

Menken
Fall
2002

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Fall, 2002

Sociology 5031: RESEARCH METHODS

Jane Menken 303-492-2144 (voicemail), 8148
210 Ketchum, 101 IBS #1
menken@colorado.edu
Monday 10:00-12:45
Office Hours: Ketchum 210
Monday 2:00-4:00 and by appointment

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

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

1. *Participation in seminar discussions (~25%):* The instructor will participate in discussions, but no lectures will be delivered. The quality of seminar discussions will, therefore, vitally depend on how well students prepare for each seminar. I hope that students will interact with one another to discuss, define, criticize, find merit in, refine, and synthesize the topics assigned for that seminar. To help this process, students are asked to prepare short papers, usually *before* class discussion, and to do so in groups.
2. *Short papers and journal article critiques (~35%):* Six short papers and two critiques are assigned. These are due before the start of seminar on the assigned date. The paper can be prepared solely or, preferably, in groups of no more than three. It should be a critical assessment, based on the readings for the week, of selected aspects of the topics to be discussed further in seminar that day. Papers should cite authors as appropriate and synthesize the substance of what was read. All papers must be typed. They should be no more than 5 pages in length - and 4 pages is preferred. The journal critique (which also can be prepared by a group) can follow the series of questions on page 2, assessing how well the author(s) describe and carry out the research.

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

3. *Term paper (~40%):* Your term paper is due at 3pm on the last regularly scheduled seminar day. The paper must be sole-authored. A **one page description** of your topic and your project is due October 14; please schedule a meeting with me by October 7. One session of the course will consist of presentations of paper proposals. Term papers must be typed, double-spaced, using the format and style of the *American Sociological Review*. All references must be complete and conform to the *ASR* style. Be sure to use spell-check!

The term paper is to be a research proposal on a topic of your choice. The paper/proposal can be a hypothetical study that you may never perform, or it can be an investigation that you plan to conduct in the

future. It cannot be work that you've already performed, e.g. your senior thesis or M.A. thesis. The proposal should cover all segments of the research process, even though the proposed data collection and analysis will not actually be performed. All term papers must use the same outline.

TERM PAPER OUTLINE:

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

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

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

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

READINGS: No single textbook is adequate for a Ph.D. level methods course. Students must read more than one book or paper, consider the range of substantive information and opinions they contain, integrate what was read, and then form clear ideas about particular methods or approaches and how to use them when doing research. All readings are available in the Sociology Department, but I hope you will use the internet instead.

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

Buying books: Some students, especially those who had not had an undergraduate course in research methods, have found it useful to consult Babbie's text which, although not required, may be an extremely useful addition to your methods library. You may want to read the appropriate section along with the readings for each week, even when that section is not specifically assigned. Two copies are available in the Sociology Department. You can order a copy on the web (e.g. Amazon) if you'd like to own a copy. I recommend the classic Kuhn book. Copies are available in the Sociology Department. I have ordered 10 copies @ \$10 each. Let me know if you'd like one.

Earl Babbie. 2000. *The Practice of Social Research*, 9th ed. Belmont CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
Thomas Kuhn. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

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

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

Journal Storage on the web is a project funded by the Andrew Mellon Foundation that is doing just what it says -- storing journals so they can be accessed from the web. They do not compete with current sales, so they have the *American Journal of Sociology* for the years 1895-2000 and the *American Sociological Review* 1936-96. You can search the journals very easily, read papers, print out copies, or download papers to your computer. BUT you can only gain access through CU, so you can't get to it through aol, for example. MUSE is a Johns Hopkins University project to bring scholarly journals online.

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

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

READING: At the end of each seminar, the topic for the next week will be introduced. Students have frequently found it useful to approach seminar readings and the preparation of the short papers in the following way. Imagine that you have just begun work on the seminar section on sampling. One topic to be covered is *quota sampling*. Imagine that there are several documents on sampling that are in a pile on a table in front of you. Pick up the first document. Look at the table of contents, the index, the abstract; flip through the pages; scan the document's text. Your task is to focus *only* on the relevant passages (and their context) that provide you with information about quota sampling. A relevant passage can vary in length between a sentence and an entire chapter. Repeat this procedure with the other documents. Once completed, you will have a collection of what every author being read on that topic has to say about quota sampling. Then let a few synthesizing questions guide your writing and preparation for seminar discussions. For example: what is quota sampling? How is a quota sample selected? When should quota sampling be used? What are the merits and shortcomings of quota samples? Did the authors agree on the answers to these questions? And so on.

Although this type of skimming is essential when you are trying to familiarize yourself with the contents of a huge reading list, there will also be times when I ask you read a book or paper very carefully.

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

www.colorado.edu/sacs/disabilityservices

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

SUMMARY SCHEDULE

Date	Topic	Papers or Presentations
1. Aug 26	Introduction to the seminar	
Sep 2	-- Labor Day --	
2. Sep 9	Theory: The traditional views	
3. Sep 16	Theory: Alternative views	Short paper: theory
4. Sep 23	<i>Session on Web Searches: Jill Williams</i>	Short paper: alternative views
5. Sep 30	Nature of Proof, Observation & Description	Short paper
6. Oct 7	Causality	Short paper
7. Oct 14	Research design I	Short paper, 1 page proposal
8. Oct 21	Research design II	Journal critique
9. Oct 28	Research design III	Short paper
10. Nov 4	<i>Review of Proposals from Earlier Years and of Proposals for External Grants</i>	
11. Nov 11	Quantity of data	Proposal Presentations
12. Nov 18	Selecting study participants	Journal article critique
13. Nov 25	Improving data collection	
14. Dec 2	Interpreting data	
15. Dec 10	Research ethics	Term paper

Please note: there are two weeks (4 and 10) for which no reading assignments are included. The Sep 23 session will be held in the computer lab in Ketchum and led by Jill Williams. It is an introduction to *web searching* for relevant research information and includes material on organizing your research materials. Before the Nov 4 session, you will have access to student proposals from earlier years and to proposals that student and faculty have submitted for external funding. We will also look at requirements for gaining research approval from the oversight group at CU, the Human Research Committee.

Wk1 Introductory readings - three research papers:

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

REQUIRED:

Engen, Rodney L. and Sara Steen. 2000. The power to punish: Discretion and sentencing reform in the war on drugs. *American Journal of Sociology* 105(5): 1357-1395.

<http://www.istor.org/browse/00029602/> or

<http://www.istor.org/view/00029602/di008401/00p00834/0?config=istor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5745@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f5c7b&dpi=3>

Cress, Daniel M. and David A. Snow. 1996. Mobilization at the margins: Resources, benefactors, and the viability of homeless social movement organizations. *American Sociological Review* 61(6): 1089-1109.

<http://www.istor.org/browse/00031224/> or

<http://www.istor.org/view/00031224/di974434/97p01687/0?config=istor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5745@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f5c7b&dpi=3>

Harris, Kathleen Mullan. 1993. Work and welfare among single mothers in poverty. *American Journal of Sociology* 99(2): 317-352.

<http://www.istor.org/browse/00029602> or

<http://www.istor.org/view/00029602/dm992735/99p0319r/0?config=istor&frame=noframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f4e26&dpi=3>

RECOMMENDED

Orloff, Ann Shola. 1993. Gender and the social rights of citizenship: The comparative analysis of gender relations and welfare states. *American Sociological Review* 58(3): 303-328.

<http://www.istor.org/browse/00031224/> or

<http://www.istor.org/view/00031224/di974413/97p0192b/0?config=istor&frame=noframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/01cc993341005090ba54&dpi=3>

Wk2 Theory: Traditional views

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

Lieberson, Stanley. 1992. Einstein, Renoir, and Greeley: Some thoughts about evidence in Sociology. 1991 ASA Presidential Address. *American Sociological Review* 57(1):1-15.

<http://www.istor.org/browse/00031224> or

<http://www.istor.org/view/00031224/di974405/97p0095p/0?config=istor&frame=noframe&userID8>

WK3 Theory: Alternative views, associated predominately with qualitative research

Cancian, Francesca M. 1992. Feminist science: Methodologies that challenge inequality. 1991 Cheryl Miller Lecture. *Gender and Society* 6:4:623-642

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

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

Babbie, Earl. 2000. Chapter 2: Paradigms, theory and research, pp. 41-65.

WK4 Web Searches: meet in Ketchum Computer Lab

WK5 The Nature of Proof and The Nature of Observation and Description

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

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

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

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

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

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

Wilson, Richard A. 1997. Representing human rights violations: Social contexts and subjectivities. In *Human Rights, Culture and Context: Anthropological Perspectives*. Richard Wilson (ed). London: Pluto Press.

WK6 Causality

- Stratton, Kathleen R, Cynthia J. Howe, and Richard B. Johnston, Jr. 1994. Causality and evidence. Chapter 2 in *Adverse Events Associated with Childhood Vaccines: Evidence Bearing on Causality*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, pp. 19-33.
<http://books.nap.edu/books/0309048958/html/19.html#page-top>
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. *Making It Count: The Improvement of Social Research and Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press. Read Chapters 3, 4, 9.
- Weiss, Robert S. 1994. The demonstration of causation. In *Learning from Strangers*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 179-181.
- Aneshensel, Carol, Eve Fielder, and R Becerra. 1989. Fertility and fertility-related behavior among Mexican-American and non-Hispanic white female adolescents. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* 30(1): 56-76.
<http://www.istor.org/browse/00221465> or
<http://www.istor.org/view/00221465/di976103/97p0023a/0?config=istor&frame=noframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/01cc993341005090ba54&dpi=3>
 A sociological study that takes a kind of "intermediate variables" approach.
- Porter, Theodore M. 1995. How social numbers are made valid. In *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Babbie, Earl. 2000. Chapter 3: The nature of causation, pp.68-83.
- The following may be skimmed
- Smith, Herb. 1990. Specification problems in experimental and nonexperimental social research. *Sociological Methodology* 20: 59-92.
- Sobel, Michael. 1995. Causal inference in the social and behavioral sciences. In G Arminger, et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Statistical Modeling for the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. New York: Plenum Press
- WK7 Research Design I – Basics on Mixed Methods**
- Mechanic, David. 1989. Medical sociology: some tensions among theory, method, and substance. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*. 30(2):147-160.
<http://www.istor.org/browse/00221465> or
<http://www.istor.org/view/00221465/di976104/97p0032c/0?config=istor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5857@colorado.edu/01cc993341005090c470&dpi=3>
 From Abstract: "Why is it that quantitative and qualitative researchers on health issues often have divergent findings and conclusions?..."
- Mathison, Sandra. 1988. Why Triangulate? *Educational Researcher* 17(2):13-17.

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

Babbie, Earl. 2000. Chapter 4: Research design, pp. 88-113. See especially p.112, Elements of a Research Proposal)

WK8 Research Design II: Surveys

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

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

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

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

Knodel, John. 1997. A case for nonanthropological qualitative methods for demographers. *Population and Development Review* 23:4:847-853

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00987921> or
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00987921/d/80539/98p0100m/0?config=jsior&frame=noiframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/018dd531800509f4ee&dpi=3>

WK 9 Research Design III: Ensuring quality of data

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

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

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

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

Axinn, WG, TE Fricke, and A Thornton. 1991. The microdemographic community-study approach: improving survey data by integrating the ethnographic method. *Sociological Methods and Research* 20(2):187-217. 1991.
“We discuss a technique that combines survey and ethnographic methods at every stage of the data collection... We use ethnographic and survey evidence to show how the combined approach reduces coverage errors, nonresponse errors and measurement errors arising from the interviewer, the questionnaire, and the respondent...”

WK10 Review of Proposals

Proposals to be discussed will be distributed two weeks before class.

Ethical and procedural review of all research that involves human subjects is carried out, at CU, by the Human Research Committee of the Graduate School. This review must be carried out whether or not the research is funded by external agencies and whether or not the investigator is a faculty member, employee, graduate student, or undergraduate student. No research can begin without HRC approval. The Graduate School Handbook for Research Investigators can be found at:
<http://www.colorado.edu/GraduateSchool/HRC/>

WK11 Quantity of Data

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

Smith, Herb. Notes on Sample Size. Xerox.

Lieberman, Stanley. 1991. Small N's and big conclusions: an examination of the reasoning in comparative studies based on a small number of cases. *Social Forces*. 70(2):307-320.

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

Babbie, Earl. 2000. Chapter 8: The logic of sampling. pp. 191-229.

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

WK12 Selecting Study Participants

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. Respondents: Choosing them and recruiting them. Chapter 2 and 3 in *Learning*

from Strangers. New York: The Free Press, pp. 15-73.
Nice discussion of the issues of sampling and recruitment in qualitative research. This is a great book.

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. How the cases you choose affect the answers you get: selection bias in comparative politics. In James A. Stimson (ed.), *Political Analysis*, vol. 2, pp. 131-150.
"This article demonstrates how the selection of cases for study on the basis of outcomes on the dependent variable biases conclusions...."

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

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

<http://www.jstor.org/view/03600572/d1974065/97p0066g/0?config=istor&frame=noiframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f4ee&dpi=3>

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

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

SKIM:

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

A complete how-to book. I don't spend much time discussing this. For graduate students, it merely serves to insure that all of the basis is presented. SKIM -- DON'T sit down and read this one cover to cover -- but it's a great reference.

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

WK13 Improving Data Collection (chose quantitative or qualitative readings)

Knodel, John. The design and analysis of focus group studies. Ch.3. in David L. Morgan (ed.), *Successful Focus Groups*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

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

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

Bosk, Charles. 1989. The fieldworker and the surgeon. In Carolyn D. Smith and William Kornblum (eds.), *In the Field: Readings on the Field Research Experience*. New York: Praeger, pp. 135-144.
What it's like to do participant observation.

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

OR

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

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

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

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

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

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/01621459> or
<http://www.jstor.org/view/01621459/dj985983/98p0227/0?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=08a92c1@colorado.edu/01cc993341005090baacf&dpi=3>
 Examples of what can go wrong between an interviewer and a respondent based on taped interviews. Introduces idea that all interviewing (quantitative or qualitative) is a form of "structured conversation." Supplemented with comments by several discussants.

Groves, Robert M. 1987. Research on survey data quality. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 51(suppl): S156-S172.
<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00333362x> or
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00333362x/dm991737/99p0030/j?config=jstor&frame=noframe&userID=808a5883@colorado.edu/018dd5531e00508e9add&dpi=3>

Converse, Jean M. And Stanley Presser. 1986. *Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire*. Sage Series in Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, no. 7. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
 A complete how-to book. Good reference

WK14 Interpreting Data

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

Knodel, John. 1994. Conducting comparative focus-group research: cautionary comments from a

coordinator. *Health Transition Review* 4(1):99-104.
http://nceph.ann.edu.au/htc/pdfs/Forum4_1.pdf

Please note: the link above is to the entire forum on Focus Groups for Health Research, in which Knodel's comments appear on pp. 99-104. The forum itself contains other interesting articles. Good discussion of the problems of analyzing focus group data and why it often doesn't get done or done properly.

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

Krueger, Richard A. Principles of analyzing focus group results. In *Focus Groups - A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications, pp. 106-121.
NOTE: Krueger 2nd edition expands this chapter into two (7&8)

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

WK15 Ethics in Research

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

<http://www.asanet.org> or
<http://www.asanet.org/members/coderev.html>

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

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

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

<http://www.jstor.org/browse/00380407> or
<http://www.jstor.org/view/00380407/d1975454/97p03312/0?config=stor&frame=noframe&userID=808a92c1@colorado.edu/018dd5531800509f4eea&dpi=3>

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

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

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

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

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

Allen, Charlotte. 1997. Spies like us: When sociologists deceive their subjects. *Lingua Franca*. I got my copy from the internet, so don't have the hard-copy pages.

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