 3: 189-202. **Google Scholar**
- Smit, Brigitte. 2002. "Atlas.ti for Qualitative Data Analysis." *Perspectives in Education* 20: 65-76. **Google Scholar**
- Methodological Evaluation due **October 4** of:  
 Kellogg, Katherine C. 2009. "Operating Room: Relational Spaces and Microinstitutional Change in Surgery." *American Journal of Sociology* 115: 657-711. **JSTOR**
- October 6 – Formal Analysis**
- Freese, Lee. 1980. "Formal Theorizing." *Annual Review of Sociology* 6: 187-212. **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**

## **PART IV – COMPLEXITIES OF CASE SELECTION**

### **>>Week 8, Oct 11-13 – Sampling**

#### **October 11 – The Concept and Logic of Sampling**

- 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**
- Stephan, Frederick F. 1939. "Representative Sampling in Large-Scale Surveys." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 34: 343-352. **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**

Methodological Evaluation due **October 11** of:

Bell, Joyce M., and Douglas Hartmann. 2007. "Diversity in Everyday Discourse: The Cultural Ambiguities and Consequences of 'Happy Talk'." *American Sociological Review* 72: 895-914. **JSTOR**

or

Loury, Glenn C. 1992. "Incentive Effects of Affirmative Action." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 523: 19-29. **JSTOR**

### **October 13 – Whether and When Sampling Goes Awry**

Luborsky, Mark R., and Robert L. Rubinstein. 1995. "Sampling in Qualitative Research: Rationale, Issues, and Methods." *Research on Aging* 17: 89-113. **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**

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. **OskiCat**

## **PART IV – ADVANCED CHALLENGES**

>> **Week 9, Oct 18-20 – Causality**

### **October 18 – Counter-factual Framework for Causal Inference**

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

**LITERATURE REVIEW SECTION DUE OCTOBER 18 (S/U)\***

### **October 20 – 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 Lieberman. 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**

## >> Week 10, Oct 25-27 – Identification

### October 25 – Identification as a General Concept

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**

### October 27 – 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**

Paxton, Pamela Marie. 2007. "Association Memberships and Generalized Trust: A Multilevel Model Across 31 Countries." *Social Forces* 86: 47-76. **Google Scholar**

Carter, D.S.G., C. Bennetts, and S.M. Carter. 2003. "'We're Not Sheep': Illuminating the Nature of the Adolescent Peer Group in Effecting Lifestyle Choice." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 24: 225-241. **JSTOR**

## >> Week 11, Nov 1-3 -- Approaches Less Commonly Used in Sociology I

### November 1 – 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**

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**

### **November 3 – Bayesian Analysis**

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**

Lucas, Samuel R. In Press. "The Road to Hell . . . : The *Statistics Proposal* as Final Solution to the Sovereign's Human Rights Question." *Wisconsin International Law Journal*.

### **>>Week 12, Nov 8-10 – Frontiers and Information**

#### **November 8 – 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**

#### **November 10 –**

#### **METHODS SECTION DUE NOVEMBER 10 (S/U)\***

### **>>Week 13, Nov 15-17 – Approaches Less Commonly Used in Sociology II**

#### **November 15 – 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**

Lieberson, Stanley. 2004. "Comments on the Use and Utility of QCA." *Qualitative Methods* 2: 13-14. **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 Benoit Rihoux and Heike Grimm. New York, NY: Springer. **Google Scholar**

Seawright, Jason. 2005. "Qualitative Comparative Analysis vis-à-vis Regression." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 40: 3-26. **Google Scholar**

### **November 17 – Multiplicity? Reflexivity? Duality? Power?**

Burawoy, Michael. 1998. "The Extended Case Method." *Sociological Theory* 16: 4-33. **JSTOR**

Brieger, Ronald L. 2002. "Writing (and Quantifying) Sociology," pp. 90-112 in *Writing and Revising the Disciplines*, edited by Jonathan Moore. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. **READER**

Lucas, Samuel Roundfield. 2008. "Experiential Realities and Public Contestation," pp. 23-52 in *Theorizing Discrimination in an Era of Contested Prejudice*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press. **READER**

## **PART VI—ETHICS**

### **>>Week 14, Nov 22 – Ethical Principles**

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, Nov 29-Dec 1 – Practical Ethics and Wrap-Up**

**November 29 – Practical Ethics**

No Reading.

**December 1 – Wrap Up**

No Reading.

**>>Week 17, Dec 12 – Final Proposal due\***