

**Graduate School for Social Research
2019-2020**

Empirical Research in the Social Sciences: Design, Implementation and Write-up

socialinquiry.wordpress.com

Course Description:

This course focuses on the logic of theory-driven and empirically-based social science research and the process underlying scientific production. We emphasize the practical steps that enable scholars to design their research project, formulate testable hypotheses, and select the data and analysis techniques most suitable for answering the project's research question(s). Equally important, the course teaches you how to read published academic studies to critically assess their merits and limitations, and how to write up research projects to meet the requirements and expectations of major English-language social science publication outlets, especially those of peer-reviewed journals like the *American Sociological Review*, *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *Social Forces*, and *European Sociological Review*.

To this end, the course comprises two independent, albeit complimentary, components, which follow one another during the 2019-2020 academic year. Part I of the course, to take place in Autumn 2019, teaches students the practicalities of moving from research design to research implementation. Part II, offered in Spring 2020, focuses on reading and writing social science publications.

The entire course is conducted from an interdisciplinary perspective. Below are the detailed descriptions for **Part I, *Research Design and Implementation in Social Science*** (30 hours, Semester I) and **Part II, *Reading and Writing in Social Science*** (30 Hours, Semester II), including timeline and requirements specific to each of the course's components.

Part I. Research Design and Implementation in Social Sciences (30 hours, Semester I)

Instructors: Irina Tomescu-Dubrow, Ilona Wysmulek, Joshua K. Dubrow
Place: Room 232, Staszic Palace, 72 Nowy Swiat, 00-330 Warsaw, Poland
Time: Monday and Friday, 11:00 – 13:00
Course Website: socialinquiry.wordpress.com
Emails: tomescu.1@osu.edu, ilona.wysmulek@ifispan.waw.pl, dubrow.2@osu.edu
Office Hours: By appointment for office meetings. We are available any time via e-mail.

Description:

Part I of the course Empirical Research in the Social Sciences deals with the multiple, often simultaneous and reiterative, steps of developing and carrying out theory-informed, empirical projects. Good research requires a well-formulated and testable problem, alternative explanations, and data that explicitly link concepts and hypotheses. Through a combination of lecture and in-class discussion, we cover the role of theory for developing research questions and hypotheses, and for interpreting results; we discuss how to pose research questions that pass the “So what?” test, and how research questions and theory inform the formulation of research hypotheses; we assess different types of data (e.g. primary and secondary data, qualitative and quantitative) and research methods in terms of their usefulness for answering given research question(s) and addressing specified hypotheses. Part I also provides an overview of the main methodological problems that different types of data and analyses carry.

Objectives:

Part I aims to provide students the key skills for developing both academic and non-academic research products that are empirically grounded and meaningful for the scientific community and/or for society in general (e.g. policy relevant). Understanding how to critically assess published empirical studies with respect to the clarity and consistency of their research design, measurement adequacy, soundness of causal statements, and the degree of correspondence between research problem – hypothesis – data – methods – conclusions, are important aspects of these skills.

At the end of Part I, you should be able to move from designing a study, whether article, dissertation proposal, or funding proposal, to implementing it. More specifically, you should know how to:

- Pose research question(s) relevant both to you and social science more broadly. Among others, these questions shall pass the “so what?” condition, and be methodologically feasible;
- Identify the theoretical framework(s) relevant to your research question(s);
- Build theory-informed arguments and use them to generate empirically testable hypotheses;
- Identify the qualitative and/or quantitative data most suitable for evaluating the research hypotheses of your projects;
- Assess the overall strengths and weaknesses of different types of data and data collection approaches;
- Evaluate overall benefits and challenges of different social science research methods;
- Discuss possibilities and limitations of conclusions derived from different data and methods;
- Understand the ethical requirements of social science research.

In addition to imparting this specialized knowledge, Part I fosters critical thinking and communication skills. By the end of the semester, you should be able to present your research design and arguments to a scholarly audience or the lay public in clear, logical fashion.

Course Requirements

Classroom participation and attendance (15% of grade)

Everyone is expected to participate regularly and to come to class prepared to meaningfully discuss the readings. Punctual attendance is required. If you have a legitimate reason why you might be late on a regular basis, please notify us at the beginning of the course, or as soon as the condition appears. Excessive absences, tardiness, or leaving early will adversely affect your grade for classroom participation.

Class discussions centered on key issues of research design are an important element of this course. The discussion format mimics in miniature what professional sociologists do – actively engage in theoretical debates with colleagues. We expect discussion to be professional and polite – but engaged. Do not shy away from points. Do push arguments. Do not accept two logically inconsistent points as “equally valid perspectives.” Do seek to integrate alternative perspectives and understand the basic assumptions that drive different conclusions. We will push you on your arguments, and we trust you will do the same for each other. For this format to work, you must be active participants.

Reading Reactions (25% of grade)

To help focus class discussions and encourage you to think critically about social science research design and implementation, you will write six short reading reactions (ca. 300-500 words), based on either empirical articles or textbook chapters assigned in this course. Each reading reaction is due electronically at least one day prior to the class period whose readings you react to. For one of the reactions, the reading to comment on will be assigned in class, by us. For the remaining five reading reactions, you will decide the readings. We will circulate a sign-up sheet for the reading reactions at the beginning of the course.

Minimum three of your total six reading reactions should engage with an empirical article. When reacting to an empirical article, please discuss how well the author(s) link (a) research question(s) and hypotheses to (b) the chosen empirical data, and (c) the selected methods of analyses. When reacting to a book chapter, please provide a summary of the chapter’s key points.

Reading reactions to both empirical papers and book chapters should be **analytic** in nature and can include questions that you have about the readings (e.g. what you may not have understood with regards to the overall research design and its implementation, including analyses), questions about the nature of social science, or a short critique of an article's methodology. These reactions are not about how you 'feel' about the readings (whether you liked them or not).

In preparing your reading reactions, you are encouraged to discuss the readings with your colleagues, and look up unclear concepts and terms. We will use your reactions as part of class discussion. Please come prepared to discuss what you wrote.

Group Assignment - Field Research (20% of grade)

To experience how the process of research design and implementation can feel, you will engage in a group exercise where you will use observation as your data collection method. Since the method is the "servant" (Firebaugh 2008), together with members of your group you will first need to formulate a research question that you can answer using data collected via field observation. Specific requirements of the Group Assignment, including for writing up the results of your exercise, will be handed out in class.

Research Proposal (40% of grade)

The final project for this course consists of a research proposal (around 2500 words, 12-point font, double-spaced). We will discuss the appropriate components of the research proposal in class, and provide a detailed handout of the requirements. Each student must write up their own paper individually and turn in their own work.

Completing the Research Proposal involves three steps, each due at different time points during Semester I (see Time Outline in Syllabus):

Step 1: Prepare a 300-500 words **General Statement about your Research Proposal's Topic** that should include (a) Research problem; (b) Research question(s), and whether answering it presupposes exploration only, or explanation, too; if you plan causal research, hypotheses are encouraged, but not mandatory for Step 1; (c) The argument as to why your research question passes the 'so what' condition; (d) What data you consider most appropriate for addressing the research question(s); (e) If you intend to collect data, what sampling technique you regard as most appropriate for your study? Please indicate in your Statement whether your research proposal is, or potentially could be, linked to your PhD thesis.

Step 2: Taking into account instructor-provided feedback to your General statement (Step 1), prepare the **Outline of your Research Proposal** (about 800 words). The Outline should briefly discuss each of the following elements (a) Research question(s), and the general research problem it links to; (b) Main theoretical framework(s) that inform your research (enumeration, not detailed description of theory); (c) If your research involves causal analysis, provide the Research hypotheses and briefly indicate how they link to the theoretical framework(s) you chose; (d) What data and methods you regard as necessary to examine the research hypotheses; (e) What limitations are these data and methods likely to have, given what you set out to investigate?

Both the General Statement and the Outline can take the form of bullet-points, followed by several phrases under each point (that is, they do not have to be written as a flowing narrative).

You are expected to present your Outline in small groups. You should treat this presentation like a "roundtable" at a conference. Usually this takes the form of an outline of the paper, but it can go beyond this. Outstanding presenters include as part of their handouts a) key lessons to be learned, and b) a list of resources (web links, key bibliographical references, key people working on that topic) to learn more. To facilitate discussion, you need to electronically share your Outline, and, if applicable, additional materials, with the class (instructors and colleagues) at least one day prior to your presentation.

Step 3: Write full **Research Proposal** (around 2500 words) according to the requirements distributed in class.

Grading:

Grades will be based: 15% on Class participation, 25% on Reading reactions; 20% on Field Methods Assignment; and 40% on the Research Proposal. Total possible points = 100%.

Students receiving more than 90% of possible points are guaranteed at least a 5-, more than 80% at least a 4-, more than 70% at least a 3-, and more than 60% at least a 2.

Readings:

Readings for Part I are available from the instructors, via a course-specific G-drive, and the GSSR library. Readings are shared for academic instruction only, and are not to be distributed further. Please consult the Timetable for reading materials assigned to each class period.

Resources:

Bryman, A., 2012. *Social Research Methods*. OUP Oxford.

Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*, 3rd edition. Los Angeles: Sage.

Firebaugh, G. 2008. *Seven Rules for Social Research*, Princeton University Press.

Hargittai, E. (ed.) 2009. *Research Confidential: Solutions to Problems Most Social Scientists Pretend They Never Have*. University of Michigan Press.

Humphrey, C. and Lee, B. H. (eds.) 2004. *The Real-Life Guide to Accounting Research: A Behind-the-scenes View of Using Qualitative Research Methods*. Elsevier.

King, G. R., Keohane, O. and Verba, S. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*, Princeton University Press.

Minichiello, V., Aroni, R. and Hays, T. N. 2008. *In-depth Interviewing: Principles, Techniques, Analysis*, 3rd edition. Pearson/Prentice Hall.

Singleton, R. A. Jr. and Straits, B. C. 1999. *Approaches to Social Research*, 3rd edition. Oxford University Press, USA,.

Cross-Cultural Survey Guidelines ccsg.isr.umich.edu/index.php

American Journal of Sociology had an in-depth symposium on Urban Ethnography in 2002. Volume 107(6):

“[Poverty, Morality and the Pitfalls of Urban Ethnography](#)” Wacquant

“[Ideologically Driven Critique](#)” – Anderson

“[What kind of Combat Sport is Sociology?](#)” – Duneier

“[View from the Left Bank](#)” – Newman

Policies on Attendance, Late Materials, and Make-Ups:

We expect everyone to show up to class on time. During class, cell phones and other electronic devices with noise-capacity must be turned off. We will make exceptions to this rule if you explain why you need them turned on during class. Please inform us of this reason before class begins.

Please remember to be courteous and polite to one another during heated discussions. We will be with each other for several months and we all need a comfortable classroom environment to learn and discuss issues.

All assignments are to be turned in electronically, via email to tomescu.1@osu.edu, ilona.wysmulek@ifispan.waw.pl and dubrow.2@osu.edu by the specified deadlines. We will accept late materials *only if* notified 24 hours prior to the deadline. Except for documented reasons (e.g. doctor's note), late assignments will incur a 10% penalty per day. For emailed assignments: it is your responsibility to be sure that we received your work.

Time Outline – Part I

1. **Nature of Science. The Science in Social Sciences. Introduction to Research Design**
Monday, Oct. 7
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:
Creswell, John W. 2009. Ch. 1 “The Selection of a Research Design”
Hargittai (Ed) Introduction (Ch1) by Hargittai “Doing Empirical Social Research”

Additional readings (optional):
Becker, Gary. 1993. “How I Learned What a Crook Was” *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 22: 28-35. *This article illustrates how research topics are generated*
Singleton Royce A. Jr. and Bruce C. Straits, Ch 2 “Nature of Science”

2. **Before the Data I: Social Inquiry, Theory, and Concepts**
Friday, Oct 11
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:
Mills, C. Wright. “Chapter One: The Promise.” *The Sociological Imagination* pp. 3 -24 Oxford University Press.
Gerring, John. 1999. “What Makes a Concept Good? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences.” *Polity* 31(3): 357-393.
Weber, Max. “Class, Status, and Party.”

Additional readings (optional):
Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. “Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics.” *American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033 – 1053.

3. **Before the Data, II: Causality, Hypotheses, and Research Questions**
Monday, Oct. 14
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:
Warner, Benjamin R. 2018. “Causality” in *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, pp. 122 – 124.
Hammersley, Martyn. 2015. “Causation and Qualitative Inquiry.” In *The Limits of Social Science: Causal Explanation and Value Relevance*, pp. 17 – 32. SAGE.
McEwan, Bree. 2018. “Null Hypothesis.” In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, pp. 1104 – 1106.
Churchill, Harriet and Teela Sanders. 2011. “Formulating a Research Question.” In *Getting Your PhD*, pp. 22 – 32. SAGE.

4. **Before the Data, III: Reading Empirical Articles**
Friday, Oct. 18
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:
Guetzkow, Joshua, Michèle Lamont and Grégoire Mallard. 2004. “What Is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences?” *American Sociological Review* 69(2): 190-212.
Rao, Aliya Hamid. 2017. “Stand By Your Man: Wives’ Emotion Work During Men’s Unemployment.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 79 (June): 636–656

5. **Units of observation. Sampling**
Friday, Oct. 25
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:
Singleton Royce A..Jr. and Bruce C. Straits, Ch. 6 “Sampling”
Becker, Howard S. 1998. “Sampling.” pp. 67-108 *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Herring, C. 2019. Complaint-Oriented Policing: Regulating Homelessness in Public Space. *American Sociological Review*, 0003122419872671.
Pailhé, A., Solaz, A., & Souletie, A. 2019. How Do Women and Men Use Extra Time? Housework and Childcare after the French 35-Hour Workweek Regulation. *European Sociological Review*.

Additional readings (optional):
Lieberson, S. 1991. "Small N's and Big Conclusions" *Social Forces*, 71:307-320
King, Kohane and Verba. 1994. Ch. 6

6. **Measurement: Concepts, Indicators. Reliability & Validity of Measurement**
Monday, Oct.28
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory
Becker, Howard S. 1998. “Concepts” Pp. 109-145 in *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think About Your Research While You're Doing It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Frost, J. 2019. "Certainty, Uncertainty, or Indifference? Examining Variation in the Identity Narratives of Nonreligious Americans". *American Sociological Review*, 0003122419871957.

Sweet, P. L. 2019. The Sociology of Gaslighting. *American Sociological Review*, 0003122419874843.

Additional Readings (optional):

Brush, L. 1990. "Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Study of Families and Households." *Gender & Society* 4(1): 156-167.

Singleton Royce A. Jr. and Bruce C. Straits, Ch. 5: "Measurement"

Step 1, Research Proposal: General Statement about Research Topic, due

7. **Survey Research (I): Types of survey design**

Friday, Nov. 8
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:

Creswell, John W. 2009. Ch. 8 "Quantitative Methods"

Hargittai (Ed), Ch 12 Freese "Secondary Analysis of Large Social Surveys

CCSG: Data Collection ccsq.isr.umich.edu/index.php/chapters/data-collection-chapter

Kalter, F., Kogan, I., & Dollmann, J. 2019. Studying Integration from Adolescence to Early Adulthood: Design, Content, and Research Potential of the CILS4EU-DE Data. *European Sociological Review*, 35(2), 280-297

Additional readings (optional):

Hargittai, Ch 11 Bandelj "Giving Mega Attention to Macro Research"

8. **Survey Research (II): Questionnaire development**

Friday Nov. 15
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:

Horton, Joanne, Richard Macve and Geert Struyven. 2004. Ch. 20. Qualitative Research: Experiences in Using Semi-Structured Interviews, 339- 358 (in Humphrey and Lee, Eds).

Krosnick, Jon, Stanley Pressner, 2010. Question and questionnaire design. *Handbook of survey research*, 263-314.

McIntosh, Michele J., and Janice M. Morse. 2015. "Situating and constructing diversity in semi-structured interviews." *Global Qualitative Nursing Research* 2: 2333393615597674.

Schneider, D.; Harknett, K. 2019. "Consequences of Routine Work-Schedule Instability for Worker Health and Well-Being". *American Sociological Review*, 84(1), 82–114.

9. **Experiments in the Social Sciences**

Monday, Nov 18
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:

Foschi, Martha. 2014. "Hypotheses, Operationalizations, and Manipulation Checks." In Webster, Murray Jr. and Jane Sell (Eds.) *Laboratory Experiments in the Social Sciences* (Second Edition). Amsterdam: Elsevier/Academic Press.

González, M. J., Cortina, C., & Rodríguez, J. 2019. The Role of Gender Stereotypes in Hiring: A Field Experiment. *European Sociological Review*, 35(2), 187-204.

Auspurg, Katrin, Thomas Hinz, and Carsten Sauer. 2017. "Why Should Women Get Less? Evidence on the Gender Pay Gap from Multifactorial Survey Experiments." *American Sociological Review* 82: 179-210.

10. **Independent Research: Fieldwork**

Friday, Nov. 22
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:

Singleton Royce A..Jr. and Bruce C. Straits. 1999. Ch. 10

Feagin, Joe. 1991. "The Continuing Significance of Race: Antiblack Discrimination in Public Places". *ASR* 56: 101-116

Tian, X. 2018. "Escaping the Interpersonal Power Game: Online Shopping in China". *Qualitative Sociology*, 41(4), 545–568.

11. **New methods of data collection. Big data in the social sciences**

Friday, Nov. 29
11:00 – 13:00

Mandatory:

Salganik, Matthew J. 2018. *Bit by Bit: Social Research in the Digital Age*. Ch. 2, pp.12 – 62.

Chmielewski, Anna K. 2019. "The Global Increase in the Socioeconomic Achievement Gap, 1964 to 2015." *American Sociological Review* (2019): 0003122419847165.

Bruns, A and Stieglitz, Stefan. 2013. "Towards more systematic Twitter analysis: metrics for tweeting activities." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 16(2), pp. 91-108.

Group Assignment Field Methods, due

12. **Mixed Methods**
 Monday, Dec. 2
 11:00 – 13:00
Mandatory
 Creswell, John W. 2009. Ch. 10 “Mixed Methods Procedures” in *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches, 3rd edition*. Los Angeles: Sage.
 Singleton Royce A..Jr. and Bruce C. Straits, Ch. 13 “Multiple Methods”
 Olsen, Wendy. 2004 “Triangulation in social research” in *Developments in Sociology* M Holborn (Ed)
 Karell, D., & Freedman, M. 2019. “Rhetorics of Radicalism.” *American Sociological Review*, 84(4), 726-753.
 Baranowska-Rataj, A., Matysiak, A.; Mynarska, M. 2014. “Does Lone Motherhood Decrease Women’s Happiness? Evidence from Qualitative and Quantitative Research”. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(6), 1457–1477.

Step 2, Research Proposal: Outline of Research Proposal, due

13. **Data management and replicability**
 Monday, Jan 10
 11:00 – 13:00
Mandatory
 Lyons, Peter and Doueck, Howard J. *The Dissertation*. Ch. 6 Data management and analysis. p. 132-153
 Moore, R. 2017. “Sardonic Atheists and Silly Evangelicals: The Relationship between Self-Concept and Humor Style”. *Qualitative Sociology* 40(4), 447–465.

Roundtable Presentations of Research Proposal Outline

14. **Research ethics**
 Friday, Jan. 13
 11:00 – 13:00
Mandatory:
 Salganik, Matthew J. 2018. Ch.6 Ethics. In *Bit by Bit: Social Research in the Digital Age*, pp. 281 – 331
 Oh, J. H., Yeatman, S., & Trinitapoli, J. 2019. Data Collection as Disruption: Insights from a Longitudinal Study of Young Adulthood. *American Sociological Review*, 84(4), 634-663.
 Lewis, K., Kaufman, J., Gonzalez, M., Wimmer, A; Christakis, N. 2008. Tastes, ties, and time: A new social network dataset using Facebook.com. *Social Networks*, 30(4), 330–342.

Additional readings (optional):

Lallmark et al 2009_Ethical issues in the use of in-depth interviews.pdf

Cross-Cultural Survey Guidelines, Ethics in Survey research:

ccsg.isr.umich.edu/index.php/chapters/ethical-considerations-in-surveys-chapter

Roundtable Presentations of Research Proposal Outline

15. **Summary**
 Monday, Jan. 17
 Jan 17
 11:00 – 13:00
Mandatory:
 Firebaugh, Glenn 2008. Ch 7: The seventh rule: Let method be the servant, not the master.
 King, Kohane and Verba. 1994. “Knowing what to avoid”

Roundtable Presentations of Research Proposal Outline

Step 3, Research Proposal: Full proposal due February 3, 2020

Empirical Research in the Social Sciences: Design, Implementation and Write-up

Part II: Reading and Writing in the Social Sciences (30 hours, Semester II)

Instructors: Joshua K. Dubrow and Ilona Wysmulek,
Place: Room 232, Staszic Palace, 72 Nowy Swiat, 00-330 Warsaw, Poland
Course Website: socialinquiry.wordpress.com
Email: dubrow.2@osu.edu and ilona.wysmulek@ifispan.waw.pl,
Office Hours: By appointment for office meetings. We are available any time via e-mail.

Description

At the heart of academic social science are theory-informed empirical research articles and constructive criticism on the pre-publication writing of colleagues. Part II of the 'Empirical Research in the Social Sciences' course trains students in how to read and write English language social science empirical research articles that conform to international standards. By article, we mean that which is found in the top journals of sociology, e.g. generalist journals such as *American Sociological Review* (Impact Factor 5.06), *Social Forces* (IF 2.11), and *European Sociological Review* (IF 1.76), and specialty journals such as *Qualitative Sociology* (IF 1.23). These articles have ca. 8000-9000 words and tend to follow a similar structure: Title, abstract, acknowledgements, introduction, theory and hypotheses, data and methods, results, conclusion, and references. Other sections depend on the methods and content of the empirical analyses, such as "setting" (for qualitative articles) and appendices.

Students will need to understand both the structure of empirical research articles and the kind of content that should be included within each part of the structure. They will write based on their own research, drawing from Part I of the course. They will also learn how to revise both their own writing and the writing of their colleagues.

Objectives

Part II aims to provide students the key skills for how to read and write for the top English language sociology journals. At the end of this course, students should be able to:

- Understand the structure of empirical research articles
- Understand the content of each section of empirical research articles
- Critically assess the structure and content of empirical social science research
- Gain experience in writing each section of a theory-informed, empirically-based article
- Develop useful writing strategies and habits
- Revise their own writing
- Provide constructive criticism on the writing of colleagues
- Understand how to present and promote their research results

Part II promotes critical thinking and communication skills in addition to this specialized knowledge. By the end of the semester, you should be able to present your arguments to a scholarly audience or the lay public in clear, logical fashion.

General Course Structure

In the first class periods, we will discuss "Reading" e.g. (a) audience expectations, (b) the structure of empirical research articles, (c) writing strategies and habits that are useful and efficient for the production of articles, and (d) how to provide constructive criticism.

Most of the classes will have the following structure: In the first hour, we will discuss the readings of the day and read and critique the writing of articles published in the top sociology journals, going in-depth on particular sections. In the second hour, under the supervision of the instructor, students will be paired with their colleagues and provide constructive criticisms on each other's writing. The instructor will inform students in advance of who their paired colleague will be (to gain experience with a variety of audiences, pairs

will change every class period). At the end of the course we will delve into particular writing topics related to academic professionalization.

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Class Participation (30%): Students are expected to have read the book chapters and articles that we will discuss with a focus on the particular section or sections due for that day. In classes where writing is due, students are expected to have prepared in advance the constructive criticism of their colleagues' writing.

Writing Text for Colleagues to Constructively Critique (40%): For four class periods, students will write in advance a short text (ca. 300 – 500 words) that is to be submitted to their paired colleague and to the instructors. Each assignment corresponds to a major structural element of empirical research papers: (1) introduction, (2) theory, research questions, and hypotheses, (3) data and methods, and (4) conclusions. Writing assignment is due 48 hours before the class. Peer review is due 5 hours before the class (12 pm on the class date).

Writing Text for the Instructor to Constructively Critique (20%): At the end of the course, students will submit to the instructor several sections of an empirical research draft paper (preferably one that they have written and revised throughout the course), ca. min. 2000 words. Details pertaining to the content and structure of this assignment will be handed out in class.

Summarizing Chapters in “How to Write” Books (10%): For three class periods, students will submit to the instructor a short summary (ca. min. 200 words) of selected chapters in Schimel (2012).

Readings

(a) Articles from the top journals in sociology TBA

(b) On writing:

Required

Schimel, Joshua. 2012. *Writing Science: How to Write Papers That Get Cited and Proposals That Get Funded*. Oxford University Press.

Lebrun, J. L. 2011. *Scientific writing 2.0: a reader and writer's guide*. New Jersey: World Scientific

NB: Chapters will be available in the GSSR library and ERSS Google Drive folder

Optional

The Academic Phrasebank, The University of Manchester, phrasebank.manchester.ac.uk

Joshua Schimel's blog on writing science: <https://schimelwritingscience.wordpress.com/>

Part II - Course Outline

Class 1

A. Introduction to the Course; Expectations of Academic Audiences

Guetzkow, Joshua, Michèle Lamont and Grégoire Mallard. 2004. "What Is Originality in the Humanities and the Social Sciences?" *American Sociological Review* 69(2): 190-212.

Davis, Murray S. 1971. "That's Interesting: Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and Sociology of Phenomenology." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 1(4).

B. The General Structure of Empirical Research Articles

Schimel (2012) Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4 (pp. 1 – 34)

Class 2

What Gets Published in the Top Journals? Topics and Structures of Articles in the Top Journals

Class 3

A. Writing Strategies and Writing Habits

Smith, Chris. 2018. "Six academic writing habits that will boost productivity." LSE Impact Blog
<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2018/03/09/six-academic-writing-habits-that-will-boost-productivity/>

Peterson, Todd C., Sofie R. Kleppner, and Crystal M. Botham. 2018. "Ten simple rules for scientists: Improving your writing productivity" Plos
<https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006379>

B. How to Provide Constructive Criticism

Online book: *Give your students better writing feedback. A practical guide for instructors.*
<http://www.betterwritingfeedback.com/>

Class 4

Summary 1 (ca. min 200 words) to Schimel (2012) Chapter 5

How to Write the Introduction

Schimel (2012) Chapter 5

Class 5

Writing assignment 1 (ca. 300 – 500 words): Introduction

Peer review 1 (in-text comments)

How to Write the Theory and Hypotheses

Schimel (2012) Chapters 6 and 7 (pp. 50 – 66)

Class 6

Summary 2 (ca. min 200 words) to Schimel (2012) Chapters 10 & 11

How to Write the Data, Methods, and Results of Quantitative Empirical Research

Zigerell, L. J. 2013. "Rookie Mistakes: Preemptive Comments on Graduate Student Empirical Research Manuscripts." *PS: Political Science and Politics* January: 142 – 146.

Schimel (2012) Chapter 8 (pp. 67 – 82)

Class 7

Summary 3 (ca. min 200 words) to Schimel (2012) Chapter 17

How to Prepare Tables and Figures: Tips for Data Visualizations in Articles and Academic Posters

Healy, K., & Moody, J. (2014). Data Visualization in Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40(1), 105–128. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145551>

Lebrun, J.-L. (2011). *Scientific writing 2.0: a reader and writer's guide*. New Jersey: World Scientific: Chapter 15, pp. 209-234

Optional: Grant, R. (2019). *Data visualization: charts, maps, and interactive graphics*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press: pp. 21-38

Class 8

Writing assignment 2 (ca. 300 – 500 words): Theory and Research Questions/Hypotheses
Peer review 2 (in-text comments)

How to Write the Conclusion

Schimel (2012) Chapters 9 and 10 (pp. 83 – 103)

Class 9

How to Write the Title and Abstract

Schimel (2012) Chapters 13 and 14 (pp. 124 – 144)

Class 10 (three hour class)

Writing assignment 3 (ca. 300 – 500 words): Data and Methods
Peer review 3 (in-text comments)

A. How to Write the Setting and Appendices

Schimel (2012) Chapters 15 and 16 (pp. 145 – 173)

B. How to Write Acknowledgments, Citations, and References

Schimel (2012) Chapters 17 and 18 (pp. 174 – 188)

Class 11 (three hour class)

Writing assignment 4 (ca. 300 – 500 words): Conclusions
Peer review 4 (in-text comments)

A. How to Write the Review of an Article

Polsky, Andrew J. 2007. "Seeing Your Name in Print: Unpacking the Mysteries of the Review Process at Political Science Scholarly Journals." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40 (3): 539-43.

Miller et al. 2013. "How to Be a Peer Reviewer: A Guide for Recent and Soon-to-Be PhDs." *PS: Political Science and Politics* January: 120 – 123.

B. Framing Research Questions for Specific Audiences

Rich, Timothy S. 2013. "Publishing as a Graduate Student: A Quick and (Hopefully) Painless Guide to Establishing Yourself as a Scholar." *PS: Political Science and Politics* April: 376 – 379

Thunder, David. 2004. "Back to Basics: Twelve Rules for Writing a Publishable Article." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37(3): 493-5

van Cott, Donna Lee. 2005. "A Graduate Student's Guide to Publishing Scholarly Journal Articles." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38(4): 741-743.

Zigerell, L. J. 2013. "Rookie Mistakes: Preemptive Comments on Graduate Student Empirical Research Manuscripts." *PS: Political Science and Politics* January: 142 – 146.

Class 12

Grant Finding and Grant Writing

Przeworski, Adam and Frank Salomon. 1995. *On the Art of Writing Proposals: Some Candid Suggestions for Applicants to Social Science Research Council Competitions*. SSRC.

Henson, Kenneth T. 2003. "Debunking Some Myths about Grant Writing." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 26.

Moffat, Anne Simon. 1994. "Grantsmanship: what makes proposals work?" *Science* 265 (September 23)

Class 13

How to Write Effective Academic Presentations

Gemayel, R., & Martin, S. J. (2019). How to prepare and deliver a great talk. *The FEBS Journal*, 286(1), 39–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.14726>

Bennett, G., & Jessani, N. (Eds.). (2011). *The knowledge translation toolkit: bridging the know-do gap: a resource for researchers*. New Delhi, India; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Ottawa, ON: Sage Publications; International Development Research Centre: pp. 205-214

Dahlin, M. (2006) Giving a Conference Talk.

<https://www.cs.utexas.edu/~dahlin/professional/goodTalk.pdf>

Class 14

How to Promote your Results through Writing: Academic Social Networks, Blogs, and Newsletters

Kulczycki, E. (2013). Transformation of Science Communication in the Age of Social Media, *Teorie vědy / Theory of Science*, Vol 35, No 1 (2013), pp. 3-28.