

**UP 589: Research Design**  
**Temple Buell Hall 225**  
**T/TH 3:30-4:50**  
**Fall 2024**

**Instructor: Rebecca Walker** (she/her)

**Email:** [rhwalker@illinois.edu](mailto:rhwalker@illinois.edu)

**Office hours:** I will be holding office hours online via Zoom on Wednesdays from 2-3:30pm. Please reserve a time for office hours using the Calendly sign up link ([sign up here!](#)). If you are unable to attend office hours due to schedule conflicts, please send an email to arrange an appointment.

**Course Overview**

This seminar is designed to introduce planning doctoral students to a range of issues surrounding scientific and social-scientific inquiry. In Section I, we ask how social-scientific ideas and practices reflect the broader societies in which they are embedded and, in turn, how social science can have an impact on the world, for good or ill. In section II, we compare and contrast methodological stances associated with positivist, interpretive, and critical traditions of social science. Our goal is to clarify and expand our understandings of the varied ways scholars pursue understanding and explanation in the social sciences. In Section III, we explore some of the key elements that combine to position and define a piece of social science research—for example, ethics and morals, theories and models, concepts and categories, questions and cases. Finally, in Section IV, we compare and contrast three modes of analysis and explanation commonly deployed across the social sciences. Broadly grouped, these explanatory styles are defined by (a) causal analyses that employ logics of control or conjunction, (b) analyses of processes, mechanisms, or paths of development, and (c) various modes of structural, relational, or constitutive analysis.

This course is not a survey of methods. We will give little attention to questions of technique, such as how to design an experiment, organize ethnographic fieldwork, conduct network analysis, or obtain efficient maximum likelihood estimates. Yet this course also is not a course on abstract philosophy. We will not go very far into the weeds when it comes to philosophical debates over epistemology, ontology, and the like. Our goal will be to till the ground between abstract philosophy and concrete technique, working to develop better understandings of how different approaches to social science actually work – in a methodological sense and as integral elements of the world of publicly engaged social science. By the end of the semester, students should have a greater ability to identify, understand, and critique the underlying logics of inquiry and explanation at work in a piece of scholarship. Students should develop a more sophisticated perspective on the interplay of science and society and a more critical understanding of the varied ways one might pursue “publicly engaged scholarship.” Students should be able to locate their own work on a broader methodological landscape, seeing more clearly the particularity of their own assumptions, procedures, standards of evaluation, ethical commitments, and orientations toward public action.

Note: the seminar portion of this course and course assignments draw heavily on the doctoral student seminar developed and taught by Dr. Joe Soss during the spring of 2020 at the Humphrey

School of Public Affairs, to which I am much indebted. Assigned readings and assignments have been adapted to meet the needs of doctoral students in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at UIUC.

### **Class Preparation**

The course is structured in two parts: *Seminar Classes* (Thursdays) and *Workshop Classes* (Tuesdays).

#### *Seminar Classes (Thursdays)*

The substantive portion of the course will be carried out through seminar meetings in which we will discuss the week's assigned readings. Preparation for these meetings will require substantial and critical engagement with the assigned texts and is essential for the success of our conversations. In class, I will pose discussion questions and present brief lectures to clarify methodological issues. In the main, though, our meetings will emphasize student participation and dialogue. For this format to work, you will need to read with a critical eye and think about how the readings relate to work in your own field. As you prepare for class each week, you should work to (1) put the assigned readings into dialogue with one another, (2) connect them to issues we've discussed in earlier weeks, and (3) develop your own questions and perspectives for class discussion. I expect students to arrive at class ready to articulate their perspectives on what the readings say, which issues most deserve our attention, why some arguments should be seen as stronger than others, and how we should think about the strengths and weaknesses of arguments, and so on.

In my experience, one of the most effective ways to prepare for class is simply to talk about the readings with one or more students at some point during the day or so before class. It's a low-pressure way to clear up confusions; it gives you a chance to complain a little about the readings and the class; it tends to make reticent students feel more at ease speaking up in seminar; and it's a great way to make sure you arrive at class with a perspective on what you've read. These sorts of conversations with a peer or two are not required, but I highly recommend them.

At the risk of stating the obvious, we differ considerably in our scholarly interests, methodological commitments, and previous training—not to mention our positions in social, economic, and political life. In all our discussions, I ask that you please show respect for these differences and try to be constructive in the ways you engage one another.

#### *Workshop Classes*

Our class time on Tuesdays will be structured as a writing workshop. In these workshop sessions, students will each develop a **research proposal** that fits their unique goals and priorities. This might be a research proposal submitted as part of a grant or fellowship application or your preliminary exam proposal. At the beginning of the semester, each student will identify their specific goal for the writing workshop and will work with me to identify expectations and set appropriate milestones. I intend for workshop sessions to be informal opportunities for students to receive peer-to-peer and instructor-to-student feedback on their writing.

Planning in an inherently interdisciplinary field that draws in which scholars draw on a range of epistemological and methodological approaches, and as such, I do not anticipate that there will be a one-size-fits-all approach to proposals or proposal writing. That said, over the course of the semester, we will explore writing exercises aimed at deepening skills in the development, articulation, and justification of research questions in social science.

Workshop sessions will begin with a brief lecture or discussion of an element of proposal writing from me, as well as an activity to practice particular skills needed for successful proposal writing. Then, over the majority of the semester, we will spend the second half of class doing peer-to-peer workshoping of our proposal drafts. At the end of each class session, students will articulate their writing goals for the next week and coordinate with their peer reviewer about when they intend to exchange drafts (I will suggest that peers exchange drafts by 8 pm the night before class, but please work to accommodate one another's schedules and preferences with regard to timing).

## **Assignments**

### **Class Participation - 15%**

I hope everyone will feel that participation in this class is about more than getting a grade. But grades matter, so I want to be clear up front that there are subjective elements to evaluating participation. People contribute to class in different ways; quality is at least as important as quantity; and when it comes to quality, listening is as important as talking. So be aware that I do not take a “bean-counting” approach to grading student participation: More is not necessarily better than less, and I don’t have a set number of statements I expect people to make.

Important elements of participation include: consistent class attendance, strong preparation for seminar discussions (such as careful reading and arriving with well-developed questions and perspectives), active engagement in seminar discussions (listening carefully, responding to others, offering good reasons for the views you advance), deliberate efforts to step back from the conversation and help the group see its own unstated assumptions or biases, active use of office hours to discuss reading and writing assignments, and so on.

In class and beyond, students should aim for consistent engagement and make a good faith effort to advance our collective understanding. Be creative. Question what you read. Give us reasons to be persuaded. Direct us to evidence. Challenge our consensus. Make trouble. But please, bear in mind that the classroom and email forum are public academic spaces. Please be respectful and follow standards of ethics and etiquette appropriate to such a setting.

Some guidelines if you do have to miss class:

- Email me so that I have it in writing, as soon as you know that you're going to miss class. I don't need an explanation—as PhD students, I believe you're entitled to make decisions for yourself about how best to prioritize your time. However,

sometimes an absence will require me to adjust class activities, and so it is helpful for me to know sooner rather than later if you'll be absent.

- If you are missing class on a workshop day on which peer-to-peer feedback is scheduled, ***you are still responsible for giving feedback to your peer.***
- If you miss class on a seminar day, you have the option of receiving full participation credit if you reply to the day's discussion questions posted by the discussion leader on Canvas. No need to respond to every question, but maybe pick 3-4 and offer a thoughtful response.

### **Leading Discussion - 10%**

Each week, one student will serve as our discussion leader. Leading discussion entails both successful stewardship of dialogue through a series of thought-provoking questions, posted by 10 am ahead of class time, and your introductions to the week's readings, presented at the beginning of class.

Discussion leaders should then foster a discussion through a series of thought-provoking questions. Questions may aim to guide deeper understanding of particular articles or to put contrasting viewpoints from different authors into conversation with one another. Discussion questions may also challenge students to apply arguments or techniques described by the week's readings to their own research. In order to ensure that all students are prepared to engage thoughtfully in the discussion, I ask that discussion leaders ***post their questions to the Discussion forum on Canvas by 10 am on the day of their discussion.*** I will supplement discussions as necessary, but we should aim for about 45 minutes of hearty discussion.

Discussion leaders should ***begin discussions with a brief introduction*** that aims to respond to the week's readings as a whole—what argument or takeaways should we draw from this body of reading, read in conversation with one another? Your overviews at the beginning of class should be more than personal reactions (e.g., “I thought A was more convincing than B”) and more than mere summaries of the readings. Your response overviews should aim to critically engage the texts and put them into dialogue with one another on clearly defined terms. These terms are yours to define; stage the conversation you want. Your introduction at the beginning of discussion should aim to improve your classmates' understanding of the key issue/questions raised by the articles, when read as a collective. In doing so, your introductions should you should elucidate key arguments, insights, distinctions, or concepts in the week's readings.

### **Writing Assignments - 50%**

Students in this course are responsible for three writing assignments. Each assignment is designed to minimize the need for outside research and intensify student engagement with course readings. The goal is for students to develop well-informed, critical perspectives on the issues raised by course readings. Toward this end, the assignments ask students to put readings into dialogue with one another and put them to use as building blocks for analytic arguments. Each assignment counts for 25% of your overall course grade.

***Paper Assignment 1*** should total no more than 8 pages, double-spaced, with twelve-point Times New Roman font and one-inch margins. Thinking broadly about the kinds of work you hope to do in the decade ahead, write an essay that locates your work in relation to positivist, interpretive, and critical traditions of social science. Your essay should address two of the three traditions.

- Begin by explaining the kind of work you hope to do in the context of the tradition that fits it best: (1) What priorities and strengths of this tradition make it the best fit for your goals and approaches? (2) What weaknesses or limitations do you see in this tradition, and how might they matter for your research?
- If you believe your work will fall entirely outside the second tradition you consider: (1) Explain the priorities and strengths of this tradition. (2) Explain why certain aspects of this tradition make it unsuitable for your research, aiming for an argument that would be convincing to someone who values and works in the tradition. (3) Draw directly on this tradition to advance one reasonable critique of the work you hope to do.
- If you believe your work will intersect in a partial way with this second tradition: (1) Identify the priorities and strengths of the tradition you expect to engage in your work and explain why. (2) Explain why some aspects of the tradition strike you as less helpful for (or incompatible with) your work, aiming for an argument that would be convincing to someone who values and works in this tradition.

***Paper Assignment 2*** consists of one essay in three parts. The paper as a whole should total no more than 15 pages, double-spaced, with twelve-point Times New Roman font and one-inch margins. Endnotes should start on page 16 and will not count toward the page limit. The essay will be based on a single article of your choosing – presumably from a field that interests you as a site of future study, but that’s up to you. To be suitable, the article must include theoretical, conceptual, and empirical elements and approach analysis in a way that you see as falling into at least one of the analytic approaches covered in our readings from weeks 11-13. This assignment can be quite difficult if you try to do it with a poorly chosen article. I strongly recommend that you consult with me as you get close to making a selection.

**Part I. Analysis:** Treat your article as a “case” of scholarship, and subject it to careful analysis. This part of your essay should (1) specify the kind of intervention the author is trying to make, (2) clarify the article’s main theoretical, conceptual, and empirical elements (including their implicit aspects), and (3) explain how the article works by breaking down the author’s key “moves” and describing how the pieces get put together in a particular way related to weeks 12-15 of our course. Part I is analytic, not evaluative.

**Part II. Internal Critique:** Write a critique of the article’s strengths and weaknesses, on its own terms. How well does the author develop and present each aspect of the article (theoretical, conceptual, and empirical), and how effectively do the pieces get put together? An “internal” critique means you should evaluate

the analysis in terms of the author's own goals and relevant standards: What are its strengths and weaknesses given the type of analysis the author aims to pursue? Taking the author's goals and methodological approach as given, what changes would you recommend in order to strengthen the piece?

Part III. External Critique or Alternative Design: The goal of this final section is to offer a different methodological perspective on the research presented in your original article (OA). If, for example, the OA adopts a variable-oriented explanatory approach that makes causal inferences based on a logic of control, you should adopt one of the other approaches explored in the readings from Weeks 12-15 of the course. Option 1 is to propose an article-length study designed to follow up on the OA, based on the alternative analytic approach you have selected. Your proposal might aim to build on, challenge, or bring greater specificity to the OA's analysis. In presenting your proposal, state your research question and explain your intervention as clearly as possible. Broadly speaking, you should consider the same kinds of issues addressed in Part I of your essay. Option 2 is to write an "external" critique of the OA, grounded in the alternative analytic approach you have selected. In the process of pursuing Option 1 or 2, you may find it necessary to suggest alternative theoretical, conceptual, and empirical foundations for the analysis.

Please note: This assignment asks you to critically engage course concepts and perspectives in concrete ways. You should think of it as an opportunity to demonstrate what you've learned from our readings and discussions and the perspectives you've developed on course themes. Your grade will depend, first and foremost, on the ways you engage, explain, critique, and apply ideas from our readings and class discussions. In developing your arguments, you should draw on or contest our readings in explicit ways. Strong papers will provide reasons why the reader should be persuaded and will do so by directly engaging and citing relevant course materials.

### **Research Proposal - 25%**

Over the course of the semester, each student will develop a research proposal, in accordance with the standards for success that they determine in consultation with the instructor. Your research proposal will count for 25% of your grade. There is no set format, page count, or required content for the research proposals. Rather, students will, at the beginning of the semester, identify the specific grant, fellowship, or academic milestone to which they hope to submit the proposal they develop through course workshop sessions. Choose a writing task that will be useful to you and your progress as a student and a scholar. Student proposals will then be graded according to the standards of their specific grant, fellowship, or academic milestone. Because we vary in our epistemological stances and methodological approaches and because no two students are ever at the exact same place in their academic career, I anticipate that the appropriate approach to proposal writing will differ from student to student. Rather than a challenge for us, this is an opportunity for us to learn from one another.

Letter grades are assigned as follows. 97-100=A+, 94-96=A, 90-93=A-, 87-89=B+, 84-86=B, 80-83=B-, and so on. Unless prior arrangements have been made, late papers will be penalized three points immediately and then again for each 48 hours that passes after the due date/time.

### **Readings**

There are no required books for this course. All readings are available to download and print from the course website on Canvas.

**Academic Honesty** — Every student is expected to review and abide by the Academic Integrity Policy: <https://studentcode.illinois.edu/article1/part4/1-401/>. Ignorance is not an excuse for any academic dishonesty. It is your responsibility to read this policy to avoid any misunderstanding. Do not hesitate to ask the instructor(s) if you are ever in doubt about what constitutes plagiarism, cheating, or any other breach of academic integrity.

**Student Conduct** — The Department of Urban and Regional Planning (DURP) is committed to creating an environment of inclusion and opportunity that is rooted in the very goals and responsibilities of practicing planners. Conduct that interferes with the rights of another or creates an atmosphere of intimidation or disrespect is inconsistent with the environment of learning and cooperation that the program requires. By enrolling in class in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, students agree to be responsible for maintaining a respectful environment in all DURP activities, including classes, projects, and extracurricular programs. We will be governed by the University Student Code. See Student Code Article 1—Student Rights and Responsibilities, Part 1. Student Rights.

**Mental Health** — Significant stress, mood changes, excessive worry, substance/alcohol misuse or interferences in eating or sleep can have an impact on academic performance, social development, and emotional wellbeing. Campus offers a variety of confidential services including individual and group counseling, crisis intervention, psychiatric services, and specialized screenings, covered through the Student Health Fee. If you or someone you know experiences a mental health concern, please contact or visit any of the University's resources provided below. Getting help is a smart and courageous thing to do.

- Counseling Center (217) 333-3704
- McKinley Health Center (217) 333-2700
- National Suicide Prevention Lifeline (800) 273-8255
- Rosecrance Crisis Line (217) 359-4141 (available 24/7, 365 days a year)

If you are in immediate danger, call 911.

**Community of Care** — As members of the Illinois community, we each have a responsibility to express care and concern for one another. If you come across a classmate whose behavior concerns you, whether in regards to their well-being or yours, we encourage you to refer this behavior to the Student Assistance Center (217-333-0050 or <http://odos.illinois.edu/community-of-care/referral/>). Based on your report, the staff in the Student Assistance Center reaches out to students to make sure they have the support they need to be healthy and safe. Further, as a Community of Care, we want to support you in your overall

wellness. We know that students sometimes face challenges that can impact academic performance (examples include mental health concerns, food insecurity, homelessness, personal emergencies). Should you find that you are managing such a challenge and that it is interfering with your coursework, you are encouraged to contact the Student Assistance Center (SAC) in the Office of the Dean of Students for support and referrals to campus and/or community resources.

**Students with Disabilities** — To obtain disability-related academic adjustments and/or auxiliary aids, students with disabilities must contact the course instructor as soon as possible and provide the instructor with a Letter of Academic Accommodations from Disability Resources and Educational Services (DRES). To ensure that disability-related concerns are properly addressed from the beginning, students with disabilities who require assistance to participate in this class should apply for services with DRES and see the instructor as soon as possible. If you need accommodations for any sort of disability, please speak to me after class, or make an appointment to see me or see me during my office hours. DRES provides students with academic accommodations, access, and support services. To contact DRES, you may visit 1207 S. Oak St., Champaign, call 217-333-1970, e-mail [disability@illinois.edu](mailto:disability@illinois.edu) or visit the DRES website at <http://www.disability.illinois.edu/>. Here is the direct link to apply for services at DRES, <https://www.disability.illinois.edu/applying-services>.

**Disruptive Behavior** — Behavior that persistently or grossly interferes with classroom activities is considered disruptive behavior and may be subject to disciplinary action. Such behavior inhibits other students' ability to learn and an instructor's ability to teach. A student responsible for disruptive behavior may be required to leave class pending discussion and resolution of the problem and may be reported to the Office for Student Conflict Resolution (<https://conflictresolution.illinois.edu>; [conflictresolution@illinois.edu](mailto:conflictresolution@illinois.edu); 333-3680) for disciplinary action.

**Emergency Response Recommendations** — Emergency response recommendations and campus building floor plans can be found at the following website: <https://police.illinois.edu/em/run-hide-fight/>. I encourage you to review this website within the first 10 days of class.

**Religious Observances** — Illinois law requires the University to reasonably accommodate its students' religious beliefs, observances, and practices in regard to admissions, class attendance, and the scheduling of examinations and work requirements. Students should complete the Request for Accommodation for Religious Observances form should any instructors require an absence letter in order to manage the absence. In order to best facilitate planning and communication between students and faculty, students should make requests for absence letters as early as possible in the semester in which the request applies.

**Sexual Misconduct Reporting Obligation** — The University of Illinois is committed to combating sexual misconduct. Faculty and staff members are required to report any instances of sexual misconduct to the University's Title IX and Disability Office. In turn, an individual with the Title IX and Disability Office will provide information about rights and options, including accommodations, support services, the campus disciplinary process, and law enforcement options. A list of the designated University employees who, as counselors, confidential advisors,

and medical professionals, do not have this reporting responsibility and can maintain confidentiality, can be found here: [wecare.illinois.edu/resources/students/#confidential](http://wecare.illinois.edu/resources/students/#confidential).

Other information about resources and reporting is available here: [wecare.illinois.edu](http://wecare.illinois.edu).

### WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic / Activity</b>	<b>Peer-to-Peer Groups / Presenter Sign-ups</b>
8/27	First meeting, discuss syllabus and class goals	NA
9/3	<u>Topic</u> : Fundamentals of proposal writing <b>Requirement</b> : Identify proposal, schedule meeting with me to set milestones	
9/10	<u>Topic</u> : Honing your research question Peer-Peer workshopping	
9/17	<u>Topic</u> : Developing a literature review Peer-Peer workshopping	
9/24	<b>No class</b>	
10/1	<u>Topic</u> : Proposal as storytelling Peer-Peer workshopping	
10/8	<u>Topic</u> : Methods Peer-Peer workshopping	
10/15	<u>Topic</u> : Narrating Theoretical Significance Peer-Peer workshopping	
10/22	<u>Topic</u> : Narrating Broader Impacts Individual presentations (1)	
10/29	<b>No workshop - will hold Seminar this day</b>	
11/5	Individual presentations (2/day)	
11/12	Individual presentations (2/day)	
11/19	Individual presentations (2/day)	
11/26	<b>No class - Thanksgiving Break</b>	
12/1	<b>Final proposal due Sunday Dec. 1</b>	

## SEMINAR READING SCHEDULE

### **I. Science, Social Science, and Society**

#### Week 1, 8/29. A Human Endeavor: All Science is Social and Situated. How and Why Does that Matter?

1. Stephen Jay Gould. 1981. "Introduction" *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton. pp.19-29.
2. Steven Rose. 2018. "[The Limits to Science](#)." *Jacobin*. May 2.
3. José Maria Medina. 2017. "Epistemic Injustice and Epistemologies of Ignorance." *The Routledge Companion to the Philosophy of Race*. Taylor and Francis. pp.247-260.
4. Aldon Morris. 2017. "[W.E.B. Du Bois at the Center: From Science, Civil Rights Movement, to Black Lives Matter](#)." *British Journal of Sociology*. 68(1): 3-16.

#### Week 2, 9/5. Publicly Engaged Scholarship I: Visions of Positive Impacts and Their Achievement

Discussion Leader: Nadia

1. Paul Cairney and Kathryn Oliver. 2017. "[Evidence-based policymaking is not like evidence-based medicine, so how far should you go to bridge the divide between evidence and policy?](#)" *Health Research Policy and Systems*. 15(1): 35.
2. Frances Fox Piven. 2004. "The Politics of Policy Science." In I. Shapiro, R.M. Smith, and T.E. Masoud, eds. *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp.83-105.
3. Frank Fischer. 2000. "Rethinking Expertise." *Citizens, Experts, and the Environment: The Politics of Local Knowledge*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. pp.29-46, 89-108.
4. Kate Derickson. 2024. "Resourcing Struggles for Social Justice from the University." in Agatha Herman and Joshua Inwood, eds. *Research Justice: Engaging with Questions and Spaces of (In)Justice through Social Research*. Eds. Bristol University Press. pp. 21-30.

#### Week 3, 9/12. Publicly Engaged Scholarship II: Troubling Histories of Social Science and Power

Discussion Leader: Julia

1. Oren Yiftachel. 1998. "Planning and Social Control: Exploring the Dark Side." *Journal of Planning Literature*. 12(4): 395-406.
2. Sanjay G. Reddy. 2019. "[Economics' Biggest Success Story Is a Cautionary Tale](#)." *Foreign Policy*. October 22.
3. Patricio Silva. 1991. "Technocrats and Politics in Chile: From the Chicago Boys to the CIEPLAN Monks." *Journal of Latin American Studies*. 23(2): 385-410.
4. Talal Asad. 1979. "Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter." In G. Huizer and B. Mannheim, eds. *The Politics of Anthropology*. Mouton Publishers. Pp.85-94.

#### Week 4, 9/19: Ethical, Moral, and Legal Aspects of Research

Discussion Leader: Camila

1. Paul G. Stiles and Roger A. Boothroyd. 2015. "[Ethical Use of Administrative Data for Research Purposes](#)." In J. Fantuzzo and D.P. Culhane, eds. *Actionable Intelligence*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
  - a. Read from the bottom of page 5-9 (the section titled "AVAILABILITY AND USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE DATA: THE ISSUES").
  - b. Then from the bottom of page 22-29. (section titled "Ethics and Best Practices from a Researcher Perspective")
2. Francesco Lo Piccolo and Huw Thomas. 2008. "Research Ethics in Planning: A Framework for Discussion." *Planning Theory*. 7(1): 7-23.
3. Gideon Lewis-Kraus. 2016. "[The Trials of Alice Goffman](#)." *The New York Times Magazine*. January 12.

4. Kate D. Derickson. 2022. "Disrupting Displacements: Making Knowledges for Futures Otherwise in Gullah/Geechee Nation" *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*. 112(3), 838–846

## II. Methodological Traditions of Social Science

Week 5, 9/26: No Class

Week 6, 10/3: Positivist Traditions of Social Science

Discussion Leader: Juliana

1. John Horgan. 2013. "[Is 'Social Science an Oxymoron? Will That Ever Change?'](#)" *Scientific American*. April 4.
2. Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp.3-49 (ch.1 and part of ch.2)
3. Branda Nowell and Kate Albrecht. 2019. "A Reviewer's Guide to Qualitative Rigor." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 29(2):348-63

Positivist Studies of Poverty and Its Governance (broadly defined)

4. Robert J. Sampson and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2004. "Seeing Disorder: Neighborhood Stigma and the Social Construction of 'Broken Windows'" *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 67(4): 319-42.

Week 7, 10/10: Interpretive Traditions of Social Science

Discussion Leaders: Kyra

1. Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. 2015. "[Interpretive Social Science](#)." *The Encyclopedia of Political Thought* [Electronic]. Pp.1-6.
2. Ellen Pader. 2014. "Seeing with an Ethnographic Sensibility: Explorations Beneath the Surface of Public Policies." In D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. New York: Routledge. Pp.194-208.
3. Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow. 2012. "Ways of Knowing: Research Questions and Logics of Inquiry." *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge. pp.24-44.

Interpretive Studies of Poverty and Its Governance (broadly defined)

4. Priya Fielding-Singh. 2017. "A Taste of Inequality: Food's Symbolic Value across the Socioeconomic Spectrum." *Sociological Science*. 4: 424-48.

Week 8, 10/17: Critical Traditions of Social Science

Discussion leaders: Camila, Julia

1. Stan Houston. 2001. "Beyond Social Constructionism: Critical Realism and Social Work." *The British Journal of Social Work*. 31(6): 845-861.
2. Tony J. Watson. 2004. "HRM and Critical Social Science Analysis." *Journal of Management Studies* 41(3): 447-67.
3. Joan Wallach Scott. 2004. "Feminism's History." *Journal of Women's History*. 16(2): 10-29.

Critical Studies of Poverty and Its Governance (broadly defined)

4. Joshua Page & Joe Soss. (2021). The predatory dimensions of criminal justice. *Science*, 374(6565), 291-294.

## III. Key Elements of Social Science Research

### Week 9, 10/24: Theories, Models, and Typologies

Discussion Leaders: Kyra, Alexis

1. Gabriel Abend. 2008. "The Meaning of 'Theory.'" *Sociological Theory*. 26(2):  
a. **Excerpt:** Read only "The Multiple Meanings of Theory," pp.177-81.
2. James Johnson. 2018. "Formal Models in Political Science: Conceptual, Not Empirical"  
[Book Review Essay]. *Journal of Politics*. 81(1): Advance Online [5 pages]
3. D. Harold Doty and William H. Glick. 1994. "Typologies as a Unique Form of Theory  
Building: Toward Improved Understanding and Modeling." *The Academy of  
Management Review*. 19(2): 230-251.  
a. **Excerpt:** Read only p. 230-top of 236, stop before "Modeling..."

**\*\*\*Paper 1 Due on Sunday, October 27 by 11:59 pm, via Canvas**

### Week 10, 10/29 (\*\*\*Seminar on TUES, no workshop, NO class THURS): Concepts, Categories, and Measures

Discussion Leader: Srirang

1. John Gerring. 1999. "What Makes a Concept Good? A Criterial Framework for  
Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences." *Polity*. 31(3): 357-393.
2. Howard Becker. 1998. "Concepts." *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your  
Research While Doing It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. 109-45.
3. Frederic Charles Schaffer. 2016. *Elucidating Social Science Concepts: An Interpretivist  
Guide*. New York Routledge. Pp.1-54, 74-88.

### Week 11, 11/7: Questions, Cases, and Casings

Discussion Leader: Juliana

1. Jörgen Sandberg and Mats Alvesson. 2011. "Ways of Constructing Research Questions:  
Gap-Spotting or Problematization?" *Organization*, 18(1): 23-44.
2. Derickson and Routledge. 2015. "Resourcing Scholar Activism: Collaboration,  
Transformation, and the Production of Knowledge." *The Professional Geographer*, 67(1):  
1-7.
3. Mario L. Small. 2009. "How Many Cases Do I Need? On Science and the Logic of Case  
Selection in Field-Based Research." *Ethnography*. 10(1): 5-38.
4. Joe Soss. "On Casing a Study versus Studying a Case." In E. Simmons and N. Smith, eds.  
*Rethinking Comparison*.

## **IV. Some Approaches to Analysis and Explanation**

### Week 12, 11/14: Explaining through Covariance, Control, and Conjunction

Discussion leaders: Srirang

1. Arthur Spirling, & Brandon Stewart. (2022). "What good is a regression." Technical  
report.
2. Angus Deaton and Nancy Cartwright. 2018. "Understanding and Misunderstanding  
Randomized Controlled Trials." *Social Science & Medicine*. 210: 2-21.
3. Charles C. Ragin. 2010. "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges  
Variable-Oriented Research." In H. Brady and D. Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry:  
Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Pp.123-38.

4. David J. Harding, Cybelle Fox, and Jal D. Mehta. 2002. "Studying Rare Events through Qualitative Case Studies: Lessons from a Study of Rampage School Shootings." *Sociological Methods & Research*. 31(2): 174-217.

Week 13. 11/21: Explaining through Processes, Mechanisms, and Paths of Development

Discussion Leaders: Nadia

1. Brady, Henry E. 2010. "Data-Set Observations versus Causal-Process Observations: The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election." In H.E. Brady and D. Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. Pp.237-42.
2. Adrian Kay and Phillip Baker. 2015. "What Can Causal Process Tracing Offer to Policy Studies? A Review of the Literature." *Policy Studies Journal*. 43(1): 1-21.
3. Tulia Falleti and Julia Lynch. 2009. "Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 42(9): 1143-1166.
4. Andre Sorensen. 2015. "Taking Path Dependence Seriously: An Historical Institutional Research Agenda in Planning History." *Planning Perspectives*. 30(1): 17-38.

Week 14 11/28: No class - Thanksgiving Break

**\*\*\*Final Proposal Due on Sunday, December 1 by 11:59 pm, via Canvas**

Week 15. 12/5: Explaining through Structural, Relational, and Constitutive Analyses

Discussion Leaders: Alexis

1. Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. 2014. "The Relational Generation of Workplace Inequalities." *Social Currents*. 1(1): 51-73.
2. Sally Haslanger. 2016. "What is a (social) structural explanation?" *Philosophical Studies*. 173(1): 113-130.
3. William H. Sewell, Jr. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology*. 98(1): 1-29.
4. Alexander Wendt. 1998. "On Constitution and Causation in International Relations." *Review of International Studies*. 24(5): 101-18.

**\*\*\*Paper 2 Due on Sunday, December 15 by 11:59 pm, via Canvas**