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Overview
A critical overview of the credibility of accepted empirical evidence in sociology, and requirements for more credible evidence. Topics include a series of research case histories, including race and gender inequality, the gender pay gap, the consequences of both marriage and divorce, the prevalence and patterns of emotional well-being, the specification of intersectionality in research, misinterpretation of older evidence, the resolution of conflicting evidence, and the historical decline in the role of evidence in shaping beliefs.

Enrolment Restrictions
This course is offered for Sociology majors and specialists only.

Description
In this course we consider the state of evidence in sociology, in academia, and in public discourse. The premise motivating this course is that the notion of evidence as guidance is in question, and that the competition for apparent truths makes choice of information especially difficult in the 21st century.

As opposed to courses that emphasize theory, this course focuses on evidence and what we accept as credible evidence. In the early stages, we will consider the tensions between experience, and beliefs, on the one hand, and research evidence on the other. A central question is why we accept certain findings and reject others. We will consider a number of case histories, as a way to raise fundamental questions about acceptable evidence – or even what constitutes evidence. Most of our examples involve conflicting findings, and why those conflicts exist. It is
not enough in this course just to enumerate conflicting results and conclude findings are inconsistent: according to the perspective I take in this course, some findings are more credible than others, and should be weighted accordingly.

Case histories include research on the effects of maternal employment on children, the gender wage gap, earlier work on race and sex stratification, contrasting views of the prevalence of suffering, including mental disorder, domestic violence, and sexual assault, the gender-specific effects of marriage, the decline in education among males, the effects of divorce on children, and the effect of working on women’s mental health. We also consider the misinterpretation of theory in research articles, using intersectionality as an example, the logic of comparison groups and generalizability, and historical forces that may contribute to the “decline of evidence”.

There are a number of reasons for taking this course, but one should be pointed out at the outset: much of what we consider here may surprise you, or even contradict what you may feel are accepted truths at this point. If you leave the class less certain of these truths, then I will judge this class to be a success.

**Classes**

Each class is scheduled to be three hours. In many classes, not all, we will use the final hour for specific purposes: group discussion of the points made in that class and the readings for that week, individual presentations on selected readings by students (see below), critical presentations on evidence you select from online discourse and you believe needs to be questioned, or background material necessary to understand the readings involved.

My role in this class is to encourage you to go deeper in your understanding of the nuances and essential details of research, as opposed to broad (and often misleading) strokes. I encourage open discussion in the classroom on all issues: nothing should be out of bounds in terms of your comments, questions, or criticisms. In response, I hope I can be helpful, but I will also be specific about the problems facing modern research in social science.

**Required Work**

**Term Work**

There are no tests in this class. You *will* have a choice in terms of required work during the semester.

To complete the class, you must submit two short comment papers online, and one other piece of work that may vary, given the following choices: 1) a live presentation in class of your critique of the evidence at issue in specific readings assigned in prior weeks; or 2) a 3rd commentary paper *or presentation* on evidence derived from an online source that you feel should be questioned.

Each paper/presentation will focus on one reading, or one study discussed online. You will comment on the merits and problems of the evidence in that reading or online, in order to argue for an overall conclusion: this research was an important contribution, or has fatal flaws. Part of
what you can consider in each case is the outline of a research proposal for improving the state of the evidence on that question.

For each paper or public source you consider in your required work, you should post two discussion questions for the class that represent the two main issues you raise in your paper or presentation.

Each paper should be 800-1000 words single-spaced: this is about 2 to 2.5 single spaced pages. There is no specific format, other than single-spacing and the number of words. If you choose a presentation, you must accompany this with a Power Point which outlines clearly your arguments in some detail, in lieu of a paper.

You can only submit at most one piece of work in any week of the class.

Papers should be analytical, not descriptive. The word “analytical” is broader then “critical”: it refers to analyzing both the weaknesses and the strengths of the reading. You will be focusing on the research aspects of this reading, not the theory per se. Of course, how a theory is translated by the research is also essential, and a common focus of discussion. You can use the paper to argue with my presentation in class as well. In general, that means you will schedule submitting papers either the week or two weeks after that reading is considered.

In addition to the submitted papers, you will also post on the discussion board two questions raised by your paper that you want discuss in class. You will be asked in class the reasoning behind your questions to clarify.

**Distribution of Grades for Required Work:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Two posted comment papers</td>
<td>By beginning of class up to the second week following chosen readings.</td>
<td>25% each for three papers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An in-class presentation on a reading or a 3rd paper that critiques evidence presented online that you choose.</td>
<td>If presentation: the next week’s class. If 3rd paper, either Nov. 24th or December 1st.</td>
<td>25% for presentation or 3rd paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Submitted Questions for Discussion</td>
<td>Same day as submitted papers</td>
<td>15% in total across all questions submitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Class Attendance: minimum of 9 of 11 classes.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note:* You will sign up online for dates to submit papers or present in class.
**Quercus**

Quercus will be used in this course primarily for three purposes: 1) I will post required readings there; 2) You will post comments about readings on the discussion board; 3) I will post most lecture PowerPoint materials there.

**Reading**

Readings are listed by topic in the reading list. All readings will either be posted on Quercus or on reserve at the library.

Class slides will also be posted online. They are quite detailed, but not detailed enough to understand without attending class.

**Class Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Section / Topic</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 15</td>
<td>1. Evidence vs. Experience</td>
<td>Merton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wheaton and Louie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 22</td>
<td>2. Gender Wage Gap</td>
<td>Gould</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blau and Kahn 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 29</td>
<td>3. Early Research on Gender and Race Inequality</td>
<td>Massey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hughey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>4. Why Methods Make a Difference</td>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 13</td>
<td>5. Estimating the Prevalence of Suffering</td>
<td>Wheaton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20 1</td>
<td>6. Uncomfortable Findings</td>
<td>Buchmann and DiPrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hopcroft and McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>7. Intersectionality</td>
<td>Erving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bauer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 3</td>
<td>8. Logic of Comparison</td>
<td>Louie and Upenieks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson and Krueger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North and Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10</td>
<td>Reading Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>9. Resolving Conflicting Evidence</td>
<td>Wallerstein and Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peterson and Zill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forehand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 24</td>
<td>10. Causality</td>
<td>Wheaton and Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>11 The Decline of Evidence</td>
<td>Faludi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Repetti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Menaghan and Parcel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Accommodations

Please see me if you have a disability or other need that requires accommodation or classroom modification. I will be glad to help you in whatever way I can.

Missed Deadlines

Medical Issues: (NOTE: Because of Covid-19, students do NOT need to submit the usual documentation, i.e., medical notes or the Verification of Illness forms).

Students who are late in submitting an assignment for medical reasons, need to email the instructor (not the TA), and also declare their absence on the system (ACORN) on the day of the test or assignment due date.

Students who are late in submitting an assignment for other reasons, such as family or other personal reasons, should request their College Registrar to email the instructor.

The submitted papers in this course are subject to late penalties. If you submit a paper within three days of the deadline, your grade will be reduced by 10%. If you submit this paper between 4 and 7 days after the deadline, the grade will be reduced by 15%. After one week, the paper the grade will be reduced by 25% but will be accepted up to two weeks after the deadline. After that point, papers will not be accepted and your grade on that portion of the course will be zero.

Academic Integrity

Students are expected to know and adhere to the University’s principles of academic integrity. Any act of plagiarism or other unethical behavior will be addressed in accordance with University guidelines. Students should be aware that turning in an old paper, or large parts thereof, for credit in a second course, is considered an academic offense. Please see the "Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters" (http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/policies/behaveac.htm) for specific information on academic integrity at the U of T.

Appointments

I encourage you to email or phone me using the number on the first page and arrange an appointment at any time. I am in my office on most days. We can arrange specific office or Zoom appointments, depending on your preference.

I will designate special office hours in the weeks before assignments are due – to be announced later.

Re-marking

If you have questions about your grade on any paper, or the presentation, you should contact the T.A. or me within two weeks of your receipt of the assignment. Note that your grade after re-marking can remain the same, or increase, or decrease.
TOPICS/READING LIST BY WEEK

NB: Please note the following. These readings are NOT all assigned. Core readings that are assigned are shown in blue; other readings are available for students to use in their commentary papers. I will also make reference to some of these additional readings in my lectures.

1. THE TENSION BETWEEN EXPERIENCE AND EVIDENCE.


2. HISTORY OF THE GENDER WAGE GAP.

Gould, Elise, Jessica Schieder, and Kathleen Geier. "What is the gender pay gap and is it real?: The complete guide to how women are paid less than men and why it can’t be explained away." (2016). Economic Policy Institute, Washington DC.


3. “EARLY” RESEARCH ON RACE AND GENDER INEQUALITY


4. WHY METHODS MAKE A DIFFERENCE


5. ESTIMATING THE PREVALENCE OF SUFFERING.


6. UNCOMFORTABLE FINDINGS


7. THE SPECIFICATION OF INTERSECTIONALITY


8. THE LOGIC OF COMPARISON


9. RESOLVING CONFLICTING EVIDENCE


Wallerstein and Kelly: Judith Wallerstein and divorce: how one woman changed the way we think about breakups. (slate.com)


10. THE ROLE OF CAUSALITY


**11. THE DECLINE OF EVIDENCE**

*No readings. Lecture only.*