BOOK REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS DE LIVRES


Reviewed by Tanner LeBaron Wallace and Marvin C. Alkin

The title of this combination textbook/workbook includes the verb “leading,” and this is very appropriate considering Earl and Katz’s motivation to create a pedagogical tool for teaching school leaders how to use “data as a positive force in planning and implementing improvement initiatives” (p. xvii). The authors have assigned themselves no small task, as anyone even remotely connected to schools knows that the job description of a principal continues to absorb an ever-growing list of responsibilities, some of which are tangentially related to school improvement and student learning. Without explicitly stating it, the material covered seems to be most relevant to K–12 school settings.

In the absence of data from school leaders who have used this book, it is impossible to say empirically whether or not Earl and Katz have accomplished their goal. But evaluating this work as educators responsible for teaching evaluation procedures to graduate students, we can say that this book is an excellent contribution to the development of thoughtful and well-trained school leaders, a textbook that we would encourage any educator to use as a primary text for an evaluation or research course within a school leadership curriculum.

Earl and Katz are quick to identify themselves as balanced researchers aware of the limited but essential role that data can play in an organization. They work hard to describe the use of data in casual, non-threatening terms such as “getting to know” (p. xiii) data and using data as a “way of deciding what to do next” (p. xiii). The tone and language used around data works to disarm even the most wary school leader. The book is designed for small group work in instructional settings. A case example of a fictional middle school is woven throughout the text to provide concrete examples of the processes discussed.
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Short assignments are scattered throughout the text to facilitate the transfer of ideas contained in the text to individual leaders’ particular school settings. To assist in the completion of assignments, 14 reproducible “Task Sheets” are included in the appendix. The book comprises seven chapters. The first chapter sets the stage by providing justification for why data are important to schools, reframing and defining accountability, and outlining the historical context of decision-making in education. The following five chapters follow a focusing-down sequence, so that the level of detail increases as the chapters progress. The core components for using data or “informed professionalism” (p. 17), developing an inquiry habit of mind, becoming data literate, and creating a culture of inquiry are presented in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 presents additional layers of detail by integrating action steps and guiding questions for each component. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 are each dedicated exclusively to one particular component. The book concludes with a chapter about how to sustain a process of ongoing inquiry.

One feature that distinguishes Earl and Katz’s textbook from other textbooks also focused on training school leaders to use data is the authors’ consistent commitment to presenting information in nuanced and rich forms. Their writing embodies the same principles of thoughtfulness, reflection, and being evidence-based that they wish to engender in the readers of their text. The authors accomplish this in several key ways.

First, the authors pepper their introductory text with supporting evidence and use citations to support their claims. This is a refreshing change from other textbooks that advocate using data to support decisions, but then fill pages with unsubstantiated opinions about the benefits of using data. Earl and Katz avoid falling into that double standard by treating the reader as an intelligent, skeptical consumer deserving of evidence to support the claims they are making. Second, instead of rushing to the how-to of using data with only obligatory introductory remarks, the authors take time to develop a thoughtful context within which the school leader can reflect and prepare for the learning to come. The authors offer a clear and direct appraisal of why educators might be skeptical about data as well as discuss the various definitions of accountability. Lastly, Earl and Katz choose to focus on a definition of accountability that relates to adaptation, responsiveness, and improvement. Defining accountability as such makes it “emotional, personal, and political” (p. 13). It is during this section of the textbook that Earl’s roots in participatory evaluation
are most evident. The result is a holistic introduction to school-level data use.

A major strength of this textbook as a pedagogical tool is both its use of a fictional case example of a public middle school and its use of the extended metaphor of painting to describe using data in schools. The case example provides a concrete example of a school site working through an inquiry process. For a reader, it is like being part of a great data discussion. The painting metaphor structures the specific action steps necessary to achieve the informed professionalism capacities as well as the guiding questions used to explicate what happens during each action step. For example, when working to become “data literate,” a school leader must learn how to “block the canvas” (p. 54). A guiding question that is part of blocking the canvas is “What is the focus of my picture?” (p. 54). The painting-a-picture metaphor works on many levels—its high impact reinforces the authors' premise that using data should be an interpretative and meaning-making endeavour, and it translates easily into the action steps and guiding questions they develop to explicate the components of informed professionalism.

Earl and Katz are extremely thoughtful in how they frame, structure, and ground the components of informed professionalism. However, the roadmap they provide the reader to navigate the textbook is somewhat lacking. Reading the text mirrors the experience of being a student who diligently follows a syllabus but must wait until the middle of the semester to discover why the course is organized in the way it is and must retrospectively construct the connections between topics. This makes it somewhat difficult for a reader to distill the central principles from the book and is particularly problematic when trying to use the text for teaching purposes. This could be easily remedied within the text with some minor editing or within the classroom by an introductory framing lecture.

One unresolved issue, which I am sure any school leader would immediately recognize, is how the inquiry process detailed by Earl and Katz relies upon the technical expertise of a “critical friend” (p. 54): someone who knows how to work with data. This issue is not unique to the collaborative evaluation process presented by Earl and Katz in this textbook, but has been the source of much debate in the evaluation literature. Do school leaders, or any stakeholders for that matter, possess the research expertise to independently judge data quality and perform data analyses after only cursory training on the topics?
Earl and Katz sidestep this issue by conveniently incorporating Thomas, a former superintendent with a university faculty connection, into their case example. In the real world, however, the presence of a Thomas is far less likely.

Despite these limitations, Earl and Katz have done a thorough job detailing the “developmental processes” (p. 101) that comprise using data for improvement purposes. In great detail, they describe an entire inquiry loop whereby the primary focus, hypotheses, questions, and interpretations are linked into one cycle of inquiry. In doing so, the authors present a complex but accessible way to create systems for using data at a school site that rely on multiple perspectives to provide clarity and coherence to improvement initiatives.

The essential contribution this book offers a school leadership curriculum is the conceptual framework for understanding school-level accountability as connected to improvement and meaning-making activities and the role that data play in providing evidence for an accountability system. Furthermore, Earl and Katz provide opportunities to develop the competence of school leaders so that they can take an active role in leading participatory inquiry processes. In doing so, the authors fill a major gap in the current training of school leaders.

Compte rendu par Pierre-Marc Daigneault

Bien que l'évaluation de programme soit une discipline relativement jeune, elle a néanmoins su développer au cours de sa brève existence « son propre langage constitué d’un riche vocabulaire […] qui alimente les théories, les concepts et les aspects techniques de la discipline » (Dubois & Marceau, 2005, p. 5–7). L’apport de domaines d’étude externes à l’évaluation (éducation, psychologie, analyse des politiques, etc.) contribue par ailleurs à complexifier un univers théorique et méthodologique déjà touffu. Si cette richesse terminologique témoigne de la santé de la discipline évaluative, tant le théoricien que le praticien peuvent parfois se sentir dépassés face à une telle situation. L’Encyclopedia of Evaluation, un ouvrage collectif dirigé par Sandra Mathison (University of British Columbia), arrive heureusement à point nommé dans une discipline où il existe peu d’ouvrages de référence couvrant l’ensemble du champ d’étude.


Les prétentions de l’encyclopédie apparaissent à première vue très ambitieuses : la préface signale d’entrée de jeu que l’ouvrage se veut le « qui, quoi, où, comment et pourquoi de l’évaluation » (ma traduction : p. xxxiii). L’ouvrage vise ainsi à capturer l’histoire et le développement de l’évaluation sous l’angle de la pratique, de la profession et de la discipline. Mathison cherche par ailleurs à transmettre une vision

Est-ce que l’encyclopédie respecte ses engagements en matière de qualité? La renommée du comité éditorial et des auteurs n’est pas une garantie de qualité. À cet égard, Michael Scriven (2005) rappelle de manière fort à propos dans l’un des articles de l’encyclopédie qu’une évaluation sérieuse devrait d’abord être fondée sur des critères de qualité plutôt que sur des indicateurs indirects de celle-ci tels que le prestige des auteurs (Checklists, pp. 56–57). Par conséquent et conformément aux bonnes pratiques de la profession qui exigent que les critères d’évaluation soient explicites (voir notamment le critère U4 des Personnel Evaluation Standards, Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1988), la qualité de l’encyclopédie sera successivement appréciée à l’aune des critères suivants : (a) exhaustivité, (b) validité, (c) convivialité, et (d) prix abordable. Je dois admettre que je n’ai pas lu tous les articles de l’encyclopédie. La présente évaluation se fonde donc sur un échantillon non représentatif d’environ 10 à 15 % des articles (représentant un peu plus de 20 % du contenu de l’ouvrage en nombre de pages) consultés dans le cadre de mes recherches sur la qualité des évaluations, l’implication des parties prenantes en évaluation, et l’utilisation des évaluations.


Un article d’encyclopédie valide contient une information exacte, fiable, complète, à jour, et qui va au-delà de la définition des termes. Une discussion des enjeux et implications d’un concept pour l’évaluation est attendue dans le cas des termes dont l’importance répond au critère de validité de manière plus que satisfaisante. À titre d’exemple, l’article de Jean A. King (2005) sur l’évaluation participative est irréprochable : l’auteure définit le concept et ses différentes dimensions à l’aide du cadre conceptuel de Weaver et Cousins (2001), la situe par rapport aux autres types de recherche participatives, débouleonne quelques mythes à son sujet, et en discute brièvement les avantages et les inconvénients. Comme dans tout ouvrage collectif, cependant, la qualité des articles est inégale. L’article sur la qualité de Bob Williams (2005) est un exemple plutôt décevant. La qualité y est étroitement conçue en termes organisationnels et aucune référence n’est faite à la qualité des évaluations ou des programmes, ce qui, à mon sens, frôle le hors-sujet. On aurait légitimement pu s’attendre à ce que soit discutées les différentes conceptions de la qualité (positiviste et constructiviste), les outils permettant d’assurer la qualité (standards, certification des évaluateurs, métaévaluation, etc.), voire les implications de la qualité pour la crédibilité de la profession et l’utilisation des évaluations. Fort heureusement, ce dernier article est l’exception et non la règle. La quasi-totalité des articles consultés sont d’un niveau de qualité comparable à la contribution exceptionnelle de King ou, du moins, s’en approchent.

Par convivialité, j’entends la facilité d’utilisation de l’ouvrage. Ce dernier obtient d’ailleurs une note quasi parfaite sur ce critère à cause du double classement, alphabétique et thématique, des articles. Bien qu’il ait été possible et souhaitable de réduire le nombre de catégories
de l’index thématique, celui-ci améliore grandement la convivialité de l’ouvrage.

Quant au prix de l’ouvrage, il est de près de 200 $ CAN au moment d’écrire ce compte-rendu. Ce montant est justifié compte tenu de la nature encyclopédique de l’ouvrage, mais il n’est toutefois pas à la portée de toutes les bourses (je pense ici en particulier aux étudiants). Plusieurs devront se rabattre sur la consultation en bibliothèque ou l’emprunt du livre à un collègue.
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**Reviewed by Kenneth Watson**

By chance I recently found myself reading two books of interest to evaluators, both on data, probability theory, and learning from experience. The first is Nassim Nicholas Taleb’s *Fooled by Randomness: The Hidden Role of Chance in Life and the Markets*. Taleb has had a long career as a trader on Wall Street and is an amateur theoretician on probability. He is fascinated by the role of chance in the markets and in life, especially in the rare but important event. His book is a meditation on the difficulty of learning from the past, and from one’s own and others’ experiences, because people seem “hard-wired” to see certainty and causality where none exists. Taleb writes in a jaunty, engaging style about the habit of mistaking luck for skill that reflects his other love—poetry and novels—or, as he says, the aesthetic approach to experience. A few of his chapter headings will convey the flavour of the book: “Bacchus Abandons Antony,” “A Mathematical Meditation on History,” and “Skills in Predicting Past History.” His section titles are even more playful—for example, “the father of all pseudothinkers” (Hegel, by the way), “gerontocracy,” and “temporary sanity.” Amusing, and thought-provoking as well.

The second book, Giuseppe Iarossi’s *The Power of Survey Design: A User’s Guide for Managing Surveys, Interpreting Results and Influencing Respondents*, also considers whether we learn from experience, but it takes a different tack. It is a sober discussion of just how difficult it is to obtain good data and how difficult it is to interpret the data that are available, but it is more optimistic than Taleb’s book about whether evaluation skill can save us from error.

The difference in style and temperament between the two authors is shown in the contrast between their chapter structures (and titles).
Instead of Taleb’s efflorescence of flowery and imaginative section titles (14 chapters and about 130 section titles in 250 pages, by quick count), Iarossi has six chapters, each with a laconic practical title: “Taking a closer look at survey implementation,” “Survey management,” “How easy it is to ask the wrong question,” “A practical approach to sampling,” “Respondent psychology and survey participation,” and “Why data management is important.”

Iarossi draws upon his experience in the Investment Climate Surveys unit of the World Bank. He begins with two cautionary examples—first, showing how similar but differently worded questions can elicit different and sometimes contradictory responses; and second, how radically different responses can arise when a questionnaire is administered face to face or on the telephone. He says,

> To the extent that the question asked is considered sensitive by the respondents, the mode of interview can influence answers. In particular, the non-response rate in the face-to-face interviews would be higher than in the phone survey. If we look at the BBC poll that is exactly what happened. In the face-to-face survey the non-response rate is double (20%) that of the phone survey. (p. 6)

Since the opinions of the non-responders are likely to be different from those of the responders, the results of the survey may depend on the mode of data collection. He shows that this is particularly the case when the interviewers are government officials.

However, this is not Taleb’s root-and-branch skepticism. Iarossi thinks there are right ways and wrong ways to collect and interpret data. In fact, having illustrated, briefly, how deceptive data can be, he moves briskly into a very practical discussion of professional survey research techniques. He is optimistic that careful planning and execution can get it right. The fact that his second chapter is entitled “Survey management” shows his practical bent. He packs a career of experience into the book. It is written clearly, and the neophyte and the manager who want to be informed users of evaluation research will find it a worthwhile read. Experienced evaluators will find a lot of it familiar, but there is nothing wrong with reading an overview like this once in a while to consolidate one’s own tacit knowledge.

Taleb, by contrast, is more introspective. He is interested in the psychology of the evaluator. He thinks that we can know how to
gather information well, in Iarossi’s sense, and still be fooled by our emotions. He says,

The problem is that while such reasoning is central to my thinking, my brain knows it but not my heart. (p. 224)

It is harder to act as if one were ignorant (that is, an evaluator who doesn’t know why something has happened) than as if one were smart; scientists (evaluators) know that it is emotionally harder to reject a hypothesis than to accept it (type I compared with type II errors)—we have such sayings as *felix qui potuit cognoscere causas* (happy is he who understands what is behind things). (p. 231)

Consequently Part III of Taleb’s book is an extended exploration of ways in which one can foresee emotional biases and do something to avoid them—mostly by setting up ways to discipline our thinking and acting automatically, in the mode of Odysseus and the sirens. There is also an appendix titled “A trip to the library: notes and reading recommendations,” which is a bibliography and endnotes, with, of course, a lot of interesting cross-disciplinary leaps of relevance.

In sum, Iarossi is very practical and experienced, probably the better guy to have on the evaluation team if you have to meet a deadline, but Taleb’s book is the better read on the beach. Taleb would be an annoying evaluator because he would spend a lot of time on (interesting) digressions—but he makes you think harder.

**Reviewed by: Marzieh H. Tafaghodtari**

In *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*, Creswell and Clark underscore that their purpose is to “offer graduate students and researchers ... practical advice for conceptualizing, proposing, designing, conducting and publishing their mixed methods studies” (p. xv). As a graduate student in the field of education, I find that the authors’ goal of practicality has been achieved through a clear presentation of the “how-to’s” of mixed methods inquiry—especially how to locate and review mixed methods studies, choose a mixed methods design, and introduce and write about a mixed methods investigation. Their guidance in these areas, accompanied by practical checklists and scripts as well as analogies between mixed methods and both qualitative and quantitative approaches, are extremely useful in helping both graduate students and beginning researchers/evaluators in planning out and implementing a rigorous mixed methods design. The writing of the text is instructive and clear, making it a very helpful textbook for methodology professors as well. A brief list of suggested activities at the end of each chapter, with the aim of guiding the reader through specific steps in developing and writing a proposal for a mixed methods study, makes it possible for the text to be adopted for a graduate-level course.

At first glance, it might appear that the ideal audience for the book should be academics; however, a further examination of the text, which is richly interwoven with useful examples from social, behavioural, and health sciences (including evaluation), makes it clear that practitioners can also benefit from the abundance of refreshing ideas included in this book. Since Creswell and Clark define their target audience as “researchers from diverse disciplines” (p. xvi), they make an explicit attempt to keep multidisciplinarity as a key feature of their text. In addition, since the content of the book (including the conceptualizations and examples) seems to be significantly informed by evaluative inquiry, the book can be particularly appealing to those evaluators interested in alternative methodologies. Frequent references to influential scholars in the field of evaluation (e.g., Greene...
Creswell and Clark’s 275 pages of text are divided into 10 chapters based on a sequential structure: understanding mixed methods research (Chapter 1), examining preliminary considerations (Chapter 2), locating and reviewing mixed methods studies (Chapter 3), choosing a mixed methods design (chapter 4), introducing a mixed methods study (Chapter 5), collecting data in mixed methods research (Chapter 6), analyzing data in mixed methods research (Chapter 7), writing and evaluating mixed methods research (Chapter 8), questions often raised about mixed methods research (Chapter 9), and future directions for mixed methods research (Chapter 10). The book concludes with useful examples from four different mixed methods design types (triangulation, embedded, explanatory, and exploratory).

The first two chapters are not only important in providing a primary overview for the framework used in the book, but they are essential for a useful understanding of the writers’ definition of mixed methods research, as well as the current ontological, epistemological, axiological, methodological, and rhetorical issues associated with mixed methodology. Creswell and Clark rightfully suggest that these topics are particularly relevant in that “some reviewers and graduate committee members may require researchers to be specific about the worldview that provides the foundations of their studies” (p. 20). However, they don’t fully engage these issues throughout the book. In fact, they fail to make a meaningful connection between any aspect of mixed methods practice (e.g., mixed methods designs, data collection and analysis) and the foundational questions raised in Chapter 2. The absence of the epistemological discussions in the other sections of the book, therefore, leaves the reader puzzled as to whether or not the brief recognition of the importance of philosophical assumptions in mixed methodology is anything more than merely paying lip service to the issue. In addition, the authors’ failure to consider the role of the political discourse in mixed methods inquiry decisions might disappoint those researchers/evaluators who assert that good mixed methods practice cannot be divorced from the broader socio-political issues (e.g., Greene, 2002).

In Chapter 3, Creswell and Clark walk the researchers new to mixed methodology through a systematic process of locating and reviewing mixed methods research investigations; an interesting feature of this chapter is the introduction of a notation system as well as the 10
practical guidelines for drawing visual diagrams that depict methods, procedures, and products of mixed methods studies.

In the next chapter, the writers introduce major classifications of mixed methods designs found in the literature. Based on the similarities, then, the writers advance a new “functional classification” (p. 59), encompassing the four major mixed methods designs. In Chapter 5, Creswell and Clark present practical guidelines for writing about mixed methods: writing a title, developing a statement of the problem, composing a purpose statement, and detailing research questions. The writers’ attempt to provide specific scripts for writing purpose statements is a significant feature of this chapter; however, readers should be warned against a tendency to simply copy and paste these scripts.

The discussions in the following two chapters are extremely useful for an introduction to data collection and data analysis in mixed methods research; however, the classifications provided for data collection and analysis seem to be somewhat limited in capturing the complexities involved in mixed methods practice. Moreover, while very practical, the tables and figures in Chapters 6 and 7 might mask the availability of the full array of options outside the presented boxes.

Chapter 8 does a great job in introducing the reader to the ways in which the account of a mixed methods study should be written and structured for presentation. The authors rightfully mention that mixed methods research is so new that researchers have yet “to reach consensus on the criteria that might be used to evaluate or assess the quality of such a study” (p. 163).

Chapters 9 and 10 adequately reflect current concerns and uncertainties with regards to the legitimacy of mixed methods as an alternative inquiry approach. The authors touch upon many important questions such as “Has this form of research found acceptance? Is it rigorous?” (p. 167); however, they disregard other equally important questions such as “Given the amount of effort and resources required, is it possible for one researcher/evaluator to conduct a mixed methods investigation?”

In general, while I recommend Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research as an important methodology book, I believe that the authors could have presented a more compelling text if they had made an explicit effort to link the technical aspect of mixed methods practice with philosophical and political discourses. Furthermore, I
agree with the authors’ own speculation that the organization of the content of the book, as helpful as it is, might “simplify the reality of a complex nonlinear process” (p. xvi) involved in many mixed methods investigations.
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**Reviewed by Chris L.S. Coryn**

Dictionaries can prove extremely challenging to review in any systematic, objective way, and *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods* is no exception. Typically, the criteria applied to judge the quality and value of such texts include comprehensiveness and accuracy. Do the entries adequately cover the domain of social science research method terminology and concepts? Or are there major omissions? Are the entries correct? Or are there major errors? Therefore, these two criteria indirectly address the extent to which the book accomplishes its intended purpose.

The dictionary, edited and compiled by Victor Jupp, contains more than 230 entries, and the list of those who contributed entries is impressive. The majority of these contributors are from the United Kingdom. Unlike the typical dictionary or glossary, however, which merely provide definitions of terms and concepts, each entry in *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods* is structured around five interrelated components. First, each concept is defined. Second, the concept’s distinctive features are presented, including, for example, historical background, disciplinary background, key writers, and applications. Third, each concept is subjected to an evaluation, in which key issues and problems associated with the concept are considered. Fourth, each entry is cross-referenced to associated concepts appearing in the dictionary. Last, a list of key readings is given for each entry. Although I found the inclusion of these five components a valuable feature of the dictionary, it often made locating specific entries difficult.

Compared to similar texts (e.g., Vogt’s *Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology*, 2005), as well as on its own merits, I found *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods* extremely lacking. On the first criterion (comprehensiveness) alone, the text has serious deficiencies. Where is the entry for item response theory? Where is the entry for structural equation modeling? Where is the entry for confidence inter-
val? Where is the entry for effect size? These are all important social research methods concepts, and widely used at that. If the book is, in fact, a dictionary of social research methods, then it is extremely inadequate in terms of its breadth of methodological coverage.

In terms of the second criterion (accuracy), the text does not do much better. Given that this review appears in an evaluation journal, one example in particular demonstrates how I arrived at this conclusion: the entry for evaluation defines evaluation research as “the systematic identification and assessment of effects generated by treatments, programmes, policies, practices and products” (p. 104). Yet, the most widely accepted definition of evaluation and evaluation research is “the process of determining the merit, worth, or value [and/or significance] of something, or the product of that process” (Scriven, 1991, p. 139). And the identification and assessment of effects given in the former definition does not always hold. For instance, many products do not produce what could reasonably be delineated as effects, and product evaluators are not always interested in whether the products they evaluate produce effects. In fact, a book review is itself a form of product evaluation, and typically reviewers do not search for a book’s effects (unless one considers user satisfaction an effect). Instead, they tend to evaluate on dimensions such as readability, quality of design, coherence, consistency with current theory and practice, match of the text to its intended audience, and so forth. Relatedly, one can ask if an automobile produces an effect. Probably not in the true sense of the meaning of an effect (yes, automobiles do produce emissions, but for the sake of argument these are not the type of effects specified in the definition given in the entry), and evaluators of automobiles (especially consumers) are more often interested in matters such as fuel economy, costs, reliability, and safety than whether the car produces an effect, which aligns more closely to the latter definition. Even if one accepts the definition of evaluation research given in this dictionary, it is still incomplete, as one of the major concerns of evaluation is “Are the effects worth what it costs to produce them?” (i.e., the value of what is being evaluated). This definition also fails to account for the vast subfields of evaluation such as performance evaluation, portfolio evaluation, and personnel evaluation, among others. Are we then to assume that personnel evaluation, for example, is not in fact evaluation? A vast body of researchers and practitioners would argue strongly that it is. In fact, personnel evaluation has a longer history than either program or policy evaluation—dating at least to the civil servant examinations of the Chinese and Egyptian dynasties more than 4,000 years ago (Coryn, 2007).
Other less obvious errors include terms given as “related concepts” under an entry that are not even included in the dictionary. For example, the path analysis entry lists causal modeling as a related concept, but causal modeling is not even an entry in the text. While these minor editorial errors are not cause for great concern, they are, nonetheless, still worth noting.

Even though I found the presentation of historical and disciplinary backgrounds, key writers, applications, related concepts, and additional readings associated with the concepts worthwhile, all in all, I found it difficult to find much positive about this book. And I would not recommend it as a resource for students or scholars of the social sciences or for methodologists or consumers of methodology; there are just far too many competing books whose entries are, in my opinion, more complete in their coverage and more accurate in their representation of social research methods’ terms and concepts.
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