

**Sociology 5031: RESEARCH METHODS**

303-492-8148, 2-2326 (no voicemail)  
210 Ketchum, 101 IBS #1  
[menken@colorado.edu](mailto:menken@colorado.edu)

Jane Menken  
Monday 3-5:45, Ketchum 120  
Office Hours: 101 IBS #1  
Tuesday 3:00-5:00 and by appointment

**SEMINAR PURPOSE:** This seminar is intended to help you familiarize yourself with a range of topics in research design and equip you with skills necessary for independent study of research methods. One of its purposes is to enable you to become a critical analyst of methods used in substantive studies in the literature; another is to help you design your own research. In addition, the seminar is geared to preparation for the Sociology Department Ph.D. comprehensive examination in methods. We will not, however, cover all relevant topics; nor will topics be covered in the depth needed to master methods at the Ph.D. level. You are encouraged to take other methods courses and to study methods on your own.

**COURSE GRADE:** The grade received in this seminar is part of the Sociology Department Preliminary Examination. It is based on the following:

1. **Participation in seminar discussions (~25%):** The instructor will participate in discussions, but no lectures will be delivered. The quality of seminar discussions will, therefore, vitally depend on how well students prepare for each seminar. I hope that students will interact with one another to discuss, define, criticize, find merit in, refine, and synthesize the topics assigned for that seminar. To help this process, students are asked to prepare short papers, usually *before* class discussion, and to do so in groups.

2. **Short papers, journal article critique, literature review (~35%):** Three short papers and a critique are assigned. These are due before the start of seminar on the assigned date. They can be prepared solely or, preferably, in groups of no more than three. Each should be a critical assessment, based on the readings and seminar discussion, of selected aspects of the topics for the week. Papers should cite authors as appropriate and synthesize the substance of what was read. You may relate your work to the introductory readings assigned for Week 1. All papers must be typed and no more than 5 pages in length - 4 pages are preferred. The journal critique also can be prepared by a group and should follow the series of questions on page 2. As part of preparation for your research proposal, you are asked to submit a literature on November 1. This will be reviewed and returned to you with comments intended to be helpful in developing your proposal.

**Email:** I communicate a lot via email. It is essential that you learn how to use email here ASAP. **Please email all assignments to me at the address above - either in the text of the email or as a PC-compatible attachment in Word or WordPerfect. PLEASE give the attachment an understandable name, e.g. sam-enid.wk1 or sam-enid sep9, that identifies person(s) and date of submission.**

3. **Term paper (~40%):** Your term paper is due at 3pm on the last regularly scheduled seminar day. The paper must be sole-authored. A **one page description** of your topic and your project is due October 11; please schedule a meeting with me by October 4. Paper presentations are scheduled for later sessions of the course. Term papers must be typed double-spaced, using the format and style of the *American Sociological Review*. All references must be complete and conform to the *ASR* style. Be sure to use spell-check!

The term paper is to be a research proposal on a topic of your choice. The paper/proposal can be a hypothetical study that you may never perform, or it can be an investigation that you plan to conduct in the future. It cannot be work that you've already performed, e.g. your senior thesis or M.A. thesis. The proposal

should cover all segments of the research process, even though the proposed data collection and analysis will not actually be performed. All term papers must use the same outline. As described above, a draft of your literature review is due Nov1.

#### TERM PAPER OUTLINE:

- a) describe the problem to be investigated;
- b) describe the purpose of the research;
- c) present the theoretical bases of the research;
- d) review and synthesize the existing literature on the subject;
- e) present your research design -- the paper's emphasis should be placed here;
- f) present your data analysis plan; and
- g) briefly discuss anticipated findings and their theoretical and applied significance.

Another way of looking at the outline is through a series of questions I frequently have used in evaluating research and advising students on their own research projects:

- What's the question? (Corresponds to (a) above)  
Clearly state the question in terms appropriate to your audience
- Why should the audience be *interested* in this question? Why is it *important*? What are you trying to do in the research project? (Corresponds to (b)- (d) above)
- Is the research designed so that it is *possible* to answer the question? (Corresponds to (e) above)
- Are the data appropriate? Is it *possible* to answer the question using these data? (Corresponds to (e) above)
- Is the data analysis *appropriate* for answering the question? Are the best methods being used? (Corresponds to (f) above)
- Is the interpretation of the results accurate?

**4. On-time attendance:** Attendance at each meeting of the seminar is required. It is expected that everyone will *attend* each seminar and *arrive on time*.

**READINGS:** No single textbook is adequate for a Ph.D. level methods course. Students must read more than one book or paper, consider the range of substantive information and opinions they contain, integrate what was read, and then form clear ideas about particular methods or approaches and how to use them when doing research. All readings are available in the Computer Lab in Ketchum and many of the papers are available on the internet.

**Readings on the web:** If readings are available on the internet, links can be found in this syllabus. The first one gets you to the journal, but you may have to click and find the paper. This involves less typing, so may be easier if you aren't connecting from the syllabus. The second, longer link gets you directly to the article. In addition, we are using the Norlin Library web system; some material has been scanned to be accessible on a password-protected site.

**Buying books:** If you have not already had a course in research methods, I strongly recommend reading the Babbie text. In the past, students who had studied methods before found Babbie an excellent refresher. Appropriate sections are recommended in the readings. You can order a copy on the web (e.g. Amazon.com or Wadsworth.com) if you'd like to own a copy.

I recommend the classic Kuhn book. I will pass around a sign-up form if you'd like copies of Babbie and/or Kuhn from Amazon.com.

Earl Babbie. 2004. *The Practice of Social Research*, 10th ed. Belmont CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.  
Thomas Kuhn. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Also, you may want to look at the Sage Publications list. Sage offers a series of excellent and inexpensive introductions to various aspects of research methods, both quantitative and qualitative. We will be using some of their publications, but I want to bring them to your attention as a resource for the future. You can browse their website at: [www.sagepub.com](http://www.sagepub.com)

Finally, you should familiarize yourself with the websites: [www.jstor.org](http://www.jstor.org) and <http://muse.jhu.edu/>

and with the online journals available through the CU library website.

*Journal Storage* on the web is a project funded by the Andrew Mellon Foundation that is doing just what it says -- storing journals so they can be accessed from the web. They do not compete with current sales, so they have the *American Journal of Sociology* for the years 1895-2000, the *American Sociological Review* 1936-2001, and the *Annual Review of Sociology* 1975-1998 (later issues are available online through the library). You can search the journals very easily, read papers, print out copies, or download papers to your computer. BUT you can only gain access through CU, so you can't get to it through aol, for example. MUSE is a Johns Hopkins University project to bring scholarly journals online.

NOTE: if you want to print or download a paper, use JSTOR's Print or Download commands, not the browser's print command. I find that the PDF economy versions are fine – and they take a much shorter time to download.

***The Sociology Department reading list*** for the Ph.D. comprehensive exam in methods is available from the department. It contains a series of questions that may help guide your study of various aspects of research methods and it contains a (too?) detailed list of readings (some I consider out of date).

The ***methods exams*** for the past few years can also be found at

<http://socsci.colorado.edu/SOC/SocComps/index.html>

**READING:** At the end of each seminar, the topic for the next week will be introduced. You will, after the second week, be expected to prepare short papers, preferably in groups, on the week's reading.

**DISABILITIES:** If you qualify for accommodations because of a disability, please submit to me a letter from Disability Services (DS) early in the semester so that your needs may be addressed. DS determines accommodations based on documented disabilities (303-492-8671, Willard 322, [www.colorado.edu/sacs/disabilityservices](http://www.colorado.edu/sacs/disabilityservices))

**RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS:** Please let me know if you need to miss a class because of religious observance or other reasons. Your needs will be accommodated.

**SOCY5031 SUMMARY SCHEDULE - REVISED**

	<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Papers or Presentations due this session</b>	<b>Readings for next session</b>
1.	Aug 23	Introduction to the seminar		Wk 2
2.	Aug 30 Sep 6	Introductory research articles and sample proposals Labor Day – no class		*Wk 3
3.	Sep 13	Theory: A traditional view		Wk 4
4.	Sep 20	Theory: Alternative views associated primarily with qualitative data	Short paper: traditional views	<b>Wk 6</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Sep 27</b>	<b>Nature of Proof, Observation, and Description</b>		<b>Wk 7</b>
			<b>Short paper: alternative views</b>	
<b>5.</b>	<b>Oct 4</b>	<b>Web Searches: Jill Williams</b>	<b>Stat Lab Ketchum 117</b>	<b>Wk 7</b>
		Anyone with identikey should be able to log on to lab computers – before this session, please check that yours works!		
7.	Oct 11	Causality	1-page proposal	Wk 8
8.	Oct 18	Research design I: Basics on mixed methods	Short paper: causality	Wk 9
9.	Oct 25	Research design II: Surveys	Journal critique	Wk 10
10.	Nov 1	Quantity of data	Proposal literature review	Wk 11
11.	Nov 8	Selecting study participants	Journal article critique	Wk 12
12.	Nov 15	Improving qualitative data collection	Proposal presentations	Wk 13
13.	Nov 22	Improving quantitative data collection	Proposal presentations	Wk 14
14.	Nov 29	Interpreting data	Proposal presentations	Wk 15
15.	Dec 6	Research ethics	Term paper	

\*Please note: The Labor Day holiday falls on Monday, so we have no class. That gives you two weeks to prepare for the first Theory session (Sep 13). Also, there is no reading assignment for Sep 27, Week 5. The Sep 27 session will be held in the computer lab in Ketchum and led by Jill Williams. It is an introduction to *web searching* for relevant research information and includes material on organizing your research materials. The readings for the session on Causality (Oct 11) are extensive, so use the extra week to prepare for Wks 6 and 7. We will use no more than ½ of class in Weeks 12-14 for you to present your proposals to the group.

## Wk2 Introductory readings - four research papers and 3 sample proposals:

These papers represent quite different research designs. Engen and Steen carry out a quantitative analysis of administrative records; Cress and Snow collected their own qualitative/ethnographic data using several sampling schemes; Harris analyzes existing social survey public use data; Orloff considers a particular problem in a new way and proposes ways of studying it. We will use these papers as background as we read and discuss methods papers throughout the semester.

Engen, Rodney L. and Sara Steen. 2000. The power to punish: Discretion and sentencing reform in the war on drugs. *American Journal of Sociology* 105(5): 1357-1395.  
<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00029602/> or  
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00029602/di008401/00p00834/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5745@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f5c7b&dpi=3>

Cress, Daniel M. and David A. Snow. 1996. Mobilization at the margins: Resources, benefactors, and the viability of homeless social movement organizations. *American Sociological Review* 61(6): 1089-1109.  
<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00031224/> or  
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00031224/di974434/97p01687/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5745@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f5c7b&dpi=3>  
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00031224/di974434/97p01687/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5745@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f5c7b&dpi=3>

Harris, Kathleen Mullan. 1993. Work and welfare among single mothers in poverty. *American Journal of Sociology* 99(2): 317-352.  
<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00029602/> or  
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00029602/dm992735/99p0319r/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f4e26&dpi=3>

Orloff, Ann Shola. 1993. Gender and the social rights of citizenship: The comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states. *American Sociological Review* 58(3): 303-328.  
<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00031224/> or  
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00031224/di974413/97p0192b/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/01cc993341005090ba54&dpi=3>

These proposals were submitted by students in previous years.

Sample Proposal 1. Social Integration, Disaster, and Migration: A study of how social integration reduces migration intent following a natural disaster

Sample Proposal 2. Examining the Effects of Extended Visitation Programs for Incarcerated Mothers with Dependent Children

Sample Proposal 3. Understanding Body Mass and the Association with Smoking: Potential Ramifications of Anti-Smoking Campaigns

**Wk3 Theory: Traditional views**

Babbie, Earl. 2004. *The Practice of Social Research*, 10th ed. Belmont CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning. Chapter 1: Human inquiry and science, pp. 3-31; Chapter 2: Paradigms, theory and research, pp. 32-60.

Kuhn, Thomas. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lieberson, Stanley, and Freda B. Lynn. 2002. Barking up the wrong branch: Scientific alternatives to the current model of sociological science. *Annual Review of Sociology* 28: 1-19.

<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/toc/soc/28/1>

**Wk4 Theory: Alternative views, associated predominately with qualitative research**

Gamson, Joshua. 2000. Sexualities, queer theory, and qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications.

Becker, Howard. 1996. The epistemology of qualitative research. In Richard Jessor, Anne Colby, and Richard Shweder (eds.), *Ethnography and Human Development*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 53-72.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2004. Grounded theory. In Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber and Patricia Leavy (eds.), *Approaches to Qualitative Research*. New York Oxford University Press, pp. 486-521.

DeVault, Marjorie L. 1996. Talking back to Sociology: Distinctive contributions of feminist methodology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 29-50.

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0360-0572%281996%2922%3C29%3ATBTSDC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-I>

Freese, Jeremy, Jui-Chung Allen Li, and Lisa D. Wade. 2003. The potential relevances of biology to social inquiry. *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 233-256.

<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.soc.29.010202.100012>

**Wk5 Web Searches: meet in Ketchum Computer Lab**

## Wk6 The Nature of Proof and The Nature of Observation and Description

Hunt, Morton. 1985. The world of social research. Chapter 1 in *Profiles of Social Research: The Scientific Study of Human Interactions*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, pp. 3-48..

This is an interesting book. Each chapter discusses a different type of social research and raises interesting questions for discussion.

Bryman, Alan. 1984. The debate about quantitative and qualitative research: a question of method or epistemology? *British Journal of Sociology*. 35:75-92.

From abstract: "The main dimensions of the debate about the relative characteristics and merits of quantitative and qualitative methodology are outlined, emphasizing the philosophical issues which underpin much of the discussion. A distinction is drawn between epistemological and technical issues in relation to the controversy.... The question is raised whether it is possible to establish a clear symmetry between epistemological positions... and associated techniques of social research....

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00071315>

or

<http://www.jstor.org/view/00071315/ap020138/02a00060/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5637@colorado.edu/01cc99333c0050d93f6b&dpi=3>

Bosk, Charles L. 1992. Invitation to ethnography. Chapter 1 in *All God's Mistakes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-19.

Johnson, Jeffrey C. 1990. That which is explicit in ethnography. *Selecting Ethnographic Informants*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 9-21.

Kitson, Gay C., Richard D. Clark, Norman B. Rushforth, Paul M. Brinich, Howard S. Sudak, and Stephen J. Zyzanski. 1996. Research on difficult family topics: Helping new and experienced researchers cope with research on loss. *Family Relations* 45: 183-188.

<http://www.jstor.org/view/01976664/ap020067/02a00070/0?currentResult=01976664%2bap020067%2b02a00070%2b0%2c01%2b19960400%2b9993%2b80039599&searchID=8dd5533b.10932101480&frame=noframe&sortOrder=SCORE&userID=c60b1b37@colorado.edu/018dd5533b005013f70ce&dpi=3&viewContent=Article&config=jstor>

**Wk7 Causality**

Babbie, Earl. 2004. Chapter 4: Research design, pp.85-106.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Read Chapters 3, 4, 9.

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. The demonstration of causation. In *Learning from Strangers*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 179-181.

The following are quite technical – but very much worth reading. Skim over the parts that are clearly beyond your current expertise.

Sobel, Michael. 1995. Causal inference in the social and behavioral sciences. In G Arminger, *et al.* (eds.), *Handbook of Statistical Modeling for the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Plenum Press

Mahoney, James. 2004. Comparative historical methodology. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 81-101.  
<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/toc/soc/30/1>

Winship, Christopher, and Stephen L. Morgan. 1999. The estimation of causal effects from observational data. *Annual Review of Sociology* 25: 659-706.  
<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/toc/soc/25/1>

The following address issues of social context even in determining numbers that represent society and issues of evidence for causality.

Porter, Theodore M. 1995. How social numbers are made valid. In *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1992. Einstein, Renoir, and Greeley: Some thoughts about evidence in Sociology. 1991 ASA Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review* 57(1):1-15.  
<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00031224> or  
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00031224/di974405/97p0095p/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a92c1colorado.edu/01cc993341005090ba54&dpi=3>

The following may be skimmed

Smith, Herb. 1990. Specification problems in experimental and nonexperimental social research. *Sociological Methodology* 20: 59-92.  
<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00811750> or

<http://www.jstor.org/view/00811750/ap010020/01a00030/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5637@colorado.edu/01cc99333c0050d93f6b&dpi=3>

## Wk8 Research Design I – Basics on Mixed Methods

Babbie, Earl. 2004. Chapter 4: Research design, pp. 107-116 - See especially p.113-114, Elements of a Research Proposal. Skim Chapter 5: Conceptualization, operationalization, and measurement, pp. 118-149 and Chapter 6: Indexes, scales, and typologies, pp. 150-177. We will not cover measurement issues in any great detail.

Mechanic, David. 1989. Medical sociology: some tensions among theory, method, and substance. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 30(2):147-160.  
<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00221465> or  
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00221465/di976104/97p0032c/0?config=jstor&frame=noiframe&userID=808a5857@colorado.edu/01cc993341005090c470&dpi=3>  
 From Abstract: “Why is it that quantitative and qualitative researchers on health issues often have divergent findings and conclusions?...”

Mathison, Sandra. 1988. Why Triangulate? *Educational Researcher* 17(2):13-17.

Tashakkori, Abbas and Charles Teddlie. 1998. *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. 1-19.

Newman, Katherine S. 2002. The right (soft) stuff: Qualitative methods and the study of welfare reform. *Focus* 22(2): 8-12.  
 This article is a summary of Chapter 11 in *Studies of Welfare Populations: Data Collection and Research Issues*, ed. R. Moffitt, S. Ver Ploeg, and C. Citro. Washington DC: National Academy Press, 2002, pp.355-83.

Snow, David A. 1999. Assessing the Ways in Which Qualitative/Ethnographic Research Contributes to Social Psychology: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 62, Special Issue: Qualitative Contributions to Social Psychology: 97-100.  
 Stable URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0190-2725%28199906%2962%3A2%3C97%3AATWIWQ%3E2.0.CO%3B2-4>

## Wk9 Research Design II: Surveys

Babbie, Earl. 2004. Chapter 8: Experiments; Chapter 9: Survey Research

Scheuren, Fritz. 2004. What is a survey? The American Statistical Association  
<http://www.amstat.org/sections/srms/pamphlet.pdf>

Laumann, Edward O., John H. Gagnon, Robert T. Michael, and Stuart Michaels, Stuart. 1994. *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 35-73.

This chapter outlines the study design. It serves to 1) building a study designed to answer a range of questions, 2) practical considerations (cost and politics) in study design, 3) sample size, response rates, mode of administration, etc. Nice overview to set out the topics to be examined in detail later.

Massey, Douglas S., Rafael Alarcón, Jorge Durand, and Humberto González. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Read pp. 1-21; 39-62; 164-169; 276-284.

These sections outline the various quantitative and qualitative parts of the project and a few very early findings to suggest how the parts fit together.

Stone, Linda and J. Gabriel Campbell. 1984. The use and misuse of surveys in international development: an experiment from Nepal. *Human Organization*. 43(1):27-37.

“An experiment in Nepal was conducted to measure the accuracy of a popular KAP ... survey.... it is emphasized that survey and qualitative methods are complimentary and need to be supplemented by one another.... a decision making model is presented to assist selection of optimum research strategies by plotting estimated total error (sampling plus non-sampling error) against sample sizes.”

Yoder, P. Stanley. 1995. Examining ethnomedical diagnoses and treatment choices for diarrheal disorders in Lubumbashi Swahili. *Medical Anthropology*. 16:211-247.

“This article examines the basis of ethnomedical classification of diarrheal disease among the Swahili speaking population of Lubumbashi, Zaire and the association of specific diagnoses with treatments given. Results from two research methods are reported: group interviews and large sample surveys.”  
 1) again raises issue of combining quantitative and qualitative, 2) good example of emic/etic validity questions, and 3) nice clear discuss of how to collect and analyze data from small group interviews.

**Wk10 Quantity of Data**

Babbie, Earl. 2004. Chapter 7: The logic of sampling, pp. 178-218.

Sloan, JH, AL Kellermann, DT Reay, JA Ferris, JA, et al. 1988. Handgun regulations, crime, assaults, and homicide. *New England Journal of Medicine* 319(19):1256-1262.  
Comparison of Seattle and Vancouver to estimate effect of handgun regulation. Goes nicely with Lieberson (below).

Smith, Herb. Notes on Sample Size. Xerox.

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(2):307-320.

“An increasing number of studies, particularly in the area of comparative and historical research, are using the method of agreement and method of difference proposed by Mill (1872) to infer causality based on a small number of cases. This article examines the logic of the assumptions implicit in such studies....”

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00377732> or

<http://www.jstor.org/view/00377732/di010935/01p0002k/0?frame=noframe&userID=808a5637@colorado.edu/01cc99333c0050d93f6b&dpi=3&config=jstor>

Ragin, Charles C. 1991. Introduction: The problem of balancing discourse on cases and variables. In *Issues and Alternatives in Comparative Social Research*. New York: E.J. Brill, pp.1-8.

Earl, Jennifer, Andrew Martin, John D. McCarthy, and Sarah A. Soule. 2004. The use of newspaper data in the study of collective action. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 65-80.

<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/toc/soc/30/1>

## Wk11 Selecting Study Participants

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. Respondents: Choosing them and recruiting them. Chapter 2 and 3 in *Learning from Strangers*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 15-73.

Nice discussion of the issues of sampling and recruitment in qualitative research. This is a great book.

Laumann, Edward O., John H. Gagnon, Robert T. Michael and Stuart Michaels. 1994. *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Appendix A: Sample procedures and data quality and part of Appendix B: Comparisons of the NHLS with other data sets. Pp. 549-597.

Johnson, Jeffrey C. 1990. *Selecting Ethnographic Informants*. Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications.

The following address issues of selection of cases for case studies. Skim.

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. How the cases you choose affect the answers you get: selection bias in comparative politics. In James A. Stimson (ed.), *Political Analysis*, vol. 2, pp. 131-150.

“This article demonstrates how the selection of cases for study on the basis of outcomes on the dependent variable biases conclusions....”

Bollen, Kenneth A., Barbara Entwisle and Arthur S. Alderson. 1993. Macrocomparative research methods. *Annual Review of Sociology* 19:321-51.

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/03600572>

or

<http://www.jstor.org/view/03600572/di974065/97p0066g/0?config=jstor&frame=noiframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f4eea&dpi=3>

“We focus on how macrocomparative sociologists address the threats to validity which surround sample selection, research design, and data and measurement. A major threat to many studies (almost a third) is the failure to apply any method of control....”

The following is a great “how-to” reference – but skim it – don’t sit down and read this one cover to cover!

Kalton, Graham. *Introduction to Survey Sampling*. Sage Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, No. 35. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

**Wk12 Improving Qualitative Data Collection and Analysis**

Babbie, Earl. 2004. Chapter 10: Qualitative Field Research; Chapter 11: Unobtrusive Research, pp. 312-340.

Morgan, David L. 1996. Focus groups. *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 129-152.

Stable URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0360-0572%281996%2922%3C129%3AFG%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Q>

Coreil, Jeannine. 1995. Group interview methods in community health research. *Medical Anthropology* 16:193-210.

“Our ethnographic study of maternal perceptions of the barriers and incentives to immunization use in Haiti underscores the importance of ‘hidden’ social and psychological costs of utilization, such as embarrassment, fear, child care difficulties, and competing demands on maternal time.

Bosk, Charles. 1989. The fieldworker and the surgeon. In Carolyn D. Smith and William Kornblum (eds.), *In the Field: Readings on the Field Research Experience*. New York: Praeger, pp. 135-144.

What it’s like to do participant observation.

Bernard, H. Russell. 1988. *Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publications. Chapters 7 (Participant observation), 8 (Taking and managing field notes) and 9 (Unstructured and semistructured interviewing), pp. 145-224.

Dohan, Daniel and Martin Sanchez-Jankowski. 1998. Using Computers to Analyze Ethnographic Field Data: Theoretical and Practical Considerations. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 477-498.

Stable URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0360-0572%281998%2924%3C477%3AUCTAEF%3E2.0.CO%3B2-T>

### Wk 13 Improving Quantitative Data Collection

Laumann, Edward O., John H. Gagnon, Robert T. Michael and Stuart Michaels. 1994. *The Social Organization of Sexuality: Sexual Practices in the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 8: Homosexuality, pp. 283-301.

Problems with previous research. A good practical example of how writing a questionnaire requires a very careful examination of the concepts being measured.

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

<http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/toc/soc/29/1>

Presser, Stanley and Johnny Blair. 1994. Survey pretesting: do different methods produce different results? *Sociological Methodology* 24: 73-104.

“This study compared four pretesting methods using a single questionnaire in repeated trials of each. The four methods were conventional pretests, behavior coding, cognitive interviews, and expert panels....”

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00811750> or

<http://www.jstor.org/view/00811750/ap010024/01a00030/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5637@colorado.edu/01cc99333c0050d93f6b&dpi=3>

Suchman, Lucy and Brigitte Jordan. 1990. Interactional troubles in face-to-face survey interviews. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 85:232-241 plus comments by R Hahn and MG Kovar and P Royston.

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/01621459> or

<http://www.jstor.org/view/01621459/di985983/98p02271/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/01cc993341005090bacf&dpi=3>

Examples of what can go wrong between an interviewer and a respondent based on taped interviews.

Introduces idea that all interviewing (quantitative or qualitative) is a form of “structured conversation.” Supplemented with comments by several discussants.

Groves, Robert M. 1987. Research on survey data quality. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51(suppl): S156-S172.

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/0033362x> or

<http://www.jstor.org/view/0033362x/dm991737/99p0030j/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5883@colorado.edu/018dd5531e00508e9add&dpi=3>

Frey, James H. 1989. Comparing survey methods. Chapter 2 in *Survey Research by Telephone*. 2nd edition. Sage Library of Social Research, vol. 150. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

**Wk14 Interpreting Data**

Huberman, A. Michael and Matthew B. Miles. 2000. Data management and analysis methods. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage Publications, 428-444.

Knodel, John. 1994. Conducting comparative focus-group research: cautionary comments from a coordinator. *Health Transition Review* 4(1):99-104.

[http://nceph.anu.edu.au/htc/pdfs/Forum4\\_1.pdf](http://nceph.anu.edu.au/htc/pdfs/Forum4_1.pdf)

Please note: the link above is to the entire forum on Focus Groups for Health Research, in which Knodel's comments appear on pp. 99-104. The forum itself contains other interesting articles.

Good discussion of the problems of analyzing focus group data and why it often doesn't get done or done properly.

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. Analysis of data. In *Learning from Strangers*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 151-182.

Krueger, Richard A. Principles of analyzing focus group results (Ch. 7, pp. 126-139), Process of Analyzing Focus Group Results (Ch. 8, pp. 140-160). In *Focus Groups - A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications.

**Wk15 Research Ethics**

Babbie, Earl. 2004. *The Practice of Social Research*, 10th ed. Belmont CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company. Chapter 3: The ethics and politics of social research, pp. 61-84.

ASA Code of Ethics. 1997. Washington: American Sociological Association.

<http://www.asanet.org> or  
<http://www.asanet.org/members/ecoderev.html>  
 only downloads in sections

Punch, Maurice. 2000. Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research. In Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 83-98.

Mitchell, Richard G. Jr. 1993. *Secrecy and Fieldwork*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Peshkin, Alan. 1984. Odd Man Out: The Participant Observer in an Absolutist Setting. *Sociology of Education* 57(4): 254-264.

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00380407> or  
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00380407/di975454/97p03312/0?config=jstor&frame=noiframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f4eea&dpi=3>

Ellis, Carolyn. c1986. *Fisher Folk : Two Communities on Chesapeake Bay*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky. First and last chapter.

Leo, Richard. 1995. Trial and tribulations: Courts, ethnography, and the need for an evidentiary privilege for academic researchers. *The American Sociologist* Spring 1995: 113-134.

Erikson, Kai. 1995. Commentary. *The American Sociologist* Spring 1995: 4-11.

Leo, Richard. 1996. The ethics of deceptive research roles reconsidered: A response to Kai Erikson. *The American Sociologist* Spring 1996: 122-128.

Erikson, Kai. 1996. A response to Richard Leo. *American Sociologist* Spring 1996: 129-130.

Allen, Charlotte. 1997. Spies like us: When sociologists deceive their subjects. *Lingua Franca*. This publication is no longer available on the web – illustrating the dangers of web-only publication.

Leo, Richard. 1998. Response to Charlotte Allen. E-mail.