

Sociology 275 – Research Design – Spring 2015 – Professor Heather A. Haveman

Wednesdays 4-6pm, 402 Barrows

Office 494 Barrows Hall

Office Hours Mondays 3:30-5:30pm (signup sheet on office door)

Email haveman@berkeley.edu

Telephone 510-642-3495

Who should take this course, and why?

This seminar is designed to guide you through the process of developing, carrying out, and writing up an empirical study that can be submitted to a sociology journal, either a general journal like *AJS*, *ASR*, or *Social Forces* or a specialty journal like *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Demography*, *Gender and Society*, or *Social Networks*. Although it is intended primarily for students working on their MA papers (sociology) or second-year papers (Haas), I also welcome students working on another research project, such as a portion of their dissertation they want to turn into a journal article. Students may find this course helpful at several stages in the research process: when they are preparing to gather data, when they have finished gathering data and are conducting analysis, when they have finished analysis and are starting to write up results, and when they are revising a paper.

This course is **not an applied statistics course**. For advice on statistics, you should talk with the people who taught you statistics. You could also take advantage of a wonderful web resource at UCLA, <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/>, which has guides for most common statistical software packages – SPSS, SAS, and Stata – and other less well-known ones. Here's the link to a great online statistics textbook: <http://www.statsoft.com/Textbook>. See also the list of resources at the end of this syllabus.

Everyone who attends the seminar must enroll. I will not accept auditors because this course requires active participation. To really improve your paper or dissertation, you have to complete all the exercises and apply what you've learned from them. You won't benefit much from simply reading the assignments and participating in class discussions because the knowledge transmitted in this course is tacit – it cannot be fully articulated. In other words, you can learn how to do sociological research only by **doing** it, not reading or talking about it.

Assignments and evaluation

You will complete a series of almost-weekly writing assignments that are designed to help you improve your research by taking you through the process of writing (and rewriting) a journal article. The table on pages 3-4 describes these assignments in detail, along with maximum lengths and due dates. The page limits given assume double-spaced text, 12-point fonts, and 1" margins; the page limits do **not** include tables, figures, or reference lists. Most assignments are due at the start of class. Bring 2 hard copies of each assignment to class – 1 to keep (if you need to refer to it during class) and 1 to give to me.

These writing assignments are designed to be cumulative. They are also designed to be flexible; you are very likely to redraft them as your research project evolves.

The final paper for the course – the culmination of your efforts over the semester – is due one week after the end of our class meetings – on **Friday, 8 May by 5pm**. Email the paper to me at haveman@berkeley.edu as a Word document or Adobe pdf file. Label the file `firstname_lastname.ext`; e.g., `heather_haveman.docx` or `heather_haveman.pdf`. I will return your papers with comments.

Assignments 1-11 will be graded on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis; assignment 12 (the final paper) will be graded on a letter scale. Your grade for the course will be based on my overall assessment of assignments 1-11 (25%), the quality (more than sheer quantity) of your participation in class discussions (10%), and your final paper (65%).

Readings

Three books constitute the intellectual backbone of this course:

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1968. *Constructing Social Theories*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Williams, Joseph M. 1990. *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The first and second books will guide you toward the development (actually, it's more often re-development) of your research questions and research design. The third book is a classic on writing style that we will read together to solidify our good writing habits and eradicate some of our bad writing habits.

You should seriously consider purchasing one of these books as references:

Miller, Jane E. 2004. *The Chicago Guide to Writing about Numbers: The Effective Presentation of Quantitative Information*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, Jane E. 2005. *The Chicago Guide to Writing about Multivariate Analyses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

I recommend the first book for those of you who do mostly qualitative research and the second for those of you who do mostly quantitative research.

We will also read several articles and chapters from other books that provide important advice on how to design and write research papers, as well as some examples of excellent research. Links to all articles through the UC Berkeley library are given below. All book chapters are on the bcourses page.

Class 1: 20 January: Introduction

- ◆ What are the goals of the course? How will we achieve them?
- ◆ Who should (and who should not) take the course?

Class 2: 28 January: Writing: Style and Substance

- ◆ How can you make your writing better (style, grammar) and more persuasive (rhetoric)?
- ◆ What makes the excerpts from Susan Shapiro's article and Pete Younkin's dissertation good writing?

Readings

Williams, Joseph M. 1990. *Style*. Preface, chapter 1, "Causes," chapter 2, "Clarity," and chapter 3, "Cohesion."

Examples of good writing:

Shapiro, Susan P. 2005. Agency theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31: 263-284.

(<http://www.istor.org/stable/29737720>) (Read just the abstract and introduction – the first 3 pages.)

Younkin, Peter A. 2010. Extract from *A Healthy Business: The Evolution of the US Market for Prescription Drugs*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, UC Berkeley, Department of Sociology. (I have given you just the abstract and the first 8 pages of the introduction.)

Optional: Bring in an example of good academic writing that you've actually enjoyed.

Class 3: 4 February: Describing Social Phenomena

- ◆ What is social science research? What does science **do**?
- ◆ What is a (good) social-scientific theory?
- ◆ What are you interested in explaining – what is your dependent variable?
- ◆ What is the phenomenon you are studying a case of? To what larger, more general class of phenomena does it belong?
- ◆ Why is it interesting ... to someone other than you?

Readings

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry* (hereafter, *DSI*), chapter 1, "The science in social science," and chapter 2, "Descriptive inference."

Walton, John. 1992. Making the theoretical case. In Charles C. Ragin and Howard S. Becker, eds., *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*: 121-137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davis, Murray S. 1971. That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1 (2): 309-344.

(<http://pos.sagepub.com/content/1/2.toc>)

Examples of describing and justifying cases (read only the introductions):

Guthrie, Douglas. 1997. Between markets and politics: Organizational responses to reform in China. *American Journal of Sociology*, 102 (5): 1258-1303.

(<http://www.istor.org/stable/10.1086/231084>)

Penner, Andrew M. 2008. Gender differences in extreme mathematical achievement: .
American Journal of Sociology, 114 (S1): S138-S170.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/589252>)

Fox, Cybelle. 2010. Three worlds of relief: Race, immigration, and public and private social welfare spending in American cities, 1929. *American Journal of Sociology*, 116 (2): 453-502. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/653836>)

Due: Assignment 1: Describe what you're studying (3 pp)

Class 4: 11 February: The Structure of Journal Articles

- ◆ What is the structure of a typical (empirical) journal article?

Readings

Data to induce your theory of journal article structure: skim these articles:

Rivera, Lauren. 2008. Managing “spoiled” national identity: War, tourism, and memory in Croatia. *American Sociological Review*, 73 (4): 613-634.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472547>)

Lena, Jennifer C., and Richard A. Peterson. 2008. Classification as culture: Types and trajectories of music genres. *American Sociological Review*, 73 (5): 697-718.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472554>)

Hagan, John, and Wenona Rymond-Richmond. 2008. The collective dynamics of racial dehumanization and genocidal victimization in Darfur. *American Sociological Review*, 73 (6): 875-902. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472566>)

McCarthy, Bill, and Teresa Casey. 2008. Love, sex, and crime: Adolescent sexual relationships and offending. *American Sociological Review*, 73 (6): 944-969.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472569>)

Weber, Klaus, L.G. Thomas, and Hayagreeva Rao. 2009. From streets to suites: How the anti-biotech movement affected German pharmaceutical firms. *American Sociological Review*, 74 (1): 106-127. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27736050>)

Tavory, Iddo, and Ann Swidler. 2009. Condom semiotics: Meaning and condom use in rural Malawi. *American Sociological Review*, 74 (2): 171-189.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27736056>)

Harding, David J. 2009. Violence, older peers, and the socialization of adolescent boys in disadvantaged neighborhoods. *American Sociological Review*, 74 (3): 445-464. (3)
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27736072>)

Due: Assignment 2: Based on these papers and others you've read, outline a “typical” empirical paper (1 p)

Class 5: 18 February: Writing: Style and Substance (Redux)

- ◆ How can you make your writing better (style, grammar) and more persuasive (rhetoric)?

Readings

Williams, Joseph M. 1990. *Style*. Chapter 4, “Emphasis,” chapter 5, “Coherence 1,” chapter 6 “Coherence 2,” and chapter 7 “Concision.”

Bem, Daryl J. 2003. Writing the empirical journal article. In J.M. Darley, M.P Zanna, and H.L. Roediger III, eds., *The Compleat Academic: A Practical Guide for the Beginning Social Scientist*, 2nd Ed. Washington, DC: Am. Psychological Assn.

Due: Assignment 3: Revision of Assignment 1: Describe what you’re studying (3 pp)

Class 6: 25 February: Causation (I)

- ◆ How do we know X causes Y?
- ◆ How do we know causation doesn’t run the other way – that X is not caused by Y?
- ◆ How do we know some other variable, Z, doesn’t cause both X and Y – that any association we observe between X and Y isn’t spurious?

Readings

Cook, Thomas D., and Donald T. Campbell. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*, pp. 9-36 from chapter 1, “Causal inference and the language of experimentation.” Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *DSI*, chapter 3, “Causality and causal inference.”

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. *Constructing Social Theories* (hereafter, *CST*), chapter 1, “Introduction,” and chapter 2, “The logic of scientific inference.”

Example of a paper that disentangles causality using statistics: King, Marissa D., and Heather A. Haveman. 2008. Antislavery in America: The press, the pulpit, and the rise of anti-slavery societies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53 (3): 492-528.

(<http://www.istor.org/stable/27749276>)

Due: Assignment 4: Outline your paper (2 pp)

Class 7: 4 March: Causation (II)

- ◆ How do we know X causes Y?
- ◆ How do we know causation doesn’t run the other way – that X is not caused by Y?
- ◆ How do we know Z doesn’t cause both X and Y – that any association we observe between X and Y is spurious?

Readings

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. *CST*, chapter 3, “Complex causal structures.” (*Skip the technical appendix.*)

Platt, John. 1964. Strong inference. *Science*, 146 (3642): 347-353.

(<http://www.istor.org/stable/1714268>)

- 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://www.jstor.org/stable/3069232>)
- Gross, Neal. 2009. A pragmatist theory of social mechanisms. *American Sociological Review*, 74 (3): 358-379. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27736068>)

Due: Nothing this week (*Breathe!!!*)

Class 8: 11 March: Reviewing the Literature

- ◆ How do you find out what sociologists (and scholars in nearby disciplines) know about a phenomenon?
- ◆ How do you join a scholarly conversation? How do you claim to be contributing to the literature on the phenomenon you are studying?
- ◆ What should you cite?

Readings

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1982. Should sociologists forget their mothers and fathers? *American Sociologist*, 17 (1): 2-11. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27702490>)

Becker, Howard S. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish your Thesis, Book, or Article*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 8, "Terrorized by the literature."

Example of a good literature review: Young, Michael P. 2006. *Bearing Witness against Sin: The Evangelical Birth of the American Social Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Introduction and chapter 1, "Modern social movements and confessional projections of the self."

Due: Assignment 5: Literature review: We do we already know about what causes your DV? (6 pp)

Class 9: 18 March: Thwarting the Skeptics

- ◆ Why might your argument be wrong? What else might explain the DV or any observed relationship between the IV and the DV?
- ◆ How can/should you discount these alternative explanations?

Readings

Timpane, John. 1995. How to convince a reluctant scientist. *Scientific American*, 272 (1): 104. (<http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/results?sid=4485e473-2a2b-4922-b9a9-0e2ed73efd1e%40sessionmgr4002&vid=3&hid=4112&bquery=JN+%22Scientific+American%22+AND+DT+19950101&bdata=JmRiPWE5aCZ0eXBIPTEmc2lOZT1laG9zdC1saXZl>)

Example of a paper that received a skeptical response after it was published:

McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and Matthew E. Brashears. 2006. Social isolation in America: Changes in core discussion networks over two decades. *American Sociological Review*, 71 (3): 353-371. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30038995>) (See also Erratum. 2008. *ASR*, 73 (6): 1022. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/25472572>).)

The debate: Skim the abstracts and introductions to each article, then read Claude's blog post for a perspective on why this is not just another boring, academic, ivory-tower hair-splitting matter.

Fischer, Claude S. 2009. The 2004 GSS finding of shrunken social networks: An artifact? *American Sociological Review*, 74 (4): 657-669.

(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27736085>)

McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and Matthew Brashears. 2009. Models and marginals: Using survey evidence to study social networks. *American Sociological Review*, 74 (4): 670-681. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27736086>)

Brashears, Matthew E. 2011. Small networks and high isolation? A reexamination of American discussion networks. *Social Networks*, 33: 331-341.

Paik, Ian, and Kenneth Sanchagrin. 2013. Social isolation in America: An artifact. *American Sociological Review*, 78 (3): 339-360. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/i23469214>)

Fischer, Claude S. 2012. The loneliness scare is back. *Made in America: Notes on American Life from American History Blog*.

<http://madeinamericathebook.wordpress.com/2012/04/24/the-loneliness-scare-is-back/>.

Due: Assignment 6: Offer three different/competing explanations for your DV (6 pp)

 **** Spring break 23-27 March ****

Class 10: 1 April: Gathering Data: Sampling

- ◆ What should be your unit(s) of analysis?
- ◆ How should you select unit(s) to observe – from what universe should you sample?
- ◆ How can you test for cause-and-effect relationships?
- ◆ How do you know whether your theories are true or false?

Readings

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *DSI*, chapter 4, “Determining what to observe,” chapter 5, “Understanding what to avoid,” and chapter 6, “Increasing the number of observations.”

Reread the Walton chapter on making a case for what you observe (class 3).

Due: Assignment 7: Describe your sampling plan (3 pp)

Class 11: 8 April: Gathering Data: Measurement

- ◆ How do you know your measures of theoretical constructs are valid?
- ◆ How do you know your measures of theoretical constructs are reliable?

Readings

Cook, Thomas D., and Donald T. Campbell. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*, chapter 2, "Validity." Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *DSI*, section 5.1, "Measurement error" in chapter 5, "Understanding what to avoid."

Example of a paper questioning measurement validity: Mizuchi, Mark S., and Linda C. Fein. 1999. The social construction of organizational knowledge: A study of the uses of coercive, mimetic, and normative isomorphism. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44 (4): 653-683. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2667051>)

Due: Assignment 8: Describe how you (will) gather data and measure key constructs (6 pp)

Class 12: 15 April: Presenting Data

- ◆ How can/should you describe/show your data in pictures?
- ◆ How can/should you show your data in numbers?
- ◆ What should go into a table of statistical results?
- ◆ How can/should you "build" tables across statistical models?

Readings

Miller, Jane E. 2005. *The Chicago Guide to Writing about Multivariate Analyses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 5, "Creating effective tables," and chapter 6, "Creating effective charts."

Tufte, Edward R. 1983. *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press. Chapter 1, "Graphical excellence."

Due: Assignment 9: Describe how you (will) analyze your data (4 pp)

Class 13: 22 April: Reformulating Research Questions

- ◆ What can you do if the data you've set out to gather are impossible to find, or if you cannot analyze the data you've already gathered in the way you planned?
- ◆ What can you do if you find different data than you originally expected to find?
- ◆ What can you do if you don't find the results you predicted?

Readings

Berg, Bruce L. 2004. *Qualitative Research Methods, 5th Edition*. Boston: Pearson Scientific. Selection from chapter 2, "Designing qualitative research," on ideas and theory.

Becker, Howard S. 1998. *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 4, "Concepts."

Merton, Robert K. 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure, Enlarged Ed*, chapter 5, "The bearing of empirical research on social theory." New York: Free Press.

Due: Assignment 10: There are 2 options, depending on where you are in the research process:

- 1) If you have data, discuss your (preliminary) results (6 pp + up to 4 tables, figures, or charts – whatever you deem necessary)
- 2) If you don't have data, prepare a contingency plan – what you would do if the data don't pan out (6 pp)

Class 14: 29 April: Handling Feedback & Getting Your Work Published

- ◆ Whom should you ask for comments on papers? At what stage? How many people should you ask? How many times can you reasonably ask any one person?
- ◆ How does the journal review process work?
- ◆ How should you respond to those “@!!! reviewers?

Readings

Stinchcombe, Arthur L., and Richard Ofshe. 1969. Journal editing as a statistical process.

American Sociologist, 4: 116-117. (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27701478>)

Reviewer forms for *ASR* and *AJS*. (Note that these journals don't have forms like this anymore because they have shifted to an online submission and review process, rather than mail and email. But these forms still reflect the interests and goals of these journals' editors.)

Fiske, Donald W., and L. Fogg. 1990. But the reviewers are making different criticisms of my paper! Diversity and uniqueness in reviewer comments. *American Psychologist*, 45 (5): 591-598.

(<http://search.proquest.com/docview/614309403/A534C36942FC4E29PQ/1?accountid=14496>)

Empirical example of feedback on a paper: King, Marissa D., and Heather A. Haveman. 2008.

Antislavery in America: The press, the pulpit, and the rise of anti-slavery societies.

Administrative Science Quarterly, 53 (3): 492-528.

(<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27749276>) (Re-read the paper, then read the 2 sets of reviews and our response to the first round of reviews. The 2 sets of reviews from *ASQ* and our letters to the editor and reviewers are on *bcourses*.)

Due: Assignment 11: Revised outline of your paper (2 pp)

FINAL PAPER due 8 May by 5pm sharp.

As with assignment 11, what you write depends on where you are in the research process:

- 1) If you have data, hand in a complete draft paper, including at least preliminary results (30pp + tables + up to 4 tables, figures, or charts)
- 2) If you don't have data, hand in the front end of a paper – up to and including your proposed research methods (20 pp)

Description	Due Date (Class #)	Max Length (# Pages)
<p>1) Describe your DV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Describe what you're studying: your dependent variable (DV). ◆ Use no jargon unless it's absolutely inescapable. Define all terms. ◆ Explain which sociologists would be interested in the phenomenon you want to study and why it would interest them. ◆ <u>Hint</u>: To do this, you have to know who they are (which subgroup(s) within sociology) and what they do and don't know from previous research. 	4 Feb (class 3)	3
<p>2) Outline the TYPICAL article</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Outline a typical empirical journal article – for each major section, give the title and a 1-2 sentence description (or a short list of bullet points) of its contents. ◆ Skim the articles listed on page 6 of the syllabus (class 4). Induce from these articles the structure of a typical empirical journal article. ◆ <u>Hint</u>: For each paper, read the introduction fully, read the first paragraph in each section, and skim the rest. List the main sections in each paper. Note what's in each section – its purpose. Figure out how the sections are linked logically – why one comes before another. 	11 Feb (class 4)	1
<p>3) Describe your DV (redux)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Describe what you're studying: your DV. (Revised version, incorporating comments from H2 and the class on the first version.) 	18 Feb (class 5)	3
<p>4) Outline YOUR paper</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Provide a title for each major section and a short list of bullet points for key contents topics within each major section. 	25 Feb (class 6)	2
<p>5) Review the literature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Tell us what we know and don't know about your DV – what is generally accepted, what remains controversial. ◆ Be careful and thoughtful about citations. Cite only what you yourself have read. (You may have to read more for this assignment than you'd read in a 280 or some other substantive course.) Follow citations back to the first work on the topic. Cite only work that is theoretically and methodologically sound, which requires critically evaluating the literature. 	11 Mar (class 8)	6
<p>6) Offer 3 different explanations for your DV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ The 3 explanations can involve either 3 different independent variables (IVs) or 3 different predictions about 1 IV. Tell us why each IV causes the DV. ◆ Attach a boxes-and-arrows diagram of your theory, including all 3 rival explanations, similar to the one in the Hagan and Rymond-Richmond article. (This is easier to do by hand or in PowerPoint than in Word.) 	18 Mar (class 9)	6
<p>7) Describe your sample</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Describe your research site and the actors you are studying. ◆ Explain your unit of observation and analysis: individual, dyad/network tie, organization, residential community, industry, geographic region, nation-state, multi-nation region, or world system. ◆ Define the universe/population from which you are sampling from and to which you want to generalize. ◆ Tell me how you will sample – random, stratified, convenience, snowball, ... 	1 Apr (class 10)	3

Writing: Style and Syntax (highlighted = most highly recommended overall)

- Barzun, Jacques. 1986. *On Writing, Editing, and Publishing, 2nd Ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barzun, Jacques. 1985. *Simple and Direct: A Rhetoric for Writers, Revised Ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, Karen Elizabeth. 1983. *The Well-Tempered Sentence: A Punctuation Handbook for the Innocent, the Eager, and the Doomed.* New York: Ticknor & Fields.
- Gordon, Karen Elizabeth. 1984. *The Transitive Vampire: A Handbook of Grammar for the Innocent, the Eager, and the Damned.* New York: Times Books.
- Gordon, Karen Elizabeth. 1997. *The Disheveled Dictionary: A Curious Caper through Our Sumptuous Lexicon.* New York: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Gordon, Karen Elizabeth. 1997. *Torn Wings and Faux Pas: A Flashbook of Style, a Beastly Guide through the Writer's Labyrinth.* New York: Pantheon.
- Gordon, Karen Elizabeth. 1998. *Out of the Loud Hound of Darkness: A Dictionarrative.* New York: Pantheon.
- Hale, Constance, and Karen Elizabeth Gordon. 2001. *Sin and Syntax: How to Craft Wickedly Effective Prose.* New York: Broadway Books.
- Lanham, Richard A. 2005. *Revising Prose, 5th Ed.* New York: Longham.
- Lodge, David. 1996. *The Practice of Writing.* London: Penguin Books.
- Miller, Jane E. 2004. *The Chicago Guide to Writing about Numbers: The Effective Presentation of Quantitative Information.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (\$17)
- Miller, Jane E. 2005. *The Chicago Guide to Writing about Multivariate Analyses.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (\$30)
- Strunk, William, Jr., and E.B. White. 1979. *The Elements of Style, 3rd Ed.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Turabian, Kate L. 2010. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, 7th Ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (\$10)
- van Maanen, John. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Walsh, Bill. 2000. *Lapsing into a Comma: A Curmudgeon's Guide to the Many Things That Can Go Wrong in Print – and How to Avoid Them.* Chicago: Contemporary Books.
- Williams, Joseph M. 1990. *Style: Toward Clarity and Grace.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Zinsser, William. 1988. *Writing to Learn.* New York: Harper & Row.
- Zinsser, William. 2006. *On Writing Well: An Informal Guide to Writing Nonfiction, 30th Anniversary Edition.* New York: Collins.

Research Design (highlighted = most highly recommended overall)

- Alford, Robert R. 1998. *The Craft of Inquiry: Theories, Methods, Evidence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blalock, Hubert M. 1969. *Theory Construction: From Verbal to Mathematical Formulation*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Braithwaite, Richard B. 1960. *Scientific Explanation: A Study of the Function of Theory, Probability and Law in Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 2008. *The Craft of Research, 3rd Ed.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (\$10)
- Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Cook, Thomas D., and Donald T. Campbell. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Evans, Richard J. 1997. *In Defense of History*. London: W.W. Norton.
- Fischer, David Hackett. 1970. *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd Edition, Enlarged*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Morgan, Stephen L., and Christopher Winship. 2007. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagel, Ernest. 1961 [1979]. *The Structure of Science: Problems in the Logic of Scientific Explanation*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Pearl, Judea. 2009. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference, 2nd Ed.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Popper, Karl R. 1934 [1968]. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ragin, Charles C., and Howard S. Becker, eds. 1992. *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. 2010. *Design of Observational Studies*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Rosenwasser, David, and Jill Stephen. 2012. *Writing Analytically, 6th Ed.* Boston: Wadsworth.

Tufte, Edward R. 1983. *The Visual Display of Quantitative Information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.

Tufte, Edward R. 1990. *Envisioning Information*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press.

Getting Work Done (highlighted = most highly recommended overall)

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.

Belcher, Wendy Laura. 2009. *Writing Your Journal Article in Twelve Weeks: A Guide to Academic Publishing Success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Machi, Lawrence A., and Brenda T. McEvoy. 2008. *The Literature Review: Six Steps to Success*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Zerubavel, Eviatar. 1999. *The Clockwork Muse: A Practical Guide to Writing Theses, Dissertations, and Books*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Research Methods, Qualitative and Quantitative (very incomplete)

Abelson, Robert C. 1995. *Statistics as Principled Argument*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

This entertaining book discusses how social scientists use statistics as a method for presenting arguments. His MAGIC criteria are a good basis for evaluating the impact of a piece of research.

Agresti, Alan, and Barbara Finlay. 2009. *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences, 4th Ed.* (1st ed. 1979, 2nd ed. 1986, 3rd ed. 1997) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Angrist, Joshua D., and Jörn-Steffan Pischke. 2009. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Glaser, Barney B., and Anselm L. Strauss. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

The primer on how and why to do inductive, qualitative, ethnographic research.

Huff, Darrell. 1954. *How to Lie with Statistics*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Levine, Joel H. 1993. *Exceptions are the Rule: An Inquiry into Methods in the Social Sciences*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Light, Richard J., and David B. Pillemer. 1984. *Summing Up: The Science of Reviewing Research*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Useful for making literature reviews more systematic and for learning how to do formal meta-analyses.

How Book Publishing Works

Coser, Lewis A., Charles Kadushin, and Walter W. Powell. 1982. *Books: The Culture and Commerce of Publishing*. New York: Basic Books.

Germano, William. 2001. *Getting It Published: A Guide for Scholars and Anyone Else Serious about Serious Books*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Powell, Walter W. 1985. *Getting into Print: The Decision-Making Process in Scholarly Publishing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

A lovely ethnography of how two scholarly book publishers handle manuscripts, both those that are solicited by editors from known authors, and those that come “over the transom.”

Web Resources (very incomplete – I welcome your suggestions)

Finding your way into the literature

UCB Library Find E-Journals. To find articles online. This gives results that are broader than jstor in that it includes the most recent issues of the journals in jstor, as well as many journals that are not in jstor. http://ucelinks.cdlib.org:8888/sfx_ucb/a-z/default

UC Library Web of Science. Use this online database to follow citation patterns to a particular book or article forward in time, to see what other studies have cited something cited in what you are reading. Also use it to see the quality of journals, as measured by journal impact factors. www.webofscience.com

Annual Review of Sociology. A great place to start when you want critical summaries of what we know and don't know about a topic. Some good musings on methods, too. Also insights into related social-science fields. <http://www.annualreviews.org/>

Help with writing

ASA Style Guide – summary. <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/583/01/>

Chicago Manual of Style, 16th Edition online

Table of Contents: <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/16/contents.html>

Citation Guide: http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html

Proofreaders' Marks: http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_proof.html

Social Science Research Center – proposal writing.

<http://www.ssrc.org/publications/view/7A9CB4F4-815F-DE11-BD80-001CC477EC70/>

National Science Foundation – improving qualitative research proposals. Report of the workshop on scientific foundations of qualitative research. Available at

<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2004/nsf04219/start.htm>

Career advice

Becoming a successful academic: Tips for grad students and junior faculty – time management, writing discipline, mentoring, teaching, etc. <http://successfulacademic.com/>

Surviving grad school & beyond: Rojas, Fabio. 2011. *Grad Skool Rulz: Everything You Need to Know About Academia from Admissions to Tenure*.
<http://www.smashwords.com/books/view/93455>; the cost is only \$3.00.

Statistics advice

UCLA stats help website: This has guides for most common statistical software packages (SPSS, SAS, and Stata) and some other less well-known ones. It also has links to many useful online help sites. <http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/>

Princeton stats help website: Great links to sources of data as well as advice on statistics and on data-analysis programs (SPSS, SAS, Stata, R).
http://dss.princeton.edu/online_help/online_help.htm

What statistical analysis to do: <http://bama.ua.edu/~jleeper/627/choosestat.html>

Statistics textbook: <http://www.statsoft.com/Textbook>

Network analysis online textbook & course: <http://faculty.ucr.edu/~hanneman/nettext/>
<http://faculty.ucr.edu/~hanneman/teaching.html>

Latent class analysis website: Introductory lecture-like material plus links to software, bibliography, and other web sites. <http://www.john-uebersax.com/stat/>

Ways to waste time thoughtfully

Essential humour: PhD comics web page. When all else fails, sometimes you just have to laugh... <http://www.phdcomics.com/comics.php>

Essential grumpiness: The disgruntled sociologist blog. When general humour about graduate school and higher education fails, you can always laugh about sociology...
<http://thedisgruntledsociologist.wordpress.com/> (TDS has stopped posting, but what he/she said in the past still has great value.)

Non-essential (?) grammar jokes: These may be necessary when you're grading undergraduate papers. <http://www.mcsweeneys.net/articles/seven-bar-jokes-involving-grammar-and-punctuation>