Sociology 30002
Principles of Sociological Research
University of Chicago
Graduate Class: Winter 2018
2:00 PM – 3:20 PM, Tuesdays and Thursdays
John Levi Martin

Course Description

How do you make knowledge in sociology? That's what this class is about. We are going to look at issues of research design and process while also exploring the diversity of methods of sociological analysis. Further, we will be doing this in a way that helps you work towards an original research paper. But we will do so in a way that forces you to look at your question from multiple angles.

As a result, we will be doing three sorts of things in this all-too-brief quarter. We will be reading a bit about, and discussing, general issues of research design. We will be reading exemplary works using different sorts of methods. We will be doing exercises related to our question, trying out different methods and seeing what kinds of things we can learn using them. I hope that at the conclusion you understand (1) how to choose a sociological research project that will not be a dead end; (2) how to choose a method that will help you answer your questions and will also be fun for you; (3) how to critically evaluate the presentation of evidence in support of theoretical claims.

Structure

We will go through a number of different methods, namely historical, ethnography, experimental, and interviewing, spending time that is roughly in proportion to the distribution of use among Chicago students. But first we will start with some general aspects of method in sociology.

Now it has become typical in these sorts of courses to assign readings *about* different aspects of the research process. So Prof. X. writes an article about "sampling" and gets it published, I make you guys read it, and so everyone but you is happy. X got a publication, and I avoided preparing anything and teaching you. But such pieces are generally dry as toast. So instead, we'll be mostly reading exemplars—pieces that show us key aspects of research design, usually for better, but sometimes for worse.

There is an exception. I don't normally assign anything I've written in my classes, but in this case, I wrote a book especially *for* this class…or, even more accurately, it *is* this class in book form. So it's required and it means that we'll have more time for discussion, since you'll have my take in the readings for the day. And it's an easy read.

¡ Note ! ¡ Note ! ¡ Note ! ¡ Note ! ¡ Note ! ¡ Note ! ¡ Note !
If you need to eat, please make sure that you bring enough for everybody. All entering food will be split 15 ways, with the exception of life-sustaining beverages or power bars for pregnant people of any gender. Also, please **do not bring laptops**. You can "read" your books on your tablet, phone, or watch, but unless you have a learning issue (speak to me), a laptop will not help you in this class. You do not need to take notes. You do need to be present.

Regarding every method I will have something prepared regarding 1) what is distinctive about a certain method, its advantages and disadvantages; 2) who uses these methods and why; 3) how the common methodological themes play out here; 4) how the works we read illustrate the methods. Then we will discuss the works in question, paying attention to 1) do the methods work? 2) were the methods done well? 3) do the methods match the questions? 4) do we see advantages or disadvantages to the method come out in the examples? You may think this is silly, as you already know this and know how to do it, but as any musician can tell you, there is a difference between "knowing how to play" a piece and knowing how to play it *well*.

I will also be returning to the key analytic issues that I think are common to sociological research; I will be trying to make use of the strengths of different readings, so that we will be able to think things we couldn't have guessed at the beginning of the class. I will tend to front load these on the "1" parts of units.

Finally, every week I will give a "tip for the week"—a little handy piece of wisdom that could save you a few years of wasted effort.

Requirements

1) Active attendance. That means (a) coming prepared (doing "all" the reading); (b) discussing the works and the results of the exercises.

2) Writing up weekly musings on the reading (i.e. you are to keep a journal in which you critically analyze the methods as they whizz past). We're talking just a two-page reaction to the readings: you need to do one for all the classes where you see the charming "  " icon. This means that your reaction paper is due 5:00 the day before this class, on the major reading for this day. They can be placed in my box or emailed to me.

3) Completion of exercises. You will have to carry out a number of projects that contribute to the fleshing out of your question and the formation of a research proposal at the end. You should thus be working on your final paper, in different ways, all through the class. It may be that portions of (some of) your exercise(s) can be incorporated in your final research proposal, although it might be that they only are food for thought. But do **not** leave the entire proposal for the last week of class!

YES, there are a lot of books to read, and the price adds up too. But a small investment in terms of the development of a methodological sense repays itself a thousand fold. As they say. The following books are going to be at the Seminary Co-Op book store. If you can't afford them, you can probably squeeze by using the library and borrowing from other people, but talk to me. Every one of these books is something any sociologist should have anyway. All the other things will appear a bit before they are assigned on CHALK; if that doesn't work for you let me know. Also, the recommended readings given below are to get anyone started who wants to pursue one method in greater detail. They are a combination of classics and personal favorites.

Speaking of reading each and every one, in case I forget to say it the first day, I am aware that some weeks the amount of assigned reading exceeds reasonable expectations even for graduate student rite-of-passage overload. When the reading is huge and multiple, it is quite acceptable to focus on a subset of the works, but to try to familiarize yourself with the methods and arguments of the others. Where we read a large book, I will usually suggest parts to concentrate on, but if I don't, read selectively if you must, so as to focus on the methods, argument, and connection of the two.

Required Books (prices are approximate and may be old):
Making It Count by Stanley Lieberson $15.95
Thinking Through Methods by John Levi Martin, $29.95
Street Corner Society by William Foote Whyte $31.00—you need the **fourth** edition!
Capitalists in Spite of Themselve by Richard Lachmann, $34.00.
The Abolition of Feudalism by John Markoff, $39.95.
Money, Morals, and Manners by Michele Lamont $24.95
Forgive and Remember by Charles L. Bosk $26.00
Evidence by Howard Becker, $20.00
And I am assuming you have
Suicide, by Emile Durkheim; the pagination is from the Free Press Edition.

Here is the overview of the analytic plan of the class: after this I'll go through things in more detail with readings and dates and all that.

I. RESEARCH DESIGN I
Basic do's and don't and wills….I will outline the main repeating themes. The class is not organized to follow these, but I indicate in the bigger part of the syllabus where these themes re-appear for reconsideration.

A. Concepts
1) What are Theories? (Revisited IV1).
2) What is real, what can act? (Revisited IV1).
3) Operationalization (Revisited IIIA1).
4) Relations between concepts (Revisited V2).
5) Objectivity vs. bullshit (Revisited IIB2)

B. Causality (Revisited V1).
1) Experiments

2) Causality
3) Randomization
4) Manipulation
5) Counterfactual

C. Other Regularities
1) Mechanisms (Revisited IIIA2).
2) Patterns (Revisited IIA2).
3) Subsumptions; this is a case of…? (Revisited VIA1).
4) Floors, ceilings and regressions-to-the-mean (Revisited IIIB1).

D. Sampling (Revisited IIA1).
1) Universe / population / sample
2) Inference
3) Risk
4) Law of large numbers
5) Your theory doesn't fit my case

E. Measurement
1) Quantities and Qualities (Revisited IIB1).
2) What is Measurement? (Revisited VIA2).
3) What is a Variable? (Revisited VIB2).
4) Validity and reliability (Revisited VIB2).
5) Indices (Revisited VIB2).

F. Designs
1) Testing Theories and other Fast Tracks to Unemployment (Revisited VIB1).
2) Impossible Case (Revisited VIB1).
3) Loaded Comparison (Revisited IIIB1).
4) Grudge Match (Revisited VIB1).
5) Synthetic Cohort and Kin (Revisited IV2).
6) Causes of Effects and Effects of….? (Revisited IIIA2).

II. WHY NOT WATCH? (*Ethnography*)
A. And Stay Out – Non-participant observation.
B. And Butt In – Participant Observation

III. IS IT IN THE LIBRARY? (*Historical*)
A. Why not see? – Systematic historical sociology
B. Why not compare? – Comparative historical
C. Is it on-line – New Data Sources

IV. IS IT IN THE BUREAU? (*Demography*)

V. WHY NOT MESS AROUND WITH THEM? (*Experimental*)

VI. WHY NOT ASK? (*Interviewing*)
   A. Why not listen? – In-depth
   B. Why not test? – Survey

VII. RESEARCH DESIGN II

Schedule of things that will happen because you make them happen….

OK, now for the details, with readings and dates! And assignments! Note that a 📄 means that your reaction paper is due 5:00 the day before this class, on the major reading for this day. A 📄📄 means that a bigger paper is due this day or the next. Since this whole icon thing is going so well, two more: a 🅳 means that this comes from the author's dissertation project; a 🅲 means that this was done at Chicago, a 👎 means that the dissertation never made it past the defense, ☠ means that the person's career was effectively over at this point, and a 💣 means that s/he became the unibomber. Don't let this happen to you! Learn the proper methods of sociological research! It's included free with your tuition this quarter!

I. RESEARCH DESIGN I

1) A Conversation About Theory? Can we go over what we have learned about The Logic of Sociological Methods: Selective abstraction; Conventional ways of thinking about sociological explanation. Variables, Cause and Effect, Deduction, Testing, Sampling. We will talk about some of the common issues and how we will be looping back to them over time. We will also talk about how to formulate a question! (**Thursday, January 4**).

   Required Reading: Martin, *TTM*, Chapters 1 and 2. Right, I get that it's the first day and you didn't know you had to read these until today, but you should read them before you start in on your question. It will help. I personally guarantee it.

📄📄 -- get your question in as soon as possible!

BEGIN Question Writing: For next time, you need to propose a sociological question that will be your focus of investigation for this quarter. It is expected that this will be the core of a paper that you are planning to write, though it is not unusual for the progress of this class to lead you to fundamentally revise your question. This question should be posted on CHALK in the blog area, which I am pretty sure I successfully created. This should be NO MORE THAN ONE PAGE. It should have NO REFERENCES. A question is something that (1) seems like it might have an answer; (2) but this answer is, so far, at least to you, unknown. It is not the same thing as an interest, an illustration, or even a test.

Due Monday, January 8, by 9:00 AM ! If you can, please get your questions in sooner so we can start our discussion of them! Please read over each other's questions, and be ready to discuss them on Tuesday.

Further recommended reading:
Regarding selective abstraction, you might want to take a good look at Max Weber's *On the Methodology of the Social Sciences*, which will give you the standard sociological theory approach to this stuff. It also gives you a good inoculation against the "variable" language we'll generally be slipping into. If you need "help" with Weber on concept formation, probably the best secondary treatment is Thomas Burger's Max Weber's Theory of Concept Formation, though you might look to Hans Henrik Bruun, *Science, Values and Politics in Max Weber's Methodology* for important corrections. Regarding the normal ways of talking about variables and all that, there are a number of standard works, but all go pretty quickly into survey analysis, statistics, or both (indeed, the more focused they are on survey analysis or statistics, often the better the initial discussions). Classic examples are Hubert Blalock, Social Statistics; Morris Rosenberg, The Logic of Survey Analysis, Earl Babbie, The Language of Social Research.

2) Do you want to stick with what you have, or try for what's behind curtain number three? (**Tuesday, January 9**)

 Required Reading: Lieberson, *Making it Count*. Read it all…or as much as you can!

If possible, we'll start discussing some questions today too!

Further recommended reading: You know, let's hold off on the critical stuff for a while. It's easy to get discouraged. But I do recommend Lieberson's later article, "Modeling Social Processes: Some Lessons from Sports" (*Sociological Forum* 12[1997]:11-35. There are also some books on sociological methodology that are collections of insight and wisdom and all that. The best I've read is Howard Becker's *Tricks of the Trade*, but there are too few tricks per column inch to justify assigning it. Also, a great collection on sociological methodology—the hows, whys, and is-it-okays, (I'm sure long out of print, otherwise I would have assigned it) is Fist-Fights in the Kitchen edited by George H. Lewis. Regarding the issues Lieberson raises, a recent volume: *Causality in Crisis*, edited by Vaugn McKim & Stephen Turner might prove helpful. Certainly John Goldthorpe's *On Sociology* has a very compelling critique. For nice polemics about use and misuse, see Joel Best's *Damned Lies and Statistics* and *More Damned Lies and Statistics*. Finally, this is a good time to start Becker's *Evidence*.

II. WHY NOT WATCH?

A. And Stay Out: The Usually Comparative Organizational Ethnography

1) In which Christopher Robin makes Some Observations about Observation, and talks about very interesting things that you can see in the five acre wood if you look carefully. Discussions of Ethology (**Thursday, January 11**). Here we will also revisit ID (sampling).

Required Reading: Martin, *TTM*, Chapter 3; Charles L. Bosk, *Forgive and Remember*;

Supporting Reading: Blau, *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*, 1-15, 183-206, 269-303*.

Further recommended reading:
An example of social movement comparative organizational ethnography that takes a very different approach is Erika Summers Effler's *Laughing Saints and Righteous Heroes.* As for other types An important ethnography is Paul Willis's *Learning to Labor*; the problem is that the ethnography is mostly interviewing and he seems to have had the theory before he began. Colin Turnbull, *The Forest People*, has wonderful anecdotes of learning to overcome his own preconceptions about the purity of other cultures. I previously used Lloyd Warner's Yankee City which is an interesting sort of community fieldwork, and Howard Pinderhughes's *Race in the Hood* which has some wonderful examples of interviewing technique (see his Appendix in particular). And Peter Moskos's *Cop in the Hood* is also a nice example of an unusual type of ethnography. Barrie Thorne's *Gender Play* is a great child ethnography which brings us to….

2) Where is the close observation hiding in sociology these days? Conversation Analysis and its near kin (**Tuesday, January 16**). Here we will revisit IC2.

Required Reading: McGrew, *An Ethological Approach to Children's Behavior*, selections*; John Heritage and Geoffrey Raymond, "The Terms of Agreement: Indexing Epistemic Authority and Subordination in Assessment Sequences," *Social Psychology Quarterly**; David Gibson. 2003. "Participation Shifts: Order and Differentiation in Group Conversation." *Social Forces* 81: 1135-81.*

Further recommended reading:
Christena Nippert-Eng has just published a fantastic work, *Watching Closely*, on how to learn how to do serious sociological observation. If you want to be a field worker who relies on observation on any form, you *must* read this work. It takes the form of a coherent program of cumulative exercises, as well filled with theoretical insights on the nature of observation and social life.

For an overview of conversation analysis, see Steven E. Clayman and Virginia T. Gill "Conversation Analysis." In Alan Bryman and Melissa Hardy (eds.) *Handbook of Data Analysis* (2004), pp. 589-606. Other work by Sacks, Schegloff, Boden and Zimmerman, Maynard and others will appear in this place over time….The close study of interaction in sociology largely begins with I. F. Bales's work; his early ideas are cool and his approach worthy of consideration. Gibson has recent work applying conversation analysis to a key historical case, the ExComm deliberations in the Cuban missile crisis. See his *Talk at the Brink*.

B. And Butt In

1) Watching, playing, asking, walking and so on (**Thursday, January 18**). Here we revisit IE1.

Required Reading: Martin, *TTM*, Chapter 5; William. H. Whyte, *Streetcorner Society*, Intro, Ch 1, Ch 5, Conclusion, Appendices A and B, Whyte, "Revisiting Street Corner Society" (note: this requires that you have the fourth edition); Mitchell Duneier, *Sidewalk*, Intro, Appendix. (I'm going to assume you either have this or will read it all anyway, so it's ordered, but we're only going to talk about the Appendix today….).

Not required but available and I'll briefly mention: You may look at Harriet Whitehead, *Renunciation and Reformulation*, selection*--it's one of my favorite examples of ethnography, but it's hard to get from this excerpt. And you should also read Duneier's "How Not To Lie With Ethnography," *Sociological Methodology* 2011.

Further recommended reading:

Michael Burawoy; Manufacturing Consent is another good example of P-O leading to strong theoretical claims. Come to think of it, so is his *Politics of Production*. He lays out his manifesto in "The Extended Case Method," Sociological Theory16(1998):4-33 and in portions of Ethnography Unbound, referred to in Week 8. There are too many great ethnographies to privilege a few here, and also lots of anguished self-analyses of fieldworkers. Look perhaps at Paul Rabinow's *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*.

Also take a look at Sudhir Venkatesh, *American Project*; his *Gang Leader for a Day* has an admirable discussion of some of the ethical/methodological problems we will return to next class. A great tradition of community studies, reaching from Lloyd Warner to Michael Bell (Childerly) should be looked at, but here the methods are generally less visible. Benajmin Zablocki's Joyful Community is an interesting twist on this take. Another Chicago PhD, Loïc Wacquant (Body and Soul), proposes a new kind of carnal ethnography. I think another of the all-time great examples of participant observation is Martin Sanchez-Jankowski, *Islands in the Street*. Matthew Desmond's frighteningly excellent *Evicted* just raised the bar on ethnography considerably; most of you won't need to embed an intensive ethnography inside of a population survey, but note that it *can* be done. And you certainly can, and should, do the "relational ethnography" that he discusses in his article of the same name.

2) Ethical ethnography (**Tuesday, January 23**). Here we revisit IA5.

Required Reading: Martin, *TTM*, Chapter 6; Kai Erikson, "A Comment on Disguised Observation in Sociology"*; Laud Humphreys, *Tearoom Trade*, 1-3, 16-44, 167-232 **; Julia O'Connell Davidson, "Pretty Woman, Ugly Man: Interpretavism and the Study of Prostitution," p. 212-215, 224-229; Charlie Kurzman, "Convincing Sociologists," from *Ethnography Unbound*, Bob Altemeyer, *Enemies of Freedom*, brief selection.* (may be in lied-to packet below).

Suggested and Available Reading: Because I discuss this at length in *TTM*, maybe you don't need to read the original, but you might want to: Carolyn Ellis, "Emotional and Ethical Quagmires in Returning to the Field." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 1995, 24(1):68-98; then there's also a **PACKET ON LYING:** I put together, including Richard A. Leo, "Trial and Tribulations: Courts, Ethnography, and the Need for an Evidentiary Privilege for Academic Researchers." *American Sociologist*, 1995 26(1):113-134, Kai Erikson, "Commentary". *American Sociologist*, 1995, 26(2): 4-11; Leo, "The Ethics of Deceptive Research Roles Reconsidered: A Response to Kai Erikson." *American Sociologist*, 1996, 27(1):122-128; Erikson, "A Response to Richard Leo." *American Sociologist*, 1996, 27:129-130; "spies like us" article from *Lingua Franca*; and then a **PACKET ON BEING LIED TO:** Evans-Pritchard, *The Nuer*, selections*, Freedman, The Hoaxing of Margaret Mead, brief selection.* Paul Stoller and Cheryl Olkes, In Sorcery's Shadow, p. 9-11**

Further recommended reading:
For an example of ethnography without the usual form of rapport, see Colin Turnbull, The Mountain People, introduction. For a glimpse of the other side, see Frederik Barth's criticism, "On Responsibility and Humanity: Calling a Colleague to Account," Contemporary Anthropology 15:99-102 (and Turnbull's non-response on the next page). Leon Festinger's When Prophecy Fails has a classic instance of a serious problem in covert ethnography—the researchers change the evolution of the group they are studying. There is a recent collection of problems like that experienced by Ellis entitled When They Read What We Write, edited by Caroline B. Brettell, Bergin and Garvey Publishers 1993. A widely cited guide to organizing ethnographic data is John Lofland and Lyn H. Lofland, *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis* (Wadsworth). And can I tell you a secret? Promise not to tell anyone? (If you lied and said yes, you are on your way to being an ethnographer!)

NOTE THAT YOU MAY WANT TO START YOUR FIRST EXERCISE NOW IF YOU ARE THINKING OF DOING AN ETHNOGRAPHIC ONE!

III. IS IT IN THE LIBRARY?

A. Why not see?

1) Where does Data Come From? (**Thursday, January 25**). Here we revisit IA3.

Required Reading: Martin, *TTM*, Chapter 8; W. F. Rothenberg, *From Market Places to a Market Society* [D], xi-4, 20-23, 28-33, 56-69, 72-111, 163-167.

Supporting Reading: Carole Shammas, "The Domestic Environment in Early Modern England and America."*

Further recommended reading:
Carole Shammas extends the work in the wonderful *The Pre-Industrial Consumer*. Jan DeVries, The Industrious Revolution puts together many of the findings from folks like Shammas and Rothenberg into a blockbuster. Jennifer Platt's Articles on "Evidence and Proof in Documentary Research I and II" (Sociological Research (1981:31-66) are well regarded and widely cited, but you don't need to read these "Plattitudes" until you're a little further along—if ever. (There's a bit too much about antiques for scholars of your tender years.). Her *History of Sociological Research Methods in America* (Cambridge) might be interesting. On the problem of small Ns, see Charles Tilly, *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. (*Selections from this may be added to this week's reading.)* Before I used Goran Ohlin, "No Safety in Numbers: Some Pitfalls of Historical Statistics," in Henry Rosovsky, ed, Industrialization in Two Systems. (NY: Wiley, 1966), p. 68-90 (it's boring, but it shows how nit picky you have to be….) and Hyman Mariampolski and Dana C. Hughes, "The Use of Personal Documents in Historical Sociology" The American Sociologist 13(1978):104-113 (sometimes too obvious). On comparative methods, see the recent article by James Mahoney, "Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis," AJS 104(1999):1154-1196.

2) What Can you do with Data? (**Tuesday, January 30**). Here we revisit IC1 and IF6.

Required Reading: John Markoff, *The Abolition of Feudalism*, 1-15, 20-42, 145-153, 203-229, 337-368 (skim), 368-410, 410-426 (skim), 569-582. Look, this is a great book, and the more you read, the better for you, but I don't feel quite comfortable saying that you have to read it all. Though you should.

Further recommended reading:

For classics, see Charles Tilly, *The Vendée*, and Ferdinand Braudel's *The Mediterranean*. You may compare a short piece by Markoff in the AJS in 1996 or 7. A recent fascinating work is Paul McLean, *The Art of the Network*. We might consider using Roger Gould, *Insurgent Identities*. Another interesting work might be: City of Capital by Bruce Carruthers. Most of the non-comparative but systematic is really done by historians. Another personal fave: Michael Katz, Michael Docet, and Mark J. Stern, The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism. With this last work, and with social history such as Claude Fischer's America Calling, one doesn't use multiple cases so much as multiple sources of data. Kai Erikson's Wayward Puritans is a classic of a different type of historical sociology; Carlo Ginzburg's *The Cheese and the Worms* is another exemplar of a different approach. I'm not sure if we could really defend them these days, but we sure could Peter Bearman's wonderful *Relations into Rhetorics*. If we had more time, I would also use Michael Rogin, *The Intellectuals and McCarthy*, 1-20, 26-31, 59-103.

B. Why not compare?

1) The Logic of Comparison. (**Thursday, February 1**). Here we revisit IF3 and IC4. Note that today's unit is twain, a purely theoretical part here and then the core reading in the next section. I'll talk a bit about this first stuff before we jump to our case; you can read or not read the more abstract and general stuff on comparison.

Required Reading: Martin, *TTM*, Chapter 7

Suggested Reading: J.S. Mill, *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive, Eighth Edition* (Harper and Row), 278-291, 579-589, 608-613, 652-653; William Whewell, On the Philosophy of Discovery, 262-268; optional: J.S. Mill, *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive, Eighth Edition* (Harper and Row), 307-311 (response to Whewell).

Further recommended reading:

A great insider's critique of the Millsian method comes from Goldstone, Revolution and Rebellion. A great outsider's is: Stanley Lieberson, "Small Ns, big conclusions"*, What is a Case?; Bourdieu, Homo Academicus, postscript (p. 194-225). A collected volume of essays (Skocpol, editor), Vision and Method in Historical Sociology has some interesting contributions in the form of critical analyses of famous guys, and especially her fighting retreat in Theda Skocpol, "Emerging Agendas and Recurrent Strategies in Historical Sociology." And of course Charles Ragin's *The Comparative Method*, 1-52.

2) What can we get out of comparison?

Required Reading: *Capitalists in Spite of Themselves: Elite Conflict and European Transitions in Early Modern Europe* by Richard Lachmann.

Further recommended reading:
I had planned on using, once again, *The Civic Foundations of Fascism in Europe: Italy, Spain, and Romania, 1870-1945* by Dylan Riley, but they were all out, in the process of switching from hardcover to softcover, and I've always wanted to read this book—I loved his articles on this project—so now is a good time. I used to use, and still strongly recommend, *The Fabrication of Labor*, by Richard Biernacki. Some of the most famous comparative-historical works are the following: Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions*; Barrington Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*; Perry Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolutist State*, and *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism*; Philip Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution*; Thomas Ertmann, *Birth of the Leviathan*. Guy Swanson's *Religion and Regime* is also a fascinating comparative study. Mary Fulbrook, *Piety and Politics* is also a meso-classic. Marion Fourcade's book *Economists and Societies* shows the Berkeley angle on a different subject. Mounira M. Charrad, *States and Women's Rights* is also on the list.

C. Is it On-Line? (Found Data) (**Tuesday, February 6**)
This is a new section! Enough students are being attracted to various forms of internet-accessible data, and there enough commonalities, that it seemed worth talking about this. I bet you didn't know what a good eugooglizer I was….

Required Reading: "The Effects of Racial Animus on a Black Presidential Candidate: Using Google Search Data to Find What Surveys Miss," by Seth I. Stephens-Davidowitz. I think that Seth didn't even bother submitting this to a journal, just stuck it on the web, accepted a job from Google, and now enjoys lattes on the Google bus…. More readings will be added….

This space intentionally left blank

BEGIN Exercise: **"Choosing a Site."** There are two variants for this—ethnographic and historical, depending on whether your question refers to something going on now, or something in the past. First, you need to translate your question as closely as possible to a form that can allow for a historical or ethnographic exploration. Then conduct one of the following exercises:

Ethnographic Variant: Choose a site and do observations. You may, if necessary, select a site in which you are simply observing people, or one to which you have pre-existing ties, but far, far, better will be participant-observation in a previously unfamiliar site, one chosen because of theoretical interest. If you are planning on *only* observing (that is, not interacting with people), you *must* have a structured plan for observing and producing data. Write up the results as follows: 1) did you have a hypothesis or hunch when you began? If so, what was it? If not, why did you pick the site (and here, "convenience" is deadly!)? 2) What did you find that was interesting? 3) If you had a hypothesis or question, was it addressed by what you found? If so, what is the result? 4) If you didn't have a hypothesis or question when you began, did you get one after the fact? What is it? 5) Ethnographers in contrast to other sociologists **are** permitted to reflect upon their research in each and every work. Tell about your personal experience as it relates to your conclusions: did you feel phony? Did you establish rapport? Are you confident that people were telling you the truth? Did you have main informants?

Historical Variant: Formulate a version of your question that has a (potentially or intrinsically) historical answer, whether comparative or non-comparative. Lay out a research design that would address the question. Explain (1) the cases to be used; (2) the data to be analyzed; (3) the sources to be consulted; (4) how this addresses the question with which you began. Take a look at one of the sources you list in (3) (yes, they must be real). Does it turn out to contain what you thought it would (2)? In other words, the goal of this exercise is to see whether primary materials that (you suspect) have information that can be used to answer your question **really do** have this information.

For either of the variants, if this is the method you are planning to propose to answer your question, how might you now revise your question? If this is *not* the method that you would propose, how has it altered your understanding of the relation between questions and answers?

This exercise is Due February 20, at 4:30 PM

IV. IS IT IN THE BUREAU?

1) The case of Durkheim, state statistics, and the founding of scientific sociology (**Thursday, February 8**). Here we revisit IA1-2.

   Required Reading: Emile Durkheim, *Suicide*, [41-46], 46-52, 104-122, 152-160, 171-202 (especially), [208-216], [246-258], 259-276 (especially). Note that it is assumed that students have read much of *Suicide* for their theory class. The assigned page numbers are to brush up on the methodological aspects. Those who have not already read *Suicide* should add the page numbers in brackets.

2) What can official statistics tell us? (**Tuesday, February 13**). Here we revisit IF5.

   , ♥ Required Reading: Michael Rosenfield, *Age of Independence*.

   Further recommended reading:
   Maybe you should be independent enough to propose to your sweetheart today! That will get you out of the homework. Anyway, Stanley Lieberson, A Matter of Taste, uses public data on names to explore the logic of cultural change. Eric Oliver's dissertation includes a lovely analysis of the causes of decreased civic participation in the suburbs. is a definitive study of the reasons for the growth in female labor force participation, basically using economic statistics and a few reasonable assumptions about human motivation. Dalton Conley's *Being Black, Living in the Red* shows a wonderful use of large scale statistics to paint a picture and weave in new understandings. And a classic example of a demographic attempt to answer an important theoretical question can be found in Valerie Kincade Oppenheimer, *The Female Labor Force in the United States* (Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, 1970)—I used to assign 1-27, 52, 56-63, 141-189. Still love that book.

V. WHY NOT MESS AROUND WITH THEM?

1) Do you have society in a tin? The logic of experiments, true and false (**Thursday, February 15**). Here we revisit IB.

   Required Reading: Devah Pager, Bruce Western, and Bart Bonikowski, "Discrimination in a Low-Wage Labor Market." *American Sociological Review* 74(2009):777-799. Robb Willer et al., "Overdoing Gender." Also review Lieberson! If you never finished it, now is a good time….

2) Discussion of exemplary experiments (**Tuesday, February 20**). Here we revisit IA4.

Required Reading: Gerald Marwell and Ruth E. Ames, 1979, "Experiments on the Provision of Public Goods I" *American Journal of Sociology* 84: 1335-1360*; "Experiments on the Provision of Public Goods II", *AJS* 85: 926-937*; Delia Baldassarri and Guy Grossman, "Centralized Sanctioning and Legitimate Authority Promote Cooperation in Humans," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(27; 2011):11023-11027.*

Note: If a more recent piece by Baldassarri and Grossman comes out, I may substitute this.

Further recommended reading:
Classic experiments are by Solomon Asch (see his Social Psychology for a bunch of them), Muzafer Sherif ("The Autokinetic Effect," a version is in his *Social Interaction*), and Stanley Milgram, *Obedience to Authority*. Regarding a discussion of the uses and limitations of experiments, I am fond of "Can You Really Study an Army in the Laboratory?" by Morris Zelditch, Jr., in Amitai Etzioni and Edward Lehman, eds., A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. One of my favorite experimental studies is the incredibly bold sociology of knowledge by Breer and Locke, *Task Experience as a Source of Attitudes*. And the wonderful "A Preliminary Laboratory Study of the Acting Crowd" by Guy Swanson, which has to be read to be believed. Those were the glory days of the ASR! The precursor to the Pager et al. piece was Devah Pager, "The Mark of a Criminal Record," American Journal of Sociology 108: 900 or so, plus her book… If you're seriously interested in pursuing experiments, I'd strongly recommend *Artifact in Behavioral Research* edited by Rosenthal and Roskow. I previously used Michael Lovaglia, Jeffrey W. Lucas, Jeffrey A. Houser, Shane Thye, and Barry Markovsky. "Status Processes and Mental Ability Test Scores." *American Journal of Sociology* 104 (1998):195-228 which is another example of a generative experiment that suggests multiple interpretations.

VI. WHY NOT ASK?

A. Why not listen?

1) How does one talk anyway? (**Thursday, February 22**). Here we revisit IC3.

Required Reading: Martin, *TTM*, chapter 4; Helen Rose Fuchs Ebaugh, *Becoming an Ex*, 1-3, 25-40, 62-65, 87-89, 97-103, 124-129, 139-143 and Appendix B (213-224) **,

Further recommended reading:
James Spradley's The Ethnographic Interview is an interesting manual for question-asking, but the technique advocated really is focused around interviewing informants when one doesn't know much, as opposed to the more focused interview style. Robert S. Weiss, Learning from Strangers might be a better one for most purposes.

2) To whom does one talk? (**Tuesday, February 27**). Here we revisit IE2.

Required Reading: Michele Lamont, *Money Morals Manners*: This is an extremely pleasant book to read, but make sure to concentrate on the note to the reader, prologue, chapters 1 through 4, and the Appendixes.

Further recommended reading:
Ann Swidler's Talk of Love shows another way of using interview data to learn things that you might not be able to understand in other ways. *Lone Pursuit: Distrust and Defensive Individualism Among the Black Poor* by Sandra Susan Smith also couples in-depth interviewing with an intriguing research design. *The Stars Are Not Enough: Scientists--Their Passions and Professions* by Joseph C. Hermanowicz may be another cool exemplar, though it's a bit depressing too. Science…is…a…harsh…god….

This space intentionally left blank

BEGIN Exercise: Making Data. There are again two variants of this exercise. But you are not only **strongly urged** to do the interviewing version, you must **receive permission** if you want to do the experimental version, and you need to request this 2.5 days before this class….for reasons that will make sense to you…

In-Depth Interviewing Version: Think of a question that you might be able to answer by asking people. And not a whole bunch of people, just some. Who would you interview? How would you get this information? Do <u>two</u> in-depth interviews. The first should be with someone who is <u>not</u> a sociologist. I understand you'll probably have to hit on someone you know pretty well, but the more distant the better. For the second, <u>interview someone in the class</u> (I will assign your interviewee from among the other students choosing the interview variant). For both, try to get the information you want to answer your question. (I suggest you tape record the interview, unless you are an expert note-taker. Give yourself an hour or so for each interview.) When you're done, write up your report as follows: 1) the question or hunch; 2) whom you would interview if this was a real project; 3) whom you actually chose to interview; 4) how you think the interview went; 5) what you learned. Attach your interview guide / set of questions. Do you think you could answer your question with more of these interviews? Give snippets. NOW ATTACH A SECOND PART—tell me about the interview in which <u>you</u> were the subject. Did you think it went well? Did the questions make sense? Did the interviewer establish rapport? Did they get information that was misleading? Did you ever withhold information or lie? Did some questions ask too much from you in cognitive terms? **Important Note:** if you are hoping to link this to a project with a very *specific* population (for example, astronauts on the Great Terror), don't do one interview with an astronaut and another totally lame one with your classmate. Instead, figure out a related question that could be asked of a population that includes your classmate.

Experimental Version: Take your question and consider some aspects that might seem most difficult to answer using the method(s) previously tried. Write a proposal that would suggest how an experimental approach could be used to answer these questions. Describe it in <u>detail</u>—say who are the subjects, what are the procedures, how are the data collected, how are they analyzed, and defend your claim that what is measured in the experiment is the same as whatever you were talking about in your theoretical question.

This exercise is due Tuesday, March 6, at 4:30 PM!

B. Why not test?

1) How do you analyze surveys? What can they tell you as opposed to not tell you? (**Thursday, March 1**). Here we revisit IF1,2,4.

Required Reading: Stephen Vaisey, "Motivation and Justification: A Dual-Process Model of Culture in Action" *American Journal of Sociology* 114(2009):1675-1715; Erik Olin Wright, *Classes*, 6-18, 137-156, 163-173—maybe another page I need to add; Kim A. Weeden and David B. Grusky, "The Case for a New Class Map," *American Journal of Sociology* 111 (2005): 141-212; D. Paul Sullins, "Catholic/Protestant Trends on Abortion, Convergences and Polarity" (JSSR 38, no .3, 1999). **Note:** There is somewhere I think a more accessible treatment of the Weeden and Grusky argument that has a very intuitive 3-D map of occupational inheritance, and if I can find it, I'll substitute it for this more technical argument….

2) How do you make surveys? (**Tuesday, March 6**). Here we revisit IE3-5. Required Reading: Edward O. Laumann et al, *The Social Organization of Sexuality*, 35-71, 96-118, 124-133, 606-608, 622-649, 670-677*, Paul M. Sniderman and Edward G. Carmines, *Reaching Beyond Race*, 11-14, 37-53*,

Further recommended reading:
A note on question writing. The course will focus on those methods that graduate students are likely to use. It is not likely that many students will write closed-choice questionnaires (standard surveys), and hence I haven't focussed on writing them. If you ever go on to do that, you will have to learn this—it's not easy. The best book on this is *still* Payne's *The Art of Asking Questions*. One of my favorite works of survey research is Sal Oropesa, "Consumer Possession, Consumer Passions, and Subjective Well Being." 1995 *Sociological Forum*.

VII. RESEARCH DESIGN II
(**Optional: Thursday, March 8**). This is in reading period; if we think that we want to discuss issues of writing it up, we can schedule an optional meeting for today.

Required Reading: Becker, *Evidence;* Martin, *TTM*, Chapter 9, Conclusion.

Now that I know that, what do I do? Here we will return to some of the main themes and see to what extent we have a coherent view. Becker's new book is the cold water in the face that you need to get serious about what you are going to go on to do! It's *outstanding*.

BEGIN Final exercise. Write a research proposal for your question. It should be as clear as possible regarding: (1) what your question is; (2) why it is reasonably important; (3) how you plan to study it (what general methodological approach); (4) your choice of site or data source; (5) your choice of methods and proposed line of investigation; (6) possible problems that you are likely to run into.

Remember:

1. Clarity and specificity above all else. You have a good proposal when you can die right now, and your executors can still write this one up.

2. Even if you've already begun your project, take this seriously—re-think what your question is. What would be the best way to answer it? Don't try to sell what you have in your hand if you realize there could be something better.

3. Feel free to use portions of your earlier exercises, word for word if appropriate. That's what they were all about.

Due Monday March 14!

ADDENDUM:
What else do you need to write a great sociological paper or book besides all the work? Maybe a bit on how to phrase your argument. This brings us to the art of rhetoric, for which I do not have time in this quarter. There are conventions of presentation and argumentation which are necessary (though not sufficient) for scholarly communication in sociology. I suggest that you take a look at the followings: Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar, *Laboratory Life*; Latour, *Science in Action*, Charles Kurzman, "The Rhetoric of Science: Strategies for Logical Leaping," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 33, 1988, pp. 131-158; Donald McCloskey, *The Rhetoric of Economics*, Michael Lynch, "Pictures of Nothing? Visual Constructs in Social Theory" *Sociological Theory* 9 (1991):1-21 has a nice analysis of the rhetoric of visual presentation. Bruno Latour, in "Visualization and Cognition" (Knowledge and Society 6:1-40) stresses the importance of distilling complexity into visual form so as to triumph in agonistic encounters with competing would-be truth-tellers. And in fact, in his *Pasteurization of France*, he has some great examples of this, but not for sociology. You also might want to look at Alvin Gouldner's explanation for Talcott Parsons's rhetorical style in *The Coming Crisis in Western Sociology*. There is a growing body of explicit work on rhetoric and/in sociology. In the Hunter edited volume, *The Rhetoric of Social Research*, you might want to look at James Bennett's analysis of the rhetoric of Merton's paper on anomie; in the same volume Kai Erikson has a nice and reasonable discussion of the pros and cons of scientific-y voice. (Which reminds me of Ira Cohen's analysis of "Voice as Method," comparing the rhetorical strategies of Goffman and Garfinkle.) Other things I haven't read: Richard H. Brown, A Poetic for Sociology, Ricca Edmondson, *Rhetoric in Sociology*, and Andrew Weigert, "The Immoral Rhetoric of Scientific Sociology", *American Sociologist* 5(1970):111-116.

Have a nice life ☺!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: This course is based on a methods course I previously taught at Rutgers University which was based on one that I took with Claude Fischer. I thank Daniel Menchik for recent suggestions.