



PPD 706 RESEARCH DESIGN

Term: Spring 2013 Mondays, 2:00 - 5:20

Location: RGL 304

Professor: Nicole Esparza

Office: RGL 201F

Office hours: Mondays, 5:30 - 7:30 PM or
by appointment

E-Mail: neesparz@usc.edu

Course Description

This doctoral seminar presents the logic of social scientific inquiry, theory building, and the fundamentals of social science research design.¹ Emphasis is placed on principles that are applicable to all types of contemporary social research. The course focuses on such practical matters as (1) how to distinguish a theory from a philosophical assertion; (2) how to derive a falsifiable hypothesis from a theory; and (3) how to design a research project, carry out the research, and write up the results.

We begin with an overview of the scientific method and examine both the advantages and pitfalls of applying the scientific method to social inquiry. After this, we discuss the stages of conducting original research. We then focus on the key aspects of social science research, including hypothesis testing, causal inference, measurement, and validity. And finally, we spend most of the semester exploring the major research designs and techniques of data collection used to investigate social phenomena.

Course Format

The course is designed around the concept of learning by doing. Therefore, your major task will be to produce a research proposal. The class will be part lecture/seminar and part workshop. During most sessions, the class will begin with a presentation of techniques, issues, and concerns regarding the topic of the week. Then there will be an open discussion which will relate these issues to substantive examples within the social sciences. Everyone will share proposal drafts, present work in progress, and provide constructive review of one another's work.

Learning Goals and Objectives

The major objective of this course is to introduce you to the process of conducting original, doctoral-level research. You should leave this course with doctoral-level proficiency in:

- understanding various epistemological approaches to investigating social phenomena;
- developing empirical, researchable, and original research questions;
- deriving, developing, and testing hypotheses from theory;

¹ This course was developed from previous versions of PPD 706 (Guiliano; Myers) and other doctoral courses on social inquiry, most notably (Bertelli PADP 8110; Moody SOC 651; and Freese SOC 750).

- understanding causal inference and different interpretations of causality;
- understanding theory development and grounded theory
- selecting the most appropriate design and measures for a given research project;
- understanding the strengths and weaknesses of different research designs;
- writing and defending a proposal;
- critiquing proposals and completed research; and
- redefining your projects and future research.

Reading Material

There is a significant amount of reading in this course and each class is organized around the assigned readings. You are expected to read the assigned pages prior to the class in which they will be discussed. Use the dates on the syllabus to help plan your reading time. You will notice that some of the pieces are marked with (*). The asterisk denotes all those texts that you should read carefully; you can skim the others. You should come to class with a working knowledge of the main ideas in each reading. In most cases, you can get the central points of the textbook fairly quickly, but prepare yourself for slower and more difficult reading in the journal articles and empirical examples. This class does not assume more than a basic understanding of multiple regression, so don't let the statistical details of a particular article worry you. Focus instead on the logic of the analysis.

Five books are required. Articles and chapters are available on the course Blackboard site.

<https://blackboard.usc.edu/>

Required Texts:

- Singleton, Royce A. Jr. and Bruce C. Straits. 2009. *Approaches to Social Research, 5th edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. (4th edition will work too).
- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Booth, Wayne C., Colomb, Gregory G., and Joseph M. Williams. 2007. *The Craft of Research, 3rd edition*. IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Goss, Kristen. 2006. *Disarmed: The Missing Movement for Gun Control in America*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Klinenberg, Eric. 2002. *Heat Wave: A Social Autopsy of Disaster in Chicago*. IL: University of Chicago Press.

Recommended texts:

- Becker, Howard S. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, Howard S. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Strunk, William, Jr. and E.B. White. 2000. *The Elements of Style*. New York: Macmillan.

Course Grading and Requirements

The course grade will be based on four components.

Class Participation: The class is a seminar, relying on active participation by all students. I expect students to attend class regularly, do the reading, and participate fully in class discussions. During class you should, ask questions, offer helpful comments, and generally engage in discussion. You are required to attend each class in its entirety, and are required to notify me in the event of an unavoidable absence. Two or more absences during the semester will result in zero total points for class participation.

Research Proposal: Your main assignment in this class is to prepare a research proposal that is about 15 pages (double-spaced, one-inch margins, and conventional fonts, such as Times Roman 12-point font). You should model your research proposal on the introduction and method sections of articles published in top academic journals. (More information is given on page 12 of the syllabus).

Written Assignments: You will complete 10 written assignments. More than half of them are intended to contribute directly to your research proposal. The other written assignments, while brief, will require a fair amount of thought and preparation. The assignments are described and due per the course schedule. Please upload your assignments on Blackboard before the start of each class.

As an academic, it is important that you develop strong writing skills. I expect all material turned in for the course to be written within the standards of professional social science. If you have trouble with writing, please seek help at the university writing center. You may also want to purchase and read one of a number of writing style guides, such as Strunk and White.

Presentation: You will present your proposal during one of the last two class sessions. Your presentation will be about 10-15 minutes with an additional 10-15 for questions. The presentations will allow feedback from classmates and help you develop your final research proposal.

To summarize, the course grade is assigned as follows:

Class participation	10%
Written assignments	50%
Presentation	5%
<u>Final Proposal</u>	<u>35%</u>
Total	100%

Course Schedule

The asterisk (*) denotes all those texts that you should read carefully; you can skim the others.

WEEK 1, January 14

Introduction to Social Science Research

As social scientists, our research spans a diverse set of topics, research designs, and audiences. Nevertheless, we all have one thing in common—we all try to make sense of the social world. How is social science different from the biological sciences or the humanities? And how are we different from journalists and other non-fiction writers?

Singleton and Straits, chpt. 1

Booth, et al. 2007. *The Craft of Research*, chpts. 1-2

*Behn, Robert D. 1985. "Policy Analysts, Clients, and Social Scientists." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 4(3): 428-432.

*Merton, Robert K. 1949. "The Role of Applied Social Science in the Formulation of Policy: A Research Memorandum." *Philosophy of Science* 16(3): 161-181.

*Buchanan, David A. and Alan Bryman. 2007. "Contextualizing methods choice in organizational research." *Organizational Research Methods* 10: 483-501.

WEEK 2, RESCHEDULED

The Nature of Science & Paradigms of Research

January 23 Wednesday 10am-1pm RGL 304

What makes our questions "scientific" and how do we establish causation in social research? There are several approaches to science, all of which agree that science is possible and desirable, but each differ as to exactly what counts as scientific, rigorous induction. In other words, each paradigm has their own philosophy of science, which boils down to the age-old question – how do we translate observations about the universe into understandings of natural law without being blinded by our preconceptions?

*Singleton and Straits, chpt. 2

*Gieryn, Thomas F. 2001. "Boundaries of Science" Pp. 393-407 in Jasanoff et al. (eds.) *Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. CA: Sage.

*Little, Daniel. 1993. "Evidence and Objectivity in the Social Sciences." *Social Research* 60: 363-96.

*Shadish, William R. 1995. "Philosophy of Science and the Quantitative-Qualitative Debates: Thirteen Common Errors." *Evaluation and Program Planning* 18: 63-75.

Scheiber, Noam. 2007. "Freaks and Geeks: How Freakonomics is ruining the dismal science." *The New Republic*. April 7, 2007 [<http://www.tnr.com>].

WEEK 3, January 28

Stages of Social Research

Research is a process that travels all the way from the research question to publication. How can we be productive researchers? What are the risks to participants in social research? How do we weigh these risks relative to the benefits of the research? How do we protect subjects from unwarranted risk?

Singleton and Straits, chpt. 3-4

*Booth, et al. 2007. *The Craft of Research*, chpts. 3-6

Baumrind, Diana. 1964. "Some Thoughts on Ethics of Research: After Reading Milgram's 'Behavioral Study of Obedience'." *American Psychologist* 19: 421-423.

Milgram, Stanley. 1964. "A Reply to Baumrind." *American Psychologist* 19: 848-852.

USC . "Student Guide to Human Subjects Research." [www.usc.edu/admin/opr/research/student.html]

Assignment 1 due:

Write 1-2 paragraphs on a research topic that interests you enough to refine into a research proposal throughout the course. Describe what is interesting about your phenomenon in a few sentences, describe any human subject issues, and then conclude with a single research question. Your proposed study must be empirical (i.e., based on evidence) as opposed to theoretical. It must investigate a relationship that is explanatory, predictive, or evaluative. Exploratory studies are highly discouraged—if not totally prohibited.

WEEK 4, February 4

Causal Inference & Its Critiques

The goal of social science inquiry is to highlight patterns of relationships between various people, organizations, institutions, concepts and meanings in the social world. Although it is common for social researchers to derive descriptive patterns from observations, most social scientists aspire to establish causation among relationships. (Note: The first misconception of causality is that all qualitative research is not causal and all quantitative research is. Not true. The second misconception of causality is that all empirical work is causal. Not true either.)

*Hedström, Peter and Petri Ylikoski. 2010. "Causal Mechanisms in the Social Sciences." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 49–67.

Marini, Margaret and Burton Singer. 1988. "Causality in the Social Sciences." *Sociological Methodology* 18: 347-409.

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

Morgan, Gareth and Linda Smircich. 1980. "The Case for Qualitative Research." *Academy of Management Review* 5(4): 491-500.

*Mahoney, James and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227-249.

Critiques:

Abbott, Andrew. 1998. "The Causal Devolution." *Sociological Methods and Research* 27: 148-181.

*Lehrer, Jonah. 2010. "The Truth Wears Off: Is there Something Wrong with the Scientific Method?" *The New Yorker*.

Assignment 2 due:

Provide a brief outline of the causal argument(s) in the Galster, Andersson, Musterd article. What are their implicit or explicit hypotheses? What are the mechanisms or processes they use to explain causation? Assess their argument using the week's readings.

Galster, George, Andersson, Roger and Sako Musterd. 2010. "Who Is Affected by Neighbourhood Income Mix? Gender, Age, Family, Employment and Income Differences." *Urban Studies* 47(14): 2915-2944.

WEEK 5, February 11 Theoretical Frames

As interdisciplinary researchers we apply theory from our field, borrow disciplinary theory, and sometimes make up our own. What are some of the pitfalls associated with theory testing and theory building? How do we move from theoretical concepts to empirical measurement?

Booth, et al. 2007. *The Craft of Research*, chpts. 7-10

*Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1968. *Constructing Social Theories*, chpt 2. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

*Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss. 1999. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, chpt 1-2. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

*Sutton, Robert I. and Barry M. Staw. 1995. "What Theory is Not." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 40: 371-384.

*Whetten, David A., Felin, Teppo and Brayden G. King. 2009. "The Practice of Theory Borrowing in Organizational Studies: Current Issues and Future Directions." *Journal of Management* 35(3): 537-563.

Mitchell, T. R. and James, L. R. 2001. "Building better theory: Time and the specification of when things happen." *Academy of Management Review* 26: 530-548.

Assignment 3 due:

For either the González & Healy OR the Garrow article below, discuss their choice of theoretical frame(s). Assess the article in light of this week's readings.

Garrow, Eve E. 2011. "Receipt of Government Revenue among Nonprofit Human Service Organizations." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21: 445-471.

González, Sara and Patsy Healey. 2005. "A sociological Institutional approach to the study of innovation in governance capacity." *Urban Studies* 42(11): 2055-2069.

WEEK 6, RESCHEDULED Measurement & Data

February 21 Thursday 10am-1pm RGL 102

Rigorous conceptual thinking early in a research project will pay off in the end. Often the sample construction, case selection, and data collection strategy are much more important than your choice of analytic procedures.

*Singleton and Straits, chpt. 5-6, 12

*Adcock, Robert and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95(3): 529-546.

*Maxwell, Joseph A. 2005. "Validity. How Might You Be Wrong?" Pp. 86-98 in *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. CA: Sage.

Assignment 4 due:

Choose an article from a top field journal (e.g., *AMJ*, *JAPA*, *JPAMM*, *JPART*, *NVSQ*, *Urban Studies*) that could serve as a model for your research project. Prepare a two-page précis of the paper that covers the question addressed, the theories covered, the data used, the methods employed, and the findings. What do you like about the article? What are its weaknesses?

WEEK 7, February 25 Case & Comparative Studies

Comparative methods are the best at answering community-level questions, such as which factors contribute to economic development. What are some unique challenges of making causal inferences when you have a modest number of cases? How do we optimally select cases?

*George and Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, chpts. 1, 3-6, 8-10.

Ragin, Charles. 1997. "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research." *Comparative Social Research* 16: 27-42.

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* 71: 307-320.

Assignment 5 due:

Prepare a 2-3 page outline that (a) refines your research question, (b) includes at least three hypotheses, (c) outlines the conditions on which you base your claims, (d) lists your methods,

and (e) provides 10 references that are relevant to your topic (published in top academic journals or presses).

WEEK 8, March 4

Case Studies (cont). & Multiple Methods

This week we will start two books, *Disarmed* and *Heat Wave*, which both began as dissertations.

Singleton and Straits, chpt. 13

*Goss, Kirstin A. 2006. *Disarmed*, chpts. 1-2, 4, 6

*Klinenberg, Eric. 2002. *Heat Wave*, prologue-chpt. 2

Assignment 6 due:

Write a reaction/critique of Goss' book *Disarmed*. Your reaction should be about 800 words and should focus on the research conducted in the book. You should write your reaction presuming that I have also read it; therefore you don't need to spend a lot of time summarizing the project. Your critique might consider: (1) ways the book did or did not exemplify things you see as strengths and weaknesses of its kind of research; (2) things you wished she had examined or talked more about; (3) ways the author might extend their research; and (4) connections between the research discussed in the book and readings/discussions from class. Conclude with at least two discussion questions for the class.

WEEK 9, March 11

Field Research: Observations & Ethnography

First-hand observations are one of the best ways to explore certain social issues. They can provide us with in depth knowledge about a specific population or process. But field observations pose unique issues. First, how can we make sure our preconceptions don't cloud our observations? And how can other researchers replicate our first-hand observations?

Singleton and Straits, chpt. 11

*Klinenberg, Eric. 2002. *Heat Wave*, chpts. 3- end

*Becker, Howard S. 1958. "Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation." *American Sociological Review* 23: 652-660.

*Van Maanen, John. 1979. "The Fact of Fiction in Organizational Ethnography." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 25(4): 539-550.

Duneier, Mitchell. 2006. "Ethnography, the Ecological Fallacy, and the 1995 Chicago Heat Wave." *American Sociological Review* 71: 679-688.

Klinenberg's response to Duneier. Klinenberg, Eric. 2006. "Blaming the Victims: Hearsay, Labeling, and the Hazards of Quick-Hit Disaster Ethnography." *American Sociological Review* 71: 689-698.

Assignment 7 due:

Write a reaction/critique of Klinenberg's book *Heat Wave*. Your reaction should be about 800 words and should focus on the research conducted in the book. You should write your reaction presuming that I have also read it; therefore you don't need to spend a lot of time summarizing the project. Your critique might consider: (1) ways the book did or did not exemplify things you see as strengths and weaknesses of its kind of research; (2) things you wished he had examined or talked more about; (3) ways the author might extend their research; and (4) connections between the research discussed in the book and readings/discussions from class. Conclude with at least two discussion questions for the class.

March 18

Spring Break – No Class

WEEK 10, March 25

Survey & Interview Research

Surveys are among the most common sources of data for social scientists. The basis for survey research ultimately rests on how respondents answer questions. What are the primary issues in fielding a survey? How do we ask questions that ensure the highest quality data?

*Booth, et al. 2007. *The Craft of Research*, chpts. 7-10

*Singleton and Straits, chpts. 9, 10

*Schaeffer, Nora Cate and Stanley Presser. 2003. "The Science of Asking Questions." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 65-88.

Dillman, Donald A. 2006. "Why Choice of Survey Mode Makes a Difference." *Public Health Reports* 121: 11-13.

Goldstein, Kenneth. 2002. "Getting in the Door: Sampling and Completing Elite Interviews." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4): 669-672.

Clampet-Lundquist, Susan, Kling, Jeffrey R., Edin, Kathryn, and Greg J. Duncan. 2011. "Moving Teenagers Out of High-Risk Neighborhoods: How Girls Fare Better than Boys." *American Journal of Sociology* 116(4): 1154-89.

Assignment 8 due:

For your research proposal, please complete one of the following:

1. Develop a survey instrument capable of gathering some of the data for your project using a wide range of question types. Begin your assignment with a paragraph that clearly states the question driving your research and how the survey will help to answer it. The total document may not exceed three pages.

2. Prepare an interview instrument (or guide) for semi-structured interviews capable of gathering some of the data to answer your research question. Begin your assignment with a paragraph that clearly states the question driving your research and how the interview data will help to answer it. Balance open-ended and follow-up questions. The total document may not exceed three pages.
3. Find an existing data set capable of answering your research question. Write a two-page memo discussing the characteristics of the dataset, such as the population, sample, number of observations. List the variables you would foresee using in the analysis, and any descriptive statistics you have about the variables (may be you have the codebook). Be sure to identify your unit and level of analysis, dependent variable, and key independent variables. Review how you will operationalize causal factors and outcomes.

WEEK 11, April 1 Experimental Design

If experiments represent the gold-standard for scientific evidence, then why are they underutilized in social research?

*Singleton and Straits, chpts. 7-8

*Burtless, Gary. 1995. "The Case for Randomized Field Trials in Economic and Policy Research." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9(2): 63-84.

*Heckman, James J. and Jeffrey A. Smith. 1995. "Assessing the Case for Social Experiments." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9(2): 85-110.

Feins, Judith and Mark D. Shroder. 2005. "Moving to opportunity: The demonstration's design and its effects on mobility." *Urban Studies* 42(8): 1275-1299.

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

Assignment 9 due WEDNESDAY April 3rd by 11:59pm:

Submit a 5-7 page draft of your final research proposal. Be sure to include sections 1-4 & 6. Please upload it on Blackboard for me and email it to two of your classmates (they'll be assigned).

WEEK 12, April 8 Peer Feedback

This week you will be sharing feedback with one another in class.

Assignment 10 due:

Review and provide feedback on two of your classmate's draft proposals (they'll be assigned). Please upload it on Blackboard for me and email your feedback to the author. Be prepared to share your feedback with the author in class.

Each student will meet with me individually this week to discuss his or her final proposal.

WEEK 13, April 15 Presentations I

Two-thirds of the class will present their proposals. All proposal presentations will be a maximum of 10-15 minutes followed by 10-15 minutes of discussion/comments.

WEEK 14, April 22 Presentations II

The rest of the class will present their proposals. All proposal presentations will be a maximum of 10-15 minutes followed by 10-15 minutes of discussion/comments.

Week 15, FRIDAY May 3rd

Final Proposal is due by 11:59pm

Final Proposal due Friday May 3rd by 11:59pm

Proposals should include the following sections and subsections. Variations in proposal structure are permitted as long as it follows the general pattern of an empirical article from your field's journal. Your proposal should be no longer than 15 double-spaced pages, exclusive of tables, figures, and references. Most effort should be on sections 1, 3, and 4.

1. An introductory statement of the significance of the study
 - a. State research question(s) and possible sub questions
 - b. Justify topic and question(s) as relevant to your field
2. Literature Review/ Theoretical Frame
 - a. Synthesize literature as related to your topic
 - b. Summarize your contribution to the literature
3. Theoretical or Conceptual Model
 - a. Create a diagram that explains your causal relations and mechanism
 - b. State explicit, testable hypotheses derived from the literature
4. Data and Methods
 - a. Describe your sample, case selection
 - b. Describe your data and data sources
 - c. Discuss validity, reliability, and justify your concepts and measures
 - d. Identify threats and other limitations and discuss mitigation strategies
5. Estimation or Analysis
 - a. Describe how you plan to analyze the data
 - b. Summarize what you expect to find
6. Appendix: Include instruments for your survey or interviews or any descriptive statistics you have on a pre-existing data set (basically a revised assignment 7).
7. References

Statement on Disabilities

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me (or to TA) as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Website and contact information for DSP:

http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html, (213) 740-0776 (Phone), (213) 740-6948 (TDD only), (213) 740-8216 (FAX) ability@usc.edu.

Statement on Academic Integrity

USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one's own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another's work as one's own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. SCampus, the Student Guidebook, (www.usc.edu/scampus or <http://scampus.usc.edu>) contains the University Student Conduct Code (see University Governance, Section 11.00), while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A. Students will be referred to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards for further review, should there be any suspicion of academic dishonesty. The Review process can be found at: <http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/SJACS/>. Information on intellectual property at USC is available at: <http://usc.edu/academe/acsen/issues/ipr/index.html>. In particular, the University recommends strict sanctions for plagiarism, defined below:

11.11 Plagiarism

A. The submission of material authored by another person but represented as the student's own work, whether that material is paraphrased or copied in verbatim or near-verbatim form.

B. The submission of material subjected to editorial revision by another person that result in substantive changes in content or major alternation of writing style.

C. Improper acknowledgement of sources in essays or papers.

<http://www.usc.edu/dept/publications/SCAMPUS/governance/gov05.html>

If you have any questions about academic integrity or citation standards, please ask in advance.

Emergency Preparedness/ Course Continuity in a Crisis

In case of a declared emergency if travel to campus is not feasible, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technologies.

Future Readings for Your Enjoyment

There are so many good readings on conducting social research. I couldn't include them all on the syllabus, so here is a list of future supplemental readings.

Introduction to Social Science Research & the Process of Research

- Alford, Robert R. 1998. *The Craft of Inquiry: Theories, Methods, Evidence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2005. *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lindblom, Charles E. 1986. "Who Needs What Social Research for Policymaking?" *Science Communication*, 7(4): 345-366.
- Martin, Joanne. 1981. "A Garbage Can Model of the Psychological Research Process." *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(2): 131-151.
- McGrath, Joseph E. 1981. "Dilemmatics: The Study of Research Choices and Dilemmas." *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(2): 179-211.
- McGrath, Joseph E. P., Joanne Martin, and Richard A. Kulka. 1981. "Some Quasi-Rules for Making Judgment Calls in Research." *American Behavioral Scientist* 25(2): 211-224.

Philosophy of Science

- Abbott, Andrew. 2001. *Chaos of Disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Camic, Charles and Yu Xie. 1994. "The Statistical Turn in American Social Science: Columbia University, 1890 to 1915." *American Sociological Review* 59: 773-805.
- Kuhn, Thomas. 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 1987. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Little, Daniel. 1995. "Objectivity, Truth, and Method: A Philosopher's Perspective on the Social Sciences." *Anthropology Newsletter*.
- Merton, Robert K. 1949. "The Role of Applied Social Science in the Formulation of Policy: A Research Memorandum." *Philosophy of Science* 16(3): 161-181.

Causal Inference

- Angrist, J D., Imbens, G W. and Donald B. Rubin. 1996. "Identification of Causal Effects Using Instrumental Variables." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 91: 444-472.
- Angrist, Joshua D. and Krueger, Alan B. 1999. "Empirical Strategies in Labor Economics," in Orley Ashenfelter and David Card (eds.) *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. 3A, Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Braumoeller, Bear F. 2003. "Causal Complexity and the Study of Politics." *Political Analysis* 11:209-233.
- Braumoeller, Bear F. and Gary Goertz. 2000. "The methodology of necessary conditions." *American Journal of Political Science* 44:844-858.
- Gennetian, Lisa A., Bos, Johannes M., and Pamela A. Morris. 2002. "Using Instrumental Variables Analysis to Learn More from Social Policy Experiments." *MDRC*.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. and Donald B. Rubin. 1984. "Reducing Bias in Observational Studies Using Subclassification on the Propensity Score." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 79: 516-524.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. and Donald B. Rubin. 1985. "Constructing a control group using multivariate matched sampling methods that incorporate the propensity score." *The American Statistician* 39: 33-38.

Theory Building

- Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss. 1999. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Jones, Charles O. 1974. "Doing Before Knowing: Concept Development in Political Research." *American Journal of Political Science* 18(1): 215-228.
- King, Gary. 1989. *Unifying Political Methodology: The Likelihood Theory of Statistical Inference*. MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, John Levi. 2003. "What is Field Theory?" *American Journal of Sociology* 109: 1-49.
- Mitchell, T. R. and James, L. R. 2001. "Building better theory: Time and the specification of when things happen." *Academy of Management Review* 26: 530-548.
- Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1968. *Constructing Social Theories*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Experiments & Quasi-Experiments

- 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.
- 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.
- Moffitt, Robert A. 2004. "The Role of Randomized Field Trials in Social Science Research: A Perspective from Evaluations of Reforms of Social Welfare Programs." *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(5): 506-540.
- Nathan, Richard P. 2008. "Point/Counterpoint: The Role of Random Assignment in Social Policy Research." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 27(3): 606-615.
- Orr, Larry L. 1999. *Social experiments: evaluating public programs with experimental methods*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Shadish, William R., Thomas D. Cook, Donald T. Campbell. 2001. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Waldfogel, Jane. 1999. "The Impact of the Family and Medical Leave Act." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 18(2):281-302.

Case Study Research Design

- Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2006. "Complex Causal Relations and Case Study Methods: The Example of Path Dependence." *Political Analysis* 14(3): 250-267.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2: 131-50.
- Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Paige, Jeffery M. 1999. "Conjuncture, Comparison, and Conditional Theory in Macrosocial Inquiry." *The American Journal of Sociology*, 105: 781-800.
- Ragin, Charles C. 2000. *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Yin, Robert K. 2002. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. Third edition. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Qualitative Research Design

- Berg, Bruce. 2004. *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Pearson.
- Collier, David, and James Mahoney. 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 49(1): 56-91.
- Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Emerson, R. M. 1983. *Contemporary Field Research*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Huberman, A. Michael and Matthew Miles. 2002. *The Qualitative Researcher's Companion*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- King, Gary, Keohane, Robert O. and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Maxwell, Joseph A. 1996. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. CA: Sage.

Sampling & Surveys

- Berk, Richard A. 1998. "An Introduction to Sample Selection Bias in Sociological Data." *American Sociological Review* 48: 386-398.
- Couper, Mick P. 2000. "Web Surveys: A Review of Issues and Approaches." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 64(4): 464-494.
- Fowler, Floyd J. 1993. *Survey research methods*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Lenth, R. 2001. "Some Practical Guidelines for Effective Sample Size Determination." *American Statistician* 55: 187-193.
- Sniderman, Paul M. and Douglas B. Grob. 1996. "Innovations in Experimental Design in Attitude Surveys." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22:377-399.
- Tourangeau, Roger, and Tom W. Smith. 1996. "Asking Sensitive Questions: The Impact of Data Collection Mode, Question Format, and Question Context." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 60(2): 275-304.
- Tourangeau, Roger. 2004. "Survey Research and Societal Change." *Annual Review of Psychology* 55: 775-801.

Interviews & Ethnographies

- Burawoy, Michael 2003. "Revisits: An Outline of a Theory of Reflexive Ethnography." *American Sociological Review* 68: 645-679.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1991. *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. (especially "The Extended Case Method" chapter).
- Katz, Jack. 1997. "Ethnography's Warrants." *Sociological Methods and Research* 25: 391-421.
- Wacquant, Loïc. 2002. "Scrutinizing the street: Poverty, morality, and the pitfalls of urban ethnography." *American Journal of Sociology* 107: 1468-1532.
- Weiss, Robert Stuart. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and method of qualitative interview studies*. Robert S. Weiss Free Press.
- Whyte, William Foote. 1955. *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (especially "Appendix: On the Evolution of *Street Corner Society*")
- Woliver, Laura R. 2002. "Ethical Dilemmas in Personal Interviewing." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(4): 677-678.