

**Sociology 750 – Research Design and Practice in Sociology**  
**Spring 2005**

**TR 9:30-10:45, Social Science 6116**

**Jeremy Freese**  
**8105 Social Science**

**Office Hours:** Tuesday 11-1 (or by appt.)

**Office Phone:** 262-1217

**e-mail:** [jfreese@ssc.wisc.edu](mailto:jfreese@ssc.wisc.edu)

**Web:** [www.ssc.wisc.edu/~jfreese/soc750.htm](http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~jfreese/soc750.htm)

*“Method’ has to do, first of all, with how to ask and answer questions with some assurance that the answers are more or less durable. ‘Theory’ has to do, above all, with paying close attention to the words one is using, especially their degree of generality and their logical relations. The primary purpose of both is clarity of conception and economy of procedure, and most importantly just now, the release rather than the restriction of the sociological imagination.”*

— C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*, 1959

*"The responsibility of the intellectual is to tell the truth and expose lies."*

— Noam Chomsky, "The Responsibility of the Intellectual," 1967

*"I've learned more from the readings listed in your syllabus than I did in my two graduate methods courses at [other Ph.D. sociology program]."*

— e-mail sent to your instructor from someone who found a previous syllabus on the web, 12/5/2003

## **PREREQUISITES**

An introductory course in social research methods and a course in statistics that provided extensive coverage of the linear regression model.

## **OFFICIAL COURSE DESCRIPTION** (date of composition unknown)

Application of scientific methods to the analysis of social phenomena; methodological orientations in sociology; types of research procedure; nature of sociological variables; lectures and lab. [mercifully, there will be no lab]

## **OVERVIEW**

Talk to people in graduate sociology departments around the country and you will find that a required course in research “methods” is often among the least popular offerings of the graduate curriculum. This is lamentable if you believe that good research practices have some association with good empirical work and that good empirical work has some association with the continued vitality of our discipline. Fortunately for you, however, 750 will be a course you adore, its meetings will serve as cherished highlights of your forthcoming semester, and it will revitalize any flagging enthusiasm you may have about being in graduate school. Or, at least, this is the boundless optimism with which I always try to begin.

The course will survey major research designs and research techniques that provide the core of contemporary empirical inquiry into social phenomena. The “methods” of the course title are practices toward offering descriptions and drawing inferences about human life from observations of it, and much of the course will involve discussions of three themes: inferences about how phenomena are related (implying much consideration of causality), inferences from a part to a whole (implying much consideration of sampling), and generating appropriate representations of phenomena (implying much consideration of

conceptualization and measurement). The extant research strategies used by sociologists are extraordinarily diverse—which is fitting given the extraordinary diversity of the research questions sociologists pursue—and the course will attempt to provide an appreciation of this diversity. Among the specific methodologies of which at least a spoonful will be served at the 750 feast are experiments, quasi-experiments, surveys, quantitative analysis of archival materials, meta-analysis, ethnography, in-depth interviews, historical methods, the analysis of texts, and the analysis of interactional data. Although your instructor personally has an aversion to talking about the “unity of method”—or, worse, the “unity of science”—the course emphasizes fundamental principles and logic disciplining research design. This is much more a theoretical course than an applied one, even though plenty of practical examples will be discussed in the readings and in class.

This will consider both some basic general issues of method and some issues regarding specific methods that your instructor believes comprise important things for you to encounter somewhere, sometime in your graduate training (even should your own intellectual pursuits lead you down entirely different sociological avenues). Importantly: *This course is most emphatically not intended as a substitute for the more specialized methodological training that successful dissertations typically demand.* Just in case the italics are insufficient to drive this point home, let me repeat: *This course is most emphatically not intended as a substitute for the more specialized methodological training that successful dissertations typically demand.* As things go, one might end up finding it difficult securing optimal specialized training over the course of one’s studies; however blame might be assigned for such regrettable deficiencies, it cannot be laid at the door of this course, as such specialized training is *not* (once again) what this course is intended to provide.

More generally, your instructor wishes to express his passionate belief that gaining command of the methods of social inquiry—both as producer and consumer—is a continual, open-ended project. He is quickly exasperated by those who embark on the course with the idea that they presently know nothing about methods and they will finish the course having learned all they need to know. Developing good research sense does not work like that.

## **COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

Grades for the course will be based on student performances on exercises (60%), weekly reactions (30%), and class attendance/participation/manifested conscientiousness (10%). One should expect the final overall distribution of student grades for the course to resemble that of other required graduate courses.

### ***Exercises***

There will be several written exercises over the course of the semester, which will provide opportunities for you to further develop and articulate your thinking about methodological considerations, including as they pertain to the research you personally plan to pursue. By far the most important of these will be a final exercise in which you are asked to describe a research project of your own and reflect at length about it (details to follow)

Written exercises will all have a specified word or sentence count to which you must adhere; you might think this overly constraining and you are right—but I believe that it is good training since much of your subsequent writing (although not syllabi!) will be constrained by strict word counts. Late work not cleared with me in advance will either be penalized or not accepted.

**Turning exercises in.** Written exercises will be submitted to me via electronic mail (jfreese@ssc.wisc.edu). You should already know how to send documents as attachments as well as just as text in the body of an e-mail message. Details on the preferred format for submitting exercises will be provided. If asked to provide an assignment as an attachment, please send it in Microsoft Word regular (.doc) or rich text format (.rtf), with a filename that includes *your* surname (e.g., smith\_ex3.doc; filenames like 750\_ex3.doc or freese\_ex3 are spectacularly unhelpful).

**Overall exercise grade.** Exercises will either be graded using standard letter grades or (for some low weighted assignments) an analogue of the OK grading system that will be used for Weekly Reactions. A weighted average of all your exercise grades will be used to provide a cumulative exercise grade for the course. Except for your final project, each exercise will have a weight of 1-4 points, with the # of points intendedly based on how demanding the exercise seems in terms of estimates about the amount of time it will take to do and the intellectual energy required.

### ***Exemplar reaction papers***

One goal of the course is to promote exposure to (some of) the extraordinary diversity of research methods used by sociologists. Chief among the ways in which this specific goal will be pursued is through a Weekly Research Exemplar<sup>1</sup> drawn from the annals of articles that have the imprimatur of validated sociology—that is, those that have appeared in one of the discipline’s two flagship journals, *American Sociological Review* [ASR] or *American Journal of Sociology* [AJS]. (Articles written by anyone presently employed by UW were excluded from consideration.) The articles included have been deliberately selected for their methodological diversity and with little consideration of their substantive particulars. We will spend the first 15 to 30 minutes of each Tuesday class discussing the Weekly Exemplar.

One of your assigned tasks for this course is to provide written Reactions to the weekly readings. You are not required to do these every week (see below). These Reactions should be between 300 and 500 words (or so), and they should focus on the research conducted in the paper (reasonably broadly construed). *You should write your Reaction presuming that I have also read the paper.*

***Some ideas for what you can write about.*** Your Reactions might consider, among other possibilities: (1) things you found praiseworthy about what the researchers did; (2) things you thought the researchers might/should have done differently; (3) things you thought the authors were mistaken about; (4) things that you see as advantages and limitations to the kind of data the researchers used; (5) things the researchers did that confused you; (6) things about how the research was conducted that you wished they had talked more about; (7) ways the authors might extend their research; (8) connections between the research discussed in the article and things discussed in class/other readings; (9) specific connections between the research discussed in the article and things you think should be considered in class/other readings; (10) questions the research raised for you about how research is conducted more generally; (11) reactions the paper inspired for how you think about some kind of research more generally; (12) ways the paper did or did not exemplify things you see as strengths and weaknesses of its kind of research.

Your Reactions can take the form of a few enumerated points rather than a single, flowing narrative. *Your Reactions should evince that you have thoughtfully read the paper.*

***Due date/time of Reactions.*** Reactions are due at the stroke of 9PM (8:59:59.999...) on the Monday before the Tuesday class in which that reading is assigned. This is so that I will be able to read the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Exemplar*, here, is intended in terms of its sense as example of a type, not necessarily in its alternate sense of a model to be imitated (as the worthiness of the paper as a model is something for you to consider as you read it).

Reactions prior to that day's class. Late assignments will be penalized (see note on grading below).

**Format of reactions.** Reactions should be e-mailed to your instructor at [jfreese@ssc.wisc.edu](mailto:jfreese@ssc.wisc.edu). Reactions should be sent *in the body of the message, not as an attachment*, and with the subject line "Weekly Reaction." If your e-mail address is something like [purplejellybean@aol.com](mailto:purplejellybean@aol.com), your name must be evident from either the header or body of the e-mail. Failure to submit your Reaction according to these not-at-all-unreasonable formatting guidelines will result in a 1 point deduction in your grade.

**Grading.** Reactions will be scored as follows: 5 points – reserved for instances of seemingly exceptionally conscientious or insightful engagement of article; 4 – good job; *this will be the default and massively modal grade for a solidly done reaction*; your instructor will not have much interest in explaining why an assignment received a "4" instead of a "5"; 3 – Reaction did not evince engagement with the methods of the article at quite the expected level; 2 – worth partial credit, but a superficial or otherwise inadequate reaction. Reactions may be turned in late, but will be penalized and will (frankly) not be graded with any haste. **Penalties:** 1 point of credit will be deducted for work that is turned in after the time of grading but before class; 2 points of credit will be deducted for work turned after class but later in that same week. Overall grades for the course will be determined according to the following scale: 43 points and above – A; 39-42 points – A/AB; 35-38 points – AB; 31-34 points – B; 27-30 points – BC; below 27 points – something below a BC.

**Additional note:** Excerpts from your Reactions may be distributed to the class, with props to you.

### ***Stern paragraph about academic integrity and propriety***

(Your instructor recognizes that this paragraph is likely unnecessary, but, just in case, he wishes to be extremely clear about his policy.) Section 14.03 of the University of Wisconsin System Administrative Code defines academic misconduct as "an act in which a student: (a) seeks to claim credit for the work or efforts of another without authorization or citation; (b) uses unauthorized materials or fabricated data in any academic exercise; (c) forges or falsifies academic documents or records; (d) intentionally impedes or damages the academic work of others; (e) engages in conduct aimed at making false representation of a student's academic performance; (f) assists other students in any of these acts." If you have any questions about what constitutes academic misconduct generally, you must consult <http://www.wisc.edu/students/amsum.htm> before proceeding in this course. Lack of familiarity with these rules in no way constitutes an excuse for acts of misconduct. Any instance of cheating, plagiarism, or other misconduct will be dealt with strictly according to University policy, and the penalties recommended to the Dean of Students will be severe.

### ***Readings***

A reading list for the course is included at the end of this syllabus. You will note that the reading list is very long; moreover, amendments to this list may be made over the duration of our semester together. Many of the readings are included as supplemental readings (denoted by the leisurely symbol ☞). Some of these are readings which will find their way into lectures; others are articles/books that I believe are interesting or provocative and cannot resist sharing at least the reference with you. In this regard, the appended list is as much a bibliography as reading list, and should not freak anyone out.

Other readings have a designation as primary readings (denoted by the more imperative ☞). Except for the Weekly Exemplars, such designations are meant to urge but not insist. If you feel like you are not getting anything out of a particular topical reading except psychic pain, do not feel obliged to soldier ahead out of some sense of 750 duty.

All of the primary readings, and many of the supplemental ones, are available on the web (denoted by the symbol ) through the Social Science Reference Library.

### ***Attendance***

If you not going to be able to attend, it would be courteous of you to e-mail me to let me know. The instructor reserves and will likely exercise the right to reduce the grades of students with inadequate attendance. Of course, so as not to distract your colleagues and instructor, appropriately professional behavior—e.g., not passing notes, not falling asleep, not playing Spider solitaire on your laptop, not continually glaring at me with maniacal hatred, etc., etc.—is expected.

### **SCHEDULE OF EXERCISES**

<b>#</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Due</b>
1	Describe instance of instructive research	2	February 10
2	Design an experiment	4	March 3
3	Causal inference in observational studies	3	March 10
4	Brief description of final project	--	March 17
5	Research ethics	1	March 31
6	Book review	3	April 7
7	Toy exercise on sampling	2	April 21
8	Project description	10	May 10

*Note:* As with everything else on this syllabus, this list of exercises is potentially subject to revision. Any exercises added to the above list will be small.

## SCHEDULE OF TOPICS

Dates	Topic	Single Sentence Preview
<b>Week 1</b> – Jan 18 & 20	Salutations and orienting remarks	
<b>Week 2</b> – Jan 25 & 27	Prefatory	Amidst the various philosophical issues that typically preface considerations of social science methodology, there are some serious exercises for the sociological imagination afoot.
<b>Week 3</b> – Feb 1 & 3	Causal relationships, basics	The empirical justification for causal claims in social research is almost always based on some kind of comparison.
<b>Week 4</b> – Feb 8 & 10	Causal relationships, complexities	The plausible complexity of actual causal relationships in the social world can very quickly outstrip the usual language we have for talking about causes.
<b>Week 5</b> – Feb 15 & 17	Causal inference, experimentation	There is nothing so powerful as a properly designed experiment for making determinations regarding causality; too bad, then, that experiments end up having such limited use for most questions of interest in sociology.
<b>Week 6</b> – Feb 22 & 24	Causal inference, covariance analyses of observational data	Regression may seem like the workhorse technology of causal inference in quantitative sociology, but its actual effectiveness in this regard is often severely limited (note: this is something that should give one pause, not paralysis).
<b>Week 7</b> – Mar 1 & 3	Causal inference and observational study design	As noted, all kinds of perils await the researcher who approaches causal questions without the benefit of experimentation; as a rule, these can be more effectively addressed in the design of data collection than they can be through subsequent analytic procedures.
<b>Week 8</b> – Mar 8 & 10	Inference from field observation	Among the most pervasive threats to our ability to learn about social processes through first-hand observation and interaction are the many preconceptions we have when we begin.
<b>Week 9</b> – Mar 15 & 17	Numbers and narratives	“Quantitative” and “qualitative” data can sometimes be jointly analyzed in ways that bring forth the inferential strengths of each.
<b><i>spring break – amusement and rest recommended (but not mandatory)</i></b>		
<b>Week 10</b> – Mar 29 & 31	Sampling and generalization	Data are very often (extremely) partial relative to the desired scope of generalization implied by one’s research question; this implies a need for a strategy about what to observe and for a logic of extrapolation between the actually-observed and the target-of-one’s-conclusions.
<b>Week 11</b> – Apr 5 & 7	Sampling theory, nuts and bolts	Where random sampling is desirable, simple random sampling is often inferior to alternatives.
<b>Week 12</b> – Apr 12 & 14	Selectivity and incompleteness	Sometimes we know that our sample is systematically deficient and can do more about it than merely being extra-cautious and apologetic in our conclusions.
<b>Week 13</b> – Apr 19 & 21	Conceptualization and measurement	Rigorous conceptual thinking early in a research project can reap many subsequent rewards, even as the same concepts can be modified as a consequence of research.
<b>Week 14</b> – Apr 26 & 28	Measurement, validation	The adequacy of a measure is often judged in terms of its relation to other measures and its own internal consistency
<b>Week 15</b> – May 3 & 5	Measurement, scales and dimensions	A recurrent strategy of social measurement is to construct global measures from an aggregation of individual measures.

## READING LIST

### *I. Weekly Research Exemplars*

**25 January:** ☒ ☞ Useem, Bert and Jack A. Goldstone. 2002. "Forging Social Order and Its Breakdown: Riot and Reform in U.S. Prisons." *American Sociological Review* 67:499-525.

**1 February:** ☒ ☞ Redding, Kent and Jocelyn S. Viterna. 1999. "Political Demands, Political Opportunities: Explaining the Differential Success of Left-Libertarian Parties." *Social Forces* 78:491-510.

**8 February:** ☒ ☞ Lovaglia, Michael J., 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.

**15 February:** ☒ ☞ Pager, Devah. 2003. "The Mark of a Criminal Record." *American Journal of Sociology* 108: 937-975.

**22 February:** ☒ ☞ Harding, David J. 2003. "Counterfactual Models of Neighborhood Effects: The Effect of Neighborhood Poverty on Dropping Out and Teenage Pregnancy." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:676-719.

**1 March:** ☒ ☞ Downey, Douglas B., Paul T. von Hippel, and Beckett A. Broh. 2004. "Are Schools the Great Equalizer?: Cognitive Inequality during the Summer Months and the School Year." *American Sociological Review* 69: 613-635.

**8 March:** ☒ ☞ Bechky, Beth A. 2003. "Workplace Artifacts as Representations." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:720-752.

**15 March:** ☒ ☞ Wilde, Melissa J. 2004. "How Culture Mattered at Vatican II: Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 69:576-602.

**29 March:** ☒ ☞ Clayman, Steven E. and Ann Reisner. 1998. "Gatekeeping in Action: Editorial Conferences and Assessments of Newsworthiness." *American Sociological Review* 63:178-199.

**5 April:** ☒ ☞ Mackenzie, Donald and Yuval Millo. 2003. "Constructing a Market, Performing Theory: The Historical Sociology of a Financial Derivatives Exchange." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:107-145.

**12 April:** ☒ ☞ Burris, Val. 2001. "The Two Faces of Capital: Corporations and Individual Capitalists as Political Actors." *American Sociological Review* 66:361-381.

**19 April:** ☒ ☞ Beckfield, Jason. 2003. "Inequality in the World Polity: The Structure of International Organization." *American Sociological Review* 68:401-424.

## II. Topical readings

### 1. Salutations and orienting remarks

☒ ☞ Freese, Jeremy. 2005. "Sociology 750: Research Design and Practice in Sociology" Unpublished syllabus.

### 2. Prefatory

*The Science Question in Sociology*

☞ ☞ Gieryn, Thomas F. 1994. "Boundaries of Science." Pp. 393-443 in *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, edited by S. Jasanoff, G. E. Markle, J. C. Petersen, and T. Pinch. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *Treating the question of what is and is not science as a matter for sociological inquiry.*

☞ ☞ Turner, Stephen Park and Jonathan H. Turner. 1990. "Possible Sociologies, Recalcitrant Worlds: Conclusion." Pp. 179-197 in *The Impossible Science: An Institutional Analysis of American Sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

*The Conjunction of Method and Substance*

☒ ☞ Lieberman, Stanley. 1992. "Einstein, Renoir, and Greeley: Evidence in sociology." *American Sociological Review* 57: 1-18. *ASA presidential address to express a variety of concerns about how sociologists think about evidence and its relationship to theory.* [For a discussion of what Lieberman says is his "straightforward thesis" that has been highly influential in political science, see King, Gary. 1989. *Unifying Political Methodology: The Likelihood Theory of Statistical Inference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1-4.]

*Being sociological about debates between the qualitative and quantitative*

☞ Porter, Theodore M. 1995. Chapters 1, 2, and 9 in *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. *A historical look at disputes between qualitative "expertise" and quantitative data, especially interesting for its consideration of the conditions that especially provide a push for the latter.*

☞ ☞ McLaughlin, Eithne. 1991. "Oppositional poverty: the quantitative/qualitative divide and other dichotomies." *The Sociological Review* 39:292-308. *General criticism of binary thinking, especially as regarding methodology.*

☞ Abbott, Andrew. 2001. *Chaos of Disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

☞ Tilly, Charles. 2004. "Observations of Social Processes and Their Formal Representations." *Sociological Theory* 22:595-602. *Attempts to lay out a topology of social research with respect to its relationship to formalism.*

*Relationship between existing literature and original research*

☒ ☞ Latour, Bruno. 1987. "Literature" Chapter 1 of *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. *Sociology of science consideration of the construction of scientific articles, both in relation to other articles and the world itself.*

☒ ☞ Becker, Howard S. 1986. Pp. 135-149 in "Terrorized by the Literature." *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. *Especially good if you are prone to thinking that you have to read thousands of pages on a topic before you can write anything yourself.*

Abbott, Andrew. 2004. *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences*. New York: Norton. Especially chapters 4-5. *As an effort to provide readers with some strategies for coming up with new ideas, describes many social science innovations in terms of their relationship to the extant literature.*

☞ ☞ Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1982. "Should Sociologists Forget Their Mothers and Fathers?" *The American Sociologist* 17: 2-11.

### *Additional readings*

☒ ☞ Katz, Jack. 1997. "Ethnography's Warrants." *Sociological Methods and Research* 25:391-421. *Description of some different ways that an ethnography can make a claim to deserving epistemic attention.*

☒ ☞ Becker, Howard S. 1998. "Tricks." pp. 1-9 of *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

☞ ☞ MacCoun, Robert J. 1998. "Biases in the interpretation and use of research results." *Annual Review of Psychology* 49:259-87. *Overview of some of the psychological tendencies that make doing good research more difficult.*

☞ ☞ Lehman, Darren R., Richard O. Lempert, and Richard E. Nisbett. 1988. "The effects of graduate training on reasoning: Formal discipline and thinking about every-day life events." *The American Psychologist* 43

### **3. Causal inference, basic notions**

#### *Standard criteria of causality and counterfactual conditionals*

☒ ☞ King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. "Causality and Causal Inference." Pp. 75-114 *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

☒ ☞ Holland, Paul. 1986. "Statistics and causal inference." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81:945-60. [Unless you are really into this sort of thing, I would skip the sections on Suppes and on Granger causality.] Also recommended is the response: Glymour, Clark. 1986. "Comment: Statistics and Metaphysics." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81:964-966. *A very specific counterfactual-based position regarding what causality is, at least for the purposes of scientific inquiries making use of statistics.*

☒ (only if needed) ☞ Agresti, Alan and Barbara Finlay. 1997. "Introduction to multivariate relationships." Pp. 356-371 in *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

☞ ☞ Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1968. "The logic of scientific inference." Pp. 15-37 in *Constructing Social Theories*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World. *Orthodox and elegant discussion of adducing evidence for theories.*

☞ Marini, M. M. and B. Singer. 1988. "Causality in the Social Sciences." *Sociological Methodology*: 347-409.

🏠 Maxim, Paul S. 1999. "Causality." Pp. 54-79 in *Quantitative Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

#### *Mill's methods*

📦 🏠 Skocpol, Theda. 1984. "Emergent Agendas and Recurrent Strategies in Historical Sociology." Pp. 356-389 in *Vision and Method in Historical Sociology*, edited by T. Skocpol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *On the relationship between the disciplines of history and sociology, as well as between theoretical generalization and historical particularity.*

🏠 🏠 Goodwin, Jeff. 1998. "How to Become a Dominant American Social Scientist: The Case of Theda Skocpol." Pp. 31-37 in *Required Reading: Sociology's Most Influential Books*, edited by D. Clawson. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press. *Okay, not so much about methodology, but some interesting speculation on the massive fame of Skocpol's State and Social Revolutions.*

📦 🏠 Mahoney, James. 1999. "Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 104:1154-1196. *Considers three distinct means of drawing inferences in 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. *An often-noted, albeit pretty predictable, critique of historical studies that draw conclusions from a small number of cases.*

*Debate, extending some of these issues to the question of the role of theory in inference for comparative-historical data:* 🏠 Gorski, Philip S. 2004. "The Poverty of Deductivism: A Constructive Realist Model of Sociological Explanation." *Sociological Methodology* 1-33. Goldstone, Jack A. 2004. "Reasoning about History, Sociologically..." *Sociological Methodology* 35-61.

🏠 🏠 Goldthorpe, John H. 2000. "Current Issues in Comparative Macrosociology" Pp. 45-64 in *On Sociology: Numbers, Narratives, and the Integration of Research and Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

🏠 Ragin, Charles C. 2000. Ch 1-4 in *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. *Description of alternative approach to the problem of making inferences about complex causal relationships.*

🏠 🏠 Braumoeller, Bear F. and Gary Goertz. 2000. "The methodology of necessary conditions." *American Journal of Political Science* 44:844-858. *Makes several points about evaluating theories that assert necessary conditions of an outcome, especially for studies that involve comparative inspection of a modest number of cases. Includes discussion of trivial vs. nontrivial necessary condition arguments and how triviality in this case is an empirical matter.*

🏠 🏠 Braumoeller, Bear F. 2003. "Causal Complexity and the Study of Politics." *Political Analysis* 11:209-233. *Introduces "boolean logit/probit" models for testing certain kinds of theories involving causal complexity.*

#### **4. Causal relationships, complexities**

📦 🏠 Wright, Erik Olin, Andrew Levine, and Elliott Sober. 1992. "Causal Asymmetries." Pp. 129-175 in *Reconstructing Marxism: Essays on Explanation and the Theory of History*. London: Verso. *Considers the merits of various grounds on which one cause is commonly said to be more important (or fundamental, etc.) than another.*

☒ ☞ Tilly, Charles. 1995. "To Explain Political Processes." *American Journal of Sociology* 100:1594-1610. *In the genre of reflective-essays-by-famous-scholars, on explanation in comparative historical research.*

☞ ☞ Fischer, David Hackett. 1970. "Fallacies of Causation." Pp. 164-215 in *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*. New York: Harper and Row. *Basically a cataloging of different kinds of fallacious thinking in history, written in a reasonably constructive spirit.*

☞ ☞ Abbott, Andrew. 1998. "The Causal Devolution." *Sociological Methods and Research* 27:148-181. *Part of Abbott's multi-essay ("general linear reality") critique of the basic approach of conventional quantitative social science.*

#### *Causal mechanisms*

☒ ☞ Link, Bruce G. and Jo Phelan. 1995. "Social Conditions as Fundamental Causes of Disease." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* Supplement: 80-94. *Considering how causes of causes might be seen as more "basic" or "fundamental" than the more proximate causes; has spawned a line of work in medical sociology.*

☞ Hedström, Peter and Richard Swedberg. 1998. "Social Mechanisms." Pp. 1-30 in *Social Mechanisms*, edited by P. Hedström and R. Swedberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## **5. Causal inference, experiments**

#### *Experimental methodology*

☒ ☞ Aronson, Elliot, Timothy D. Wilson, and Marilynn B. Brewer. 1998. "Experimentation in Social Psychology." in *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. *Reviews many of the main methodological issues in social psychological experiments.*

☒ ☞ Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. "Factors jeopardizing validity..." Pp. 5-16 in *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. *Classic source on inferences and inferential problems in quasi-experimental studies.*

☞ Winston, Andrew S. and Daniel J. Blais. 1996. "What counts as an experiment?: A transdisciplinary analysis of textbooks, 1930-1970." *American Journal of Psychology* 109:599-616.

☞ ☞ Marwell, Gerald. 2000. "Experiments." Pp. 887-892 in *Encyclopedia of Sociology*, edited by E. F. Borgatta and R. J. V. Montgomery. New York: Macmillan. *Short summary of the experimental logic, includes discussion in terms of a path diagram of implied relationships.*

☞ Oakley, Ann. 2000. *Experiments in Knowing: Gender and Method in the Social Sciences*. New York: The New Press. Especially Chapters 8-11.

#### *Experiments in survey research*

☒ ☞ Sniderman, Paul M. and Douglas B. Grob. 1996. "Innovations in Experimental Design in Attitude Surveys." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:377-399. *Describes some of the different ways in which substantive questions about social attitudes can be pursued using experimental methods in surveys.*

### *External validity in experiments*

☒ ☞ Zelditch, Morris, Jr. 1969. "Can you really study an army in the laboratory?" Pp. 528-539 in *A sociological reader on complex organization*, edited by A. Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston. *Defense against common criticism of the artificiality of psychological laboratory experiments.*

☞ ☞ Sears, David O. 1986. "College sophomores in the laboratory: Influence of a narrow data base on social psychology's view of human nature." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 51:515-30. *Reflections on what the consequences might be of a subfield conducting most of its research on a relatively narrow population.*

## **6. Causal inference, covariance analysis of observational data**

### *Empirical comparisons of experimental results with results of observational study*

☒ ☞ Gray-Donald, Katherine and Michael Kramer. 1988. "Causality inference in observational vs. experimental studies." *American Journal of Epidemiology* 127:885-92.

☞ ☞ LaLonde, Robert J. 1986. "Evaluating the econometric evaluations of training programs with experimental data." *American Economic Review* 76:604-620.

☞ ☞ Friedlander, Daniel and Philip K. Robins. 1995. "Evaluating program evaluations: New evidence on commonly used nonexperimental methods." *American Economic Review* 85:923-937.

### *Quantitative analysis of data from observational studies*

(☒ if interested in quantitative research, unless/until you find it too dispiriting) ☞ Berk, Richard A. 2004. "Causal Inference for the Simple Linear Model." (pp. 81-101) and "What to Do" in *Regression Analysis: A Constructive Critique*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *Many complaints (some, in my opinion, rather unproductive) about the use of regression as a tool for causal inference, with some suggestions at the end.*

☞ Raftery, Adrian E. 2001. "Statistics in Sociology, 1950-2000: A Selective Review." *Sociological Methodology* 31:1-45. ☒ at least if you plan on doing quantitative research.

(☒ if needed) ☞ Agresti, Alan and Barbara Finlay. 1997. "Comparing dependent samples" and "Adjusted means." Pp. 226-229, 508-516 in *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

### *Propensity-score adjustment*

☞ Smith, Herbert L. 1997. "Matching with Multiple Controls to Estimate Treatment Effects in Observational Studies." *Sociological Methodology* 27: 325-353. *This is a fairly accessible introduction to propensity-score adjustment for sociologists; other virtues are that it talks about many-to-many matching and the idea of using a panel-type regression model instead of explicit matching.*

☞ Rosenbaum, Paul. 1986. "Dropping out of high school in the United States." *Journal of Educational Statistics* 11: 207-24. *An application of the propensity score method.*

🏠🏠 Rubin, Donald B. 1974. "Estimating the causal effects of treatments in randomized and non-randomized studies." *Journal of Educational Psychology*: 688-700. *Early paper that anticipates the propensity score method; an easier read than the Rosenbaum and Rubin paper.*

#### *The importance of getting important things right*

*Debate concerns the validity of the most widely cited statistic from Weitzman's The Divorce Revolution, 1986 Winner of the ASA Distinguished Scholarly Publication award. Can be read as a cautionary tale, both for research-producers and research-consumers*

✉️🏠 Peterson, Richard R. 1996. "A re-evaluation of the economic consequences of divorce." *American Sociological Review* 61:528-536.

✉️🏠 Weitzman, Lenore J. 1996. "The Economic Consequences of Divorce are Still Unequal: Comment on Peterson." *American Sociological Review* 61:537-538.

Peterson, Richard R. 1996. "Statistical Errors, Faulty Conclusions, Misguided Policy: Reply to Weitzman." *American Sociological Review* 61:539-540.

#### *Regression to the mean*

✉️🏠 Campbell, Donald and David A. Kenny. 1999. "Graphical Introduction" and "Frequently Asked Questions about Regression to the Mean." Pp 1-20, 28-36 in *A Primer on Regression Artifacts*. New York: Guilford. *Authoritative treatment of regression to the mean.*

🏠 Campbell, Donald and Laurence Ross. 1968. "The Connecticut crackdown on speeding: Time series data in quasi-experimental analysis." *Law and Society Review* 3:17-33. *The most famous example of regression to the mean in an interrupted time-series.*

🏠🏠 Hrobjartsson, A. and P. C. Gotzsche. 2001. "Is the Placebo Powerless?: An Analysis of Clinical Trials Comparing Placebo with No Treatment." *New England Journal of Medicine* 344:1594-1602. *Meta-analysis examining if, when, how giving control group patients a treatment yields different results than just giving them no treatment.*

#### *Assorted other readings*

✉️🏠 Mayer, Susan E. 1997. Selection from *What Money Can't Buy: Family Income and Children's Life Chances*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. *Regardless of ultimate opinions about the book, the selection section nicely lays out the logic of an attempt to make inferences from secondary, observational data.*

🏠🏠 Lunneborg, Clifford E. 1994. "Auxiliary variable models." Pp. 314-321, 356-359 in *Modeling Experimental and Observational Data*. Belmont, Calif.: Duxbury Press. *Discussion of the uses of control variables in regression models.*

🏠🏠 Duncan, Otis D. 1969. "Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race?" Pp. 85-110 in *On Understanding Poverty*, Edited by Daniel P. Moynihan. New York: Basic Books.

🏠 🏠 Stata Corporation. 1998. "What are some of the problems with stepwise regression?" From their Frequently Asked Questions webpage. *Basically sums up the reasons why stepwise regression is regarded with disfavor by many social scientists for many applications.*

🏠 Lieberman, Stanley. 1985. *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. Especially Chapters 2 ("Selectivity"), 3 ("Comparisons..."), 6 ("Control Variables"), and 10 ("From Controls to Outcomes"). *Discusses many key problems in attempting to make defensible causal inferences from observational data. Certainly commendable for its relentless attack on the argument to conventional practice as a justification for methodological decisions.*

## 7. Causal inference, design of observational studies

### *Purposely narrow samples*

📦 🏠 🏠 Snowdon, David A. 2001. "The Road to Good Counsel Hill" Pp. 11-25 in *Aging with Grace: What the Nun Study Teaches Us About Leading Longer, Healthier, and More Meaningful Lives*. New York: Bantam. *A great example of the potential virtues of studies that focus specifically on a narrow population (nuns) that is strategically selected for methodological reasons.*

### *Instrumental variables*

📦 🏠 🏠 Angrist, Joshua and Alan B. Krueger. 2001. "Instrumental Variables and the Search for Identification: From Supply and Demand to Natural Experiments." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 15:69-85. *Accessible overview to the use of instrumental variables, with references to numerous examples.*

🏠 🏠 Neal, Derek. 1997. "The effects of Catholic secondary schooling on educational achievement." *Journal of Labor Economics* 11:98-123. *Application of instrumental variables approach.*

### *Natural experiments*

📦 🏠 Meyer, Bruce, W. Kip Viscusi, and David Durbin. 1995. "Workers' compensation and injury duration: Evidence from a natural experiment." *American Economic Review* 85:322-39.

📦 🏠 Berk, Richard and David Rauma. 1983. "Capitalizing on nonrandom assignment to treatments: A regression-discontinuity evaluation of a crime-control program." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 78:21-27. *Expository example of the regression discontinuity design.*

### *Control by design versus statistical control*

📦 🏠 Freedman, David A. 1991. "Statistical models and shoe leather." *Sociological Methodology* 21: 291-313. *This is an article by a statistician that basically argues that the virtues of multiple regression for causal inference in the real world have been greatly exaggerated.*

🏠 Rutter, Michael, Andrew Pickles, Robin Murray, and Lindon Eaves. 2001. "Testing Hypotheses on Specific Environmental Causal Effects on Behavior." *Psychological Bulletin* 127:291-324. *Article about psychopathology by behavior geneticists. It's on the syllabus because behavioral genetics exemplifies an alternative emphasis to observational*

*studies where the effort to solve causal inference problems focuses mainly on well-designed and strategic data collection, rather than post-hoc statistical adjustment.*

## 8. Inference from field data

☒ ☞ Maxwell, Joseph A. 1996. "Validity: How Might You Be Wrong?" Pp. 86-98 in *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *Discussion of different sense in which an ethnographic claim can be said to be valid.*

☒ ☞ Burawoy, Michael. 1991. "The Extended Case Method." Pp. 271-300 in *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press *Methodological statement of highly influential way of thinking about the relationship between theory and observation and between large-scale and local social processes.*

☞ ☞ Burawoy, Michael. 1991. "Introduction." Pp. 1-27 in *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

☒ ☞ Maynard, Douglas W. 2003. "Conversation Analysis: What is the Context of an Utterance?" Pp. 64-87 in *Bad News, Good News: Conversational Order in Everyday Talk and Clinical Settings*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

☞ ☞ Goldthorpe, John H. 2000. "Sociological Ethnography Today: Problems and Possibilities" Pp. 65-93 in *On Sociology: Numbers, Narratives, and the Integration of Research and Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. *A prominent quantitative researcher delivers a lengthy critique of the quality of inferences evinced by what he takes as standard practice in contemporary ethnography.*

☞ ☞ Katz, Jack. 1983. "A Theory of Qualitative Methodology." Pp. 127-148 in *Contemporary Field Research*, edited by R. M. Emerson. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

☞ Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *Although parts of this book are less compelling, I like its discussion of all the different types of displays it presents as methods of realizing patterns in your data or of thinking more carefully through what your data show.*

☞ Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Chapters 5-12. *This book is a maybe oversimplified rendition compared to the Glaser and Strauss book on grounded theory. Anyway, you should read some kind of primary source on grounded theory before you (a) actually do any work that claims to be employ grounded theory methodology [seems obvious, but the available literature suggests otherwise], or (b) take too seriously some of the characterizations of grounded theory that are made by its detractors.*

☞ Whyte, William Foote. 1955. "Appendix: On the Evolution of 'Street Corner Society'" Pp. 279-358 in *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. *Perhaps the most famous of all methodological appendices in sociological ethnography; added only for the expanded second edition of the book.*

## 9. Combining numbers and narratives

☒ ☞ *Of these two readings: the Laitin article is more applicable for people interested in comparative work; the Goldthorpe article is more applicable for people interested in survey or other secondary quantitative analysis.*

📖 Laitin, David. 2002. "Comparative Politics: The State of the Subdiscipline." in *The State of the Discipline*, edited by I. Katznelson and H. Milner. New York: Norton. *This is a description of Laitin's "tripartite method," which is basically a call for the disciplined integration of formal models, quantitative research, and in-depth qualitative studies of small numbers of cases.*

📖 Goldthorpe, John H. 2000. "The Quantitative Analysis of Large-Scale Data Sets and Rational Action Theory: For a Strategic Alliance" Pp. 94-114 in *On Sociology: Numbers, Narratives, and the Integration of Research and Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## 10. Sampling and generalization, orienting considerations

### *Sampling in qualitative research*

📖 📖 Becker, Howard S. 1998. "Sampling." pp. 67-108 *Tricks of the Trade : How to Think About Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

📖 📖 Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. "Sampling: Bounding the Collection of Data." Pp. 27-34 in *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

📖 Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Chapter 11, "Theoretical Sampling." *See earlier annotation.*

📖 📖 Scriven, Michael. 1974. "Evaluation Perspectives and Procedures." Pp. 3-93. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan. *This is on the syllabus specifically for the description of modus operandi approach on pages 68-84.*

📖 📖 Romney, A. Kimball. 1999. "Culture Consensus as a Statistical Model." *Current Anthropology* 40:S103-115. *Beyond the particular method described, a reason I like this paper is the general point about how usual ideas about sample size are dramatically transformed when what one is trying to get at as some shared conception (e.g., cultural knowledge) of respondents.*

📖 Corsaro, William. 1985. *Friendship and Peer Culture in the Early Years*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. Chapter 1. *Interesting discussion of the value of episodic sampling, as well as of how to take fieldnotes.*

## 11. Sampling theory, nuts and bolts

### *Sampling theory for statistical research*

📖 📖 Stuart, Alan. 1984. *The Ideas of Sampling*. New York: Macmillan. *A general introduction to sampling theory, simply described.*

📖 📖 Frankel, Martin. 1983. "Sampling Theory." Pp. 21-52 in *Handbook of Survey Research*, edited by P. H. Rossi, J. D. Wright, and A. B. Anderson. New York: Academic Press. *Another general introduction to sampling theory, not quite as simply described.*

📖 📖 Schlesselman, James J. 1982. "Relative measures of disease occurrence / Cohort and case-control sampling schemes." Pp. 32-39 in *Case control studies: design, conduct, analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

### *Significance testing and power*

🏠🏠 McCloskey, Deirdre N. and Stephen T. Ziliak. 1996. "The Standard Error of Regressions." *Journal of Economic Literature* 34: 97-114. *What they call the "standard error" is the confusion of statistical and substantive significance; includes systematic examination of ways in which regression results are discussed in a sample of papers by economists.*

*On the misuse of significance testing*

🏠🏠 Cohen, Jacob. 1994. "The earth is round ( $p < .05$ )."  
*American Psychologist* 49:997-1003.

🏠🏠 Gill, Jeff. 1999. "The insignificance of null hypothesis significance testing."  
*Political Research Quarterly* 52:647-674.

🏠🏠 Cohen, Jacob. 1992. "A power primer."  
*Psychological Bulletin* 112:155-159. *Statistical power is wildly underappreciated concept in quantitative sociology.*

🏠🏠 Mock, Carol and Herbert F. Weisberg. 1992. "Political innumeracy: Encounters with coincidence, improbability, and chance."  
*American Journal of Political Science* 36 (4):1023-46. *Considering ways in which researchers chronically misestimate the likelihood or unlikelihood of their own results.*

*Sampling with knowledge of the outcome*

📧🏠 King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Pp. 115-149 "Determining What to Observe." Pp. 75-114  
*Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

🏠🏠 Lustick, Ian S. 1996. "History, historiography, and political science: Multiple historical records and the problem of selection bias."  
*American Political Science Review* 90:605-618. *If one is going to use the work of historians as "facts" for comparative inquiry, and historians themselves disagree, does this open itself up to the possibility that one can pick and choose the histories that happen to confirm one's theory?*

🏠🏠 Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics."  
*Political Analysis* 2:131-50. *(Title speaks well for itself.)*

## 12. Selectivity and incompleteness

🏠🏠 Winship, Christopher and Larry Radbill. 1994. "Sampling Weights and Regression Analyses."  
*Sociological Methods and Research* 23:230-257. *Article that quantitative researchers are likely to be told to read when they start asking questions about weights.*

🏠 Allison, Paul D. 2001. *Missing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *Little-Green-Sage-Book treatment that covers the main issues; note how little value it attaches to any intermediate solution between listwise deletion and either maximum likelihood or multiple imputation.*

🏠🏠 Little, Roderick and Donald B. Rubin. 1990. "The analysis of social science data with missing values."  
*Sociological Methods and Research* 18:292-326. Also: 🏠 Schafer, Joseph L. 1999. "Multiple Imputation: A Primer."  
*Statistical Methods in Medical Research* 8:3-15.

🏠🏠 Berk, Richard. 1983. "An introduction to sample selection bias in sociological data." *American Sociological Review* 48:386-398.

### 13. Conceptualization and operationalization

🏠🏠 Cohen, Bernard P. 1989. Chapters 7-9 (pp. 127-175) *Developing Sociological Knowledge: Theory and Method*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall. *Treatment of the issues of conceptualization and operationalization from a very orthodoxly "positivist" perspective*

🏠🏠 Wright, Erik Olin. 1985. "Biography of a Concept." Pp. 19-63 in *Classes*. London: Verso. *Describes the process over which the concept of "contradictory class locations" was developed.*

🏠🏠 Collier, David and James E. Mahon. 1993. "Conceptual 'stretching' revisited: Adapting categories in comparative analysis." *American Political Science Review* 87:845-55. *On extending concepts to new domains in comparative analysis.*

🏠🏠 Becker, Howard S. 1998. "Concepts" Pp. 109-145 in *Tricks of the Trade : How to Think About Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

🏠🏠 Clayman, Steven E. and John Heritage. 2002. "Questioning Presidents: Journalistic deference and adversarialness in the press conferences of U.S. Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan." *Journal of Communication* 52:749. *Especially interesting for the different ways in which authors try to conceptualize how the "deference" and "adversarialness" is done in interviews.*

🏠🏠 Danner, Deborah D., David A. Snowden, and Wallace V. Friesen. 2001. "Positive Emotions in Early Life and Longevity: Findings from the Nun Study." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 80:804-813.

### 14. Representation

Latour, Bruno. 1999. "Circulating Reference: Sampling the Soil in the Amazon Forest." Pp. 24-79 in *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

*Accuracy in ethnographic research*

📧🏠 Duneier, Mitchell. 1999. "Appendix: A Statement on Method." Pp. 333-357 in *Sidewalk*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

*Critique and response regarding the methods and interpretations of Sidewalk, interesting for both the issue of the adequate representation of subjects and the adequate representation of the work of other researchers.*

🏠 Wacquant, Loïc. 2002. "Scrutinizing the street: Poverty, morality, and the pitfalls of urban ethnography." *American Journal of Sociology* 107:1468-1532. [esp. pp. 1471-86]

🏠 Duneier, Mitchell. 2002. "What kind of combat sport is sociology?" *American Journal of Sociology* 107:1551-1576. [skipping 1561-1564]

*Incidentally, this debate goes on to have a sequel of sorts: see Duneier, Mitchell. 2004. "Scrutinizing the Heat: On Ethnic Myths and the Importance of Shoe Leather." Contemporary Sociology 33:139-150; Klinenberg, Eric [a student of Wacquant's]. 2004. "Overheated." Contemporary Sociology 33:522-528.*

#### *Reactivity in ethnographic research*

📖 Eder, Donna. 1995. "Notes on Methodology" Pp 171-176 in *School Talk: Gender and Adolescent Culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

#### *Question design in survey research*

📧 📖 Schaeffer, Nora Cate and Stanley Presser. 2003. "The science of asking questions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 65-88.

#### *Problems of self-report in survey research*

📧 📖 Lewontin, Richard. [1995] 2000. "Sex, Lies, and Social Science." Pp. 229-269 in *It Ain't Necessarily So: The Dream of the Human Genome and Other Illusions*. New York: New York Review Books. [With responses from Laumann et al. and Richard Sennett and a rejoinder from Lewontin] *Lewontin, a population geneticist, criticizes the large-scale sex study fielded by researchers at Chicago, seeking to draw larger conclusions about the limitations of intellectual enterprises reliant on self-reported measurements.*

## **15. Measurement, validation**

#### *Overview of measurement*

📧 📖 Judd, Charles M. and Gary H. McClelland. 1998. "Measurement." in *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. *General overview of measurement from the standpoint of psychologists, who often think about measurement more than sociologists do.*

📖 Weller, Susan C. and A. Kimball Romney. 1988. *Systematic Data Collection*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage (Qualitative Research Methods series). *Discussion of some of the methods for measuring cultural beliefs used by quantitative anthropologists.*

📖 Duncan, Otis Dudley. 1984. *Notes on Social Measurement: Historical and Critical*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. *A wideranging consideration of measurement from an eminent sociologist.*

#### *Reliability*

📧 at least skim 📖 Chapters 3-7 from Traub, Ross E. 1994. *Reliability for the Social Sciences: Theory and Applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. *Overview of classical reliability theory.*

📖 Tinsley, Howard E. A. and David J. Weiss. 1975. "Interrater Reliability and Agreement of Subjective Judgments." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 22:358-376.

#### *Levels of measurement*

🏰 Jacoby, William G. 1999. "Levels of measurement and political research: An optimistic view." *American Journal of Political Science* 43:271-301. *Considers how the level of measurement of a variable to be itself a theoretical and often empirically testable matter.*

🏰 Velleman, Paul F. and Leland Wilkinson. 1993. "Nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio typologies are misleading." *The American Statistician* 47:65-72. *(Title is its own best annotation.)*

#### *Coding in historical research*

🏰 Markoff, John. 1996. "Seigneurial Rights on the Revolutionary Agenda." Pp. 16-64 in *The Abolition of Feudalism: Peasants, Lords, and Legislators in the French Revolution*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

#### *Anchoring vignettes as a measurement strategy*

📦 King, Gary, Christopher J. L. Murray, Joshua A. Salomon, and Ajay Tandon. 2004. "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research." *American Political Science Review* 98:567-583.

## **16. Scale development and factor analysis**

📦 at least skim 🏰 Chapters 2, 4-6 from DeVellis, Robert F. 1991. *Scale Development: Theory and Applications*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. *Basic overview of scaling and factor analyses of scales.*