JOMC 701

Communication Research Methods

Fall 2014

8:30-9:45am, M/W Carroll 143

**Professor**: Daniel Kreiss **Office**: 377 Carroll Hall

**E-mail**: dkreiss@email.unc.edu **Hours**: 9:45am-10:45 am, M/W

**Phone**: 415.238.6924 (mobile) and by appointment

**Twitter:** @kreissdaniel

Course Goals

 Social science is one powerful way that we understand and make sense of the world. We have a rich set of theories and tools for discovering why people think and act as they do and how important institutions function. Ultimately, our knowledge of the foundations of human thought, behavior, and social organization can inform everything from the policies that shape our democracy to the ways we educate our children.

The purpose of this course is to provide you with a broad introduction to the methodological foundations of and tools of inquiry in communication research. Much of the semester will focus on the fundamentals of quantitative and qualitative social science research, as well as applied research methods, including ethics, theory construction, hypothesis development, and the logic of causal claims. You will learn to formulate research interests, specify independent and dependent variables and mediators and moderators, check for the reliability and validity of studies, and design research projects. You will be exposed to the broad range of designs used in communication research, including laboratory and field experiments, surveys, content analysis, interviewing, and ethnography.

 Throughout the course, we will periodically step back and take a deeper look at the practice of science. Given that many of you will be called upon to interpret and use the results of social science in your professional work, we will read research articles to evaluate the methodological choices of social scientists, understand the limitations of studies, and differentiate between reliable and unreliable work. In our final weeks, we will discuss the nature of scientific controversies and consensus, and encounter a set of readings about the role of science and expert knowledge in society - all with the aim of helping you vet the claims, evidence, and values of social scientists. Students taking this course will gain core competencies outlined by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC), and will be able to think critically, creatively, and independently, learn how to conduct research and evaluate information, write correctly and clearly, critically evaluate their own work and that of others, apply basic numerical and statistical concepts, and contribute to knowledge appropriate to the communications professions in which they work.

**Readings**

There are three required books for this class. In addition, there are a number of journal articles and book chapters posted on the class Sakai site and that can be accessed online using the UNC-Chapel Hill library system. The three required books are:

Leslie A. Baxter and Earl Babbie. (2004). *The Basics of Communication Research*. Belmont,

CA: Wadsworth Press.

Kristin Luker. (2008). *Salsa Dancing Into the Social Sciences: Research in an Age of Info-Glut*.

 Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nikki Usher. (2014). *Making News at the New York Times.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan

Press.

In addition, your papers must be formatted according to either MLA, Chicago, or APA style. Abbreviated guides are available online at:

 <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

 <http://www.lib.unc.edu/instruct/citations/introduction/index.html>

**Grades:**

Graduate grades are H, P, L, F. I determine your grade by active participation in class, the quality of your assignments, and your work in relation to others.

The following is a general description of graduate grades:

 • H means a truly outstanding performance in the class and on assignments.

 • P is a solid performance overall in the class and on assignments.

 • L is a performance in the class and on assignments that is below the acceptable level for graduate students. It means the student does not understand the course material very well, does not have a grasp of what is required in this area at the graduate level, is not participating in the class, is not handing in assignments on time, or is not participating in research basics or in-class exercises.

 • F is failing.

**Course Requirements**

Participation 20%

IRB certification 5%

Critique of a quantitative research article 10%

Observation and field notes 10%

Peer review comments 20%

Final Research Proposal 35%

***Participation***

 While this is a lecture course, the class is highly participatory. I expect you to do the readings and contribute to the in-class discussion. Contributions include questions, thoughts, or responses to your peers. I especially value critical readings of the literature encountered in the course. In addition to active participation in class, you are responsible for posting at least one question for the class about the readings *each week* on the Sakai forum, or writing one response

to a peer’s question. I will often use these posts as the starting points for classroom discussion.

 **A note about laptops:** Laptops are welcome in class, but I ask that you refrain from using them for purposes other than note taking, in-class assignments, or class-related research. Your participation in class will suffer if you are not fully present, and that will detract from the learning environment in the room as a whole.

***Assignments***

 We will discuss these assignments in greater depth in class. All assignments are due in hard copy on the dates indicated below. Late papers will be penalized.

*Peer Groups*

 On Monday, September 29th you will create peer groups based on the type of research you are interested in conducting (ethnography, experiments, surveys, applied case studies, etc.) *or* your substantive area of interest (i.e.: health communication). These peer groups are intended to be forums for you to share literature, propose ideas and questions, and vet research plans. You will write your assignments with your peer groups, and share your research questions and literature review with members of your peer group, as well as the entire draft of your proposal or research for formal peer review.

*IRB certification*

All students need to complete the Institutional Review Board’s (IRB) certification process. This means that you will do the Collaborative IRB Training Initiative course on the internet and print out the certification. This certification may take some time, so it may be helpful to do it in stages. **The certification must be completed by Monday, September 29th.**  The course is available online here: <https://research.unc.edu/offices/human-research-ethics/researchers/training/index.htm>

*Critique of a quantitative research article*

As a peer group, you are responsible for writing a critique of one of the quantitative research articles we read, that is on the recommended reading list, or that is important for your respective research projects. You should specify the study’s independent and dependent variable(s), mediator(s), and moderator(s). You should also provide a summary of the article’s key causal claims and point to the strengths and possible limitations of the study. The assignment is due anytime before **Monday, October 13th**, the start of the applied research portion of this class. The written assignment should not be more than three single-spaced pages.

*Observation and field notes*

 As a peer group, you are responsible for conducting an exploratory field observation and individually writing up your field notes for a research site of your choosing. This means that you will decide as a group on one research site, but do your own work of independent observation.

 This assignment is designed to introduce you to the disciplined practice of ethnographic observation, the challenge of creating a ‘thick description’ of a field site, and through review of each others’ work to see commonalities and discrepancies in observation. The assignment is due anytime before **Monday, November 24th**.

*Research proposal or original research*

Research question(s) and literature review

 As the first stage of the research proposal, you are responsible for generating research question(s) and a literature review. Your research question(s) should be geared towards a study that would be suitable for a journal article, research project, or, at their most ambitious, for a thesis or dissertation. In other words, keep these questions narrow enough so that you could in theory actually conduct an empirical study answering them in the span of a year or two (i.e.: no large career-defining questions.) The goal is for this assignment to actually be useful for you academically or professionally. The research question(s) and literature review should run between 8 and 10 pages, not counting references. While there is no rule for how many sources need to be considered for your literature review, it is hard to imagine a quality piece of work that utilizes less than ten scholarly sources. I will grade the research questions and literature review as part of your final research proposal or program, which is due by 10:00am on **Monday, December 8th**.

Option 1: Research Proposal

Your final project will consist of the research question(s) and literature review along with the outline of a proposed study that could be conducted as part of your graduate work. In other words, the full proposal should outline your research questions, which need to be grounded in the social scientific or professional literature, and then propose a study to answer them.

 The full proposal will include a title page, summary, introduction, section explaining the purpose and significance of your study, research questions and literature review, your hypotheses or anticipated findings, full discussion of the methods you will use, plan for carrying the study out, conclusion, and references. The methods and research plan sections will explain, in detail, how you plan to answer the questions you have asked and defend the methodological choices you make. You should also include a discussion of how you plan to operationalize variables, your key terms or concepts, and the limitations to the study you have identified.

Option 2: Original Research

 As an alternative to the research proposal, some students may wish to begin conducting original research as part of this class. This works particularly well for Ph.D. students who already have research plans or work in-progress, or professional track masters students with a defined area of interest they are planning on exploring further as either a stand alone project or part of their master’s thesis.

 If you are pursuing this option, you must speak to me by **Wednesday, October 16th**, the start of Fall Break.

*Peer Review*

 To familiarize you with a core practice of the sciences, and help you improve your work, you must submit a draft of your full proposal or the original research you have in-progress (along with your research plan) to your peer group for peer review by **Wednesday, November 26th**. You are responsible, as a group, for providing feedback on the work of your peers by the last class on **Wednesday, December 3rd**, which will provide you with a little less than a week to make revisions. All comments should also be emailed to me.

 Comments should engage critically with all aspects of the proposal or original work, from the literature review and research questions to the design of the study. By ‘critically,’ I mean that you should look for weaknesses in the work so the author can correct them and make it stronger as a result.

*Grading*

 I will grade all aspects of the research proposal or original work (including your peer review comments) based on originality, rigor, and the thoroughness of your review of the relevant literature. There is no page limit for the proposal or original work, although as a guideline it should be approximately 20 pages. There is no minimum or limit on peer review comments, but they should be thorough, thoughtful, and clearly identify areas for improvement.

**The Honor Code**

 The Honor Code is in effect at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. If you have questions about the Honor Code, please see me or read more at http://honor.unc.edu

**Key Semester Dates**

Monday, September 29th: IRB certification due

Formation of peer groups

Monday, October 13th: Critique of quantitative research article due

Monday, November 24th: Field observation due

Wednesday, November 26th: Deadline to circulate full proposals/papers to peer groups for peer review

Wednesday, December 3rd: Peer review comments due

Monday, December 8th, 10am: Final papers due

**Course Schedule**

***I. Overview: Introduction to the Research Process***

Wednesday, August 20

*Introduction to the course and each other*

Reading:

Paul Edwards, “How to Read a Book v4.0.”

 Available online at: <http://pne.people.si.umich.edu/PDF/howtoread.pdf>

**Monday, August 25**

*Introduction to Communication Theory and Research*

Readings:

Baxter and Babbie, Chapters 1, 3, and 4

W. Russell Neuman and Lauren Guggenheim, “The Evolution of Media Effects Theory: A Six

 Stage Model of Cumulative Research,” *Communication Theory*, 21, 169-196, 2011.

Recommended:

James Carey. “A Cultural Approach to Communication,” in *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*, Unwin Hyman, Boston, pp. 13–36, 1989.

Todd Gitlin, “Media Sociology: The Dominant Paradigm,” *Theory and Society* 6(2): 205-253, 1978.

Elihu Katz, “Communications Research Since Lazarsfeld,” *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 51(2): S25-S45, 1987.

Leah Lievrouw, “New Media, Mediation, and Communication Study,” *Information, Communication, and Society* 12(3): 303-325, 2009.

John Durham Peters, “Institutional Sources of Intellectual Poverty in Communications Research,” *Communication Research* 13: 527-559, 1986.

**Wednesday, August 27**

**Class will start at 8:00am**

*Situating Your Project and Understanding the Work of Others: Understanding Literature Reviews and the Research Process*

with Francesca Dillman Carpentier, Associate Professor, School of Journalism and Mass Communication

Readings:

Baxter and Babbie, Chapter 2

Luker, Chapters 1-5

Recommended:

Lance Bennett and Shanto Iyengar, “A New Era of Minimal Effects? The Changing

 Foundations of Political Communication,. *Journal of Communication* 58, 707-731, 2008.

Pablo Boczkowski and Leah A. Lievrouw. “Bridging STS and Communication Studies: Scholarship on Media and Information Technologies.” In *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, 3rd ed., edited by Edward J. Hackett, Olga Amsterdamska, Michael Lynch, and Judy Wajcman. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2008.

Gabriella Coleman, “Ethnographic Approaches to Digital Media.” *Annual Review of Anthropology.* 39, 1-16, 2010.

Adam Fish, Luis F.R. Murillo, Lilly Nguyen, Aaron Panofsky and Christopher Kelty, “Birds of the Internet: Towards a Field Guide to the Organization and Governance of Participation,” *Journal of Cultural Economy* 4(2): May 2011.

Marion Fourcade and Kieran Healy, “Moral Views of Market Society,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 33, 285–311, 2007.

Shanto Iyengar, “The Method is the Message.” *Political Communication,* 18, 225-229, 2001.

Michelle M. Kazmer and Bo Xie, “Qualitative Interviewing in Internet Studies: Playing With the

 Media, Playing With the Method,” *Information, Communication, & Society* 11(2), 257-278, 2008.

Daniel Kreiss, Megan Finn, and Fred Turner, “The Limits of Peer Production: Some Reminders From Max Weber for the Network Society,” *New Media & Society*, 13(2), 243-259, 2011.

Benjamin Peters, “And Lead Us Not Into Thinking the New is New: a bibliographic case for new Media History,” *New Media & Society* 11(1-2), 13-30, 2009.

**Monday, September 1**

*No class, Labor Day holiday*

**Wednesday, September 3**

*Guest Lecture: Introduction to the Library and Internet Services*

Stephanie Willen Brown, JOMC Park Library

Please bring your laptop to class

Readings:

Review the Park Library Course Webpage at:

<http://parklibrary.jomc.unc.edu/course-guides/jomc-701>

**Monday, September 8**

*Ethics and Institutional Review Boards*

Readings:

Baxter and Babbie, Chapter 5

Skim: Association of Internet Researchers. “Ethical Guide.” Available online at:

<https://aoir.org/documents/ethics-guide/>

**Read in sequence for discussion**

Kramer, Adam D.L., Jamie E. Guillory, and Jeffrey T. Hancock. “Experimental evidence of

massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* Available online at: <http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2014/05/29/1320040111.full.pdf>

Kramer, Adam D.L. (Mea Culpa).

<https://www.facebook.com/akramer/posts/10152987150867796>

Meyer, Michelle. “How an IRB Could Have Legitimately Approved the Facebook Experiment—and Why that May Be a Good Thing.” The Faculty Lounge. Available online at: <http://www.thefacultylounge.org/2014/06/how-an-irb-could-have-legitimately-approved-the-facebook-experimentand-why-that-may-be-a-good-thing.html>

Tufecki, Zeynep. “Facebook and Engineering the Public”. Medium. Available online at:

https://medium.com/message/engineering-the-public-289c91390225

Crawford, Kate. “The Test We Can – And Should – Run on Facebook.’” The Atlantic. Available online at:

 [http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/07/the-test-we-canand-shouldrun-on-facebook/373819/?utm\_content=bufferc258a&utm\_medium=social&utm\_source=twitter.com&utm\_campaign=buffer](http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/07/the-test-we-canand-shouldrun-on-facebook/373819/?utm_content=bufferc258a&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_)

Gray, Mary. “When Science, Customer Service, Human Subjects Research Collide. Now What?” Culture Digitally. Available online at:

<http://culturedigitally.org/2014/07/when-science-customer-service-and-human-subjects->research-collide-now-what/

Recommended:

Charlotte Allen, “Spies like us: When sociologists deceive their subjects.” *Lingua Franca*, 31-39, 1997.

Charles Bosk and Raymond De Vries, “Bureaucracies of Mass Deception: Institutional Review Boards and the Ethics of Ethnographic Research,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 595, 249-263, 2004.

Christine Halse and Anne Honey, “Unraveling Ethics: Illuminating the Moral Dilemmas of Research Ethics,” *Signs* 30, 2141-2162, 2005.

Donna Eder and William Corsaro, “Ethnographic Studies of Children and Youth: Theoretical and Ethical Issues,” Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 28(5), 520-531, 1999.

Chih Hoong Sin, “Seeking Informed Consent: Reflections on Research Practice.” *Sociology* 39, 277-294, 2005.

John Van Maanen, “The Moral Fix: On the Ethics of Fieldwork,” In [Mark Pogrebin](http://www.uk.sagepub.com/authorDetails.nav?contribId=522373) (Ed.) *Qualitative Approaches to Criminal Justice: Perspectives from the Field.*  New York:

 Sage Publications, 2002.

***II: Quantitative Research Methods***

**Wednesday, September 10**

*Guest Lecture on Measurement*

Francesca Dillman Carpentier

Readings:

Baxter and Babbie, Chapter 6

**Monday, September 15**

*Guest Lecture on Measurement*

Francesca Dillman Carpentier

Readings:

To be announced

**Wednesday, September 17**

*Introduction to Statistical Reasoning*

Francesca Dillman Carpentier

Readings:

To be announced

**Monday, September 22**

*Overview of Surveys and Sampling*

Readings:

Baxter and Babbie, Chapter 7

Penny S. Visser, Jon A. Krosnick, and Paul J. Lavrakas, “Survey Research.” In Harry T. Reis and Charles M. Judd (Eds.) *Handbook of Research Methods in Social Psychology.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

 Available online at: <http://comm.stanford.edu/faculty/krosnick/Survey_Research.pdf>

Alison L. Holbrook, Jon A. Krosnick, Penny S. Visser, Wendi L. Gardner, and John T. Cacioppo, “Attitudes Toward Presidential Candidates and Political Parties: Initial Optimism, Inertial First Impressions, and a Focus on Flaws.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 45, 930-950, 2001.

Jon A. Krosnick, Alison L. Holbrook, and Penny S. Visser. “The Impact of the Fall 1997 Debate About Global Warming on American Public Opinion.” *Public Understanding of Science*,9, 239-260, 2000.

**Wednesday, September 24**

*Surveys: Questionnaire Design and Experiments*

*Field Experiments*

Readings:

Baxter and Babbie, Chapter 8

Alison L. Holbrook, Jon A. Krosnick, Richard T. Carson, & Robert Cameron Mitchell, “Violating Conversational Conventions Disrupts Cognitive Processing of Attitude Questions.” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 465-494, 2000.

Jon A. Krosnick, “Response Strategies for Coping With the Cognitive Demands of Attitude Measures in Surveys.” *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 5, 213-236, 1991.

Adam S. Gerber and Donald P. Green, “The Effects of Canvassing, Direct Mail, and Telephone Contact on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment.” American Political Science Review, 94, 653-63, 2000.

John A. Krosnick and Donald R. Kinder. “Altering the Foundations of Support for the President Through Priming.” American Political Science Review, 84, 497-512, 1990.

Review the following websites:

GOTV, Yale University Institution for Social and Policy Studies

<http://gotv.research.yale.edu/?q=node/49>

James Irvine Foundation, California Votes Initiative

<http://irvine.org/evaluation/program-evaluations/californiavotesinitiative>

**Monday, September 29**

**Formation of Peer Groups**

*Content Analysis*

Readings:

Baxter and Babbie, Chapter 10

Anne Johnston and Lynda Lee Kaid, “Image Ads and Issue Ads in U.S. Presidential Advertising: Using Videostyle to Explore Stylistic Differences in Televised Political Ads from 1952 to 2000.” *Journal of Communication*, 52, 281-300, 2002.

Jochen Peter and Edmund Lauf. “Reliability in cross-national content analysis.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 79, 815-832, 2002.

Charles P. Smith. “Content Analysis and Narrative Analysis.” In Harry T. Reis and Charles M.

Judd (Eds.) *Handbook of Research Methods in Social Psychology.* New York:

Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Available online at: <http://faculty.fuqua.duke.edu/~jglynch/Ba591/Session02/Smith%202000%20Handbook%20Content%20Analysis.pdf>

Recommended:

Daniel Riffe, Stephen Lacy, Frederick G. Fico, Analyzing Media Messages: Using Quantitative Content Analyses in Research. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2005 (2nd Ed.)

**Wednesday, October 1**

In-class content analysis exercise

Readings:

To be announced

**Monday, October 6**

*Guest Lecture on Programming and Research Methods*

Joe Bob Hester, Associate Professor, School of Journalism and Mass Communication

Readings:

To be announced

**Wednesday, October 8**

*Guest Lecture on Laboratory Experiments*

Janas Sinclair, Associate Professor, School of Journalism and Mass Communication

Readings:

Baxter and Babbie, Chapter 9

To be announced

***III. Applied Research Methods***

**Monday, October 13**

***Critique of quantitative research article due***

*Guest Lecture on Experimental Applied Methods*

Laura Ruel, Associate Professor, School of Journalism and Mass Communication

Readings:

To be announced

**Wednesday, October 15**

*Focus Groups*

“Guidelines for Conducting Focus Groups.” Available online at:

<http://assessment.aas.duke.edu/documents/How_to_Conduct_a_Focus_Group.pdf>

Javier Lezaun, (2007) “A market of opinions: the political epistemology of focus groups.” *The*

*Sociological Review* 55: 130-151.

**Monday, October 20**

*Guest Lecture on Applied Research Methods*

JoAnn Sciarrino, Knight Chair in Digital Advertising, School of Journalism and Mass Communication

Readings:

To be announced

**Wednesday, October 22**

*Guest Lecture on Applied Research Design, Methods, and Evaluation*

Heidi Hennink-Kaminski, Associate Professor, School of Journalism and Mass Communication

Readings:

To be announced

**IV: Qualitative Research Methods**

**Monday, October 27**

*Approaches to Qualitative Research*

Readings:

Luker, Chapters 6 and 7

Graeme Wood, “Anthropology, Inc.” The Atlantic. Available online at:

<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2013/03/anthropology-inc/309218/>

Clifford Geertz, “Deep Play: Notes on a Balinese CockFight” <http://uwch-4.humanities.washington.edu/~WG/~DCIII/120F%20Course%20Reader/CR5_Geertz_Deep%20Play.pdf>

Recommended:

Michael Burawoy, “The extended case method,” *Theory and Society,* 16(1), 4-33, 1998.

Kathy Charmaz, “Grounded Theory.” Available online at:

<http://www.sxf.uevora.pt/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Charmaz_1996.pdf>

Bent Flyvbjerg, “Five Misunderstandings About Case Studies Research.” *Qualitative Inquiry.*

 12(2), 219-245, 2006.

Clifford Geertz, “Thick Description: Toward and Interpretive Theory of Culture.” Available

online at:

<http://growingsideways.files.wordpress.com/2011/11/thick-discription.pdf>

Alexander N. George and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2005.

Robert K. Yin. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2009.

**Wednesday, October 29**

*Fieldwork: Sites, Access, and Engagement*

Readings:

Paul Atkinson and Martyn Hammersley. “Ethnography and Participant Observation.” PP. 248-261, In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S Lincoln (Eds.) [Handbook of Qualitative Research](http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=nrI65qyhL84C&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&sig=-xyNSmDKLMD4nNBn11N_JY3MFn4&dq=handbook+of+qualitative+research&prev=http://scholar.google.com/scholar%3Fq%3Dhandbook%2Bof%2Bqualitative%2Bresearch%26num%3D100%26hl%3Den%26lr%3D%26sa%3DG)*.*  Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2005.

Maxine Baca Zinn. “Field Research in Minority Communities.” Social Problems.

Available online at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/800369>

Luker, Chapter 8

Recommended:

George E. Marcus, “Ethnography In/Of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-sited

 Ethnography,” *Annual Review of Anthropology,* 24(1), 95–117, 1995.

**Monday, November 3**

*Example: Ethnography*

Nikki Usher, *Making News at the New York Times*

Recommended

Fred Turner, “Burning Man at Google: A Cultural Infrastructure for New Media Production.” *New Media & Society*, 11: 73-94, 2009.

**Wednesday, November 5**

*Interviewing*

Carol A. B. Warren. “Qualitative Interviewing.” Chapter 4, Qualitative Interviewing, PP 83-101, In [Jaber F. Gubrium](http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/contrib/501069) and [James A. Holstein](http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/contrib/514124) (Eds.) Handbook of Interview Research. New York: Sage Publications, 2001.

Available online at: <http://www.lcc.gatech.edu/~cpearce3/ResearchPapers/InterviewMethods.pdf>

Robert S. Weiss, *Learning from strangers: The art and method of qualitative interview studies*, Free Press, New York, 1995. Read Chapter 4, Interviewing, PP: 61-119.

Available online at: <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~rturley/Soc357/Weiss%20pgs.%2061-119.pdf>

**Monday, November 10**

*In-class Interview Assignment*

**Wednesday, November 12**

*Evaluating Qualitative Research: Credibility, Reliability, and Validation*

Readings:

Howard S. Becker. “Problems of Inference and Proof in Participant Observation”

American Sociological Review

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2089053>

Howard Becker, “The Epistemology of Qualitative Research”

[http://www.sfu.ca/~palys/BeckerEpistemologyOfQualitativeResearch.pdf](http://www.sfu.ca/~palys/Becker-EpistemologyOfQualitativeResearch.pdf)

**Monday, November 17**

*Guest Lecture on Historical Analysis*

Barbara Friedman, Associate Professor, School of Journalism and Mass Communication –

Readings:

To be announced

Recommended:

Andrew Abbott. “Conceptions of Time and Events in Social Science Methods: Causal and

 Narrative Approaches.” *Historical Methods*, 23(4), 140-150, 1990.

Roberto Franzosi. “The Press as a Source of Socio-Historical Data: Issues in the Methodology of Data Collection from Newspapers.” *Historical Methods*, 20(1), 5-15, 1987.

Luker, Chapter 9

Michael Schudson. “Politics as a Cultural Practice. *Political Communication* 18: 421-431*,* 2001.

Fred Turner. “When the Counterculture Met the New Economy: The Well and the Origins of Virtual Community.” *Technology & Culture* 46, 485-512, 2005.

**Wednesday, November 19**

*Guest Lecture on Mixed Methodological Work*

Zeynep Tufecki, Assistant Professor, School of Information and Library Sciences

Readings:

To be announced

Recommended:

Philip N. Howard. “Network Ethnography and the Hypermedia Organization: New Media, New Organizations, New Methods,” *New Media & Society* 4(4), 550-574, 2002.

Doug McAdam, “The Biographical Consequences of Activism,” *American Sociological*

 *Review,* 54(5), 744-706, 1989.

Deanna A. Rohlinger, “Framing the Abortion Debate: Organizational Resources, Media Strategies, and Movement-Countermovement Dynamics,” *The Sociological Quarterly*

43(4), 479-507, 2002.

Adam F. Simon and Jenifer Jerit. “Toward a Theory Relating Political Discourse, Media, and Public Opinion.” *Journal of Communication*, 57, 254-271, 2007.

David Ayman Shamma, “Tweeting Minarets.” Ethnography Matters. Available online at: <http://ethnographymatters.net/2013/05/06/tweeting-minarets/>

***IV: The Practice of Science***

**Monday, November 24**

***Field observation due***

*Constructing Knowledge and Understanding Scientific Controversies*

Bruno Latour. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

**Wednesday, November 26**

***Deadline to swap draft research proposals for peer review***

*Thanksgiving Holiday, No Class*

**Monday, December 1**

*Research and Expertise in the World*

John Law, (2009). “Seeing Like a Survey.” *Cultural Sociology* 3(2): 239-256

Michael Schudson, (2006). “The Trouble With Experts - And Why Democracy Needs Them.”

*Theory and Society* 35: 491-506.

Recommended:

Harry M. Collins and Robert Evans. “The Third Wave of Science Studies: Studies of Expertise

and Experience.” *Social Studies of Science* 32: 235-296, 2002.

**Wednesday, December 3**

***Peer comments due to group members and instructor***

*Wrap Up*

Howard Becker, “Tricks of the Trade,” In Emerson, pp. 353-360 and Chapter 1,

 available online at: <http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/041247.html>

Recommended:

Thom Brooks. “Publishing Advice For Graduate Students,” 2008.

Available online at: <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1085245&http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1085245>

Department of History and Philosophy of Science, Cambridge University. “How to Publish and Article,” 2011.

 Available online at: <http://www.hps.cam.ac.uk/students/training/publish.html>

Jonathan Sterne’s professionalization resource page at: <http://sterneworks.org/academe/>

1. Emmett Winn. “Advice to Graduate Students Preparing for Their First Conference Presentation.”

 Available online at: <http://sterneworks.org/Winn.html>

**Monday, December 8th**

**Final papers due by 10am**