POL506: Qualitative Research Methods
Spring 2021
Prof. Layna Mosley

Course meetings: Wednesdays, 1:30-4:20pm
Course format: Synchronous Online

Contact Information:
Professor Layna Mosley
School of Public and International Affairs and
Department of Politics
layna.mosley@princeton.edu
Office: Robertson 448

Office Hours: by appointment, including on-line as well
as (weather dependent) in-person outdoor options.

Preceptor: Derek Wakefield
derekjw@princeton.edu

Overview. This course introduces graduate students to the principles and tools used to design and conduct empirical research in political science. We focus on the use of various qualitative methods and techniques, such as process tracing, case studies, interviews and archival analyses. We also address research design and the philosophy of social science more generally. Indeed, many of the principles related to case selection and data collection are common across empirically-oriented methods, whether they are qualitative, quantitative or formal.

The course seeks to balance a consideration of these broader issues and principles– such as the definition and formation of concepts, the generation of causal claims, the selection of cases and the ethical conduct of research – with the practical application of empirical tools. To this end, some readings and discussions will focus on general principles, while others will offer practical lessons and suggestions. The syllabus also includes examples of recently-published research using qualitative methods (solely or as part of a mixed methods design). Throughout the course of the semester, students will be asked to consider how to design their own, qualitatively-oriented research projects.

It is worth noting that "qualitative methods" encompasses a range of approaches and epistemological viewpoints. Scholars using qualitative techniques may find themselves using single-case counterfactual analyses and process tracing approaches; small-n comparisons; mixed method designs; ethnographic field visits; or machine-coded data from archival sources, to name a few. They will almost certainly need to address ethical (and IRB-related) concerns, as well as to consider how best to balance transparency with confidentiality. As such, while the course will seek to offer familiarity with best practices for designing and conducting state-of-the-art social science research, students using qualitative techniques also are encouraged to seek further theoretical training and practical guidance.

The syllabus includes optional/additional readings on specific topics and themes. Further sources of guidance and training include the Princeton Politics Department's Colloquium on Qualitative Methods; reading lists and courses offered at Syracuse University's Consortium on Qualitative Research Methods; and APSA's Organized Section on Qualitative and Multi-Method Research. Andrew Bennett has a

recent [compilation of resources](#) related to digital fieldwork. And Steven van Evera's *A Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997) has lots of useful advice.

More generally, I view our graduate students as future colleagues in our profession, and I want to offer you the chance to develop the practical (as well as theoretical) knowledge necessary for success. This course therefore provides an opportunity to develop and receive feedback on a research project related to qualitative methods. For more general advice on our profession, Raul Pacheco-Vega has written a [wide variety](#) of professional advice posts (and regularly [tweets](#) on these issues as well). *PS: Political Science and Politics* also regularly publishes articles focused on various aspects of the profession; a collection of some of these pieces is [here.](#) Brendan Nyhan has collected another set of such posts [here](#) (scroll down to "Resources for New/Aspiring Academics.")

About the Instructor: Layna Mosley is Professor in School of Public and International Affairs, as well as in the Department of Politics. Mosley's research addresses international and comparative political economy. Her first book, *Global Capital and National Governments* (2003), examines the politics of sovereign debt; her second book, *Labor Rights and Multinational Production* (2011) explores the consequences of economic globalization for workers' rights in developing countries. Mosley's current research concerns the politics of sovereign debt and borrowing; the effects of multinational production and global supply chains on worker rights; and the governance of international financial markets. Mosley was a first-generation college student at Rollins College; she earned her Ph.D. from Duke University. Mosley joined the faculty at Princeton University in 2020, after spending 16 years on the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and five years on the faculty at the University of Notre Dame.

Course Requirements, Expectations and Grading

Class Participation. Like any graduate seminar, our model of learning is a collaborative one. Informed, active participation in seminar in therefore a requirement of the course. This can be more challenging in the Zoom era, but we will make it work! All students are expected to engage in, and remain engaged in throughout the class meeting, our discussions. Active participation requires that you read carefully prior to seminar; take notes on your reading; and arrive prepared to discuss and participate. Our discussions will, depending on the reading materials as well as your own interests and written work, take a variety of formats over the course of the semester.

To reflect the importance of participation to the success of our seminar, **participation in class discussion** accounts for **25 percent** of the final course grade. As part of your participation in the course, please submit – via the "discussion" link in that week's Canvas module – one or more questions or issues you'd like to discuss in that week's class meeting. Your questions may be very specific or quite general; they will allow me to get a sense of where you have questions, and of what part of the readings interests you most. Post your questions no later than **11pm on Tuesdays.**

Please keep in mind that our classroom meeting environment – whether that environment is in-person or virtual – should be one that is professional and inclusive. This means that, while we may disagree on questions of research design and ethics, or have different interpretations of theories and causal claims, we treat each other respectfully. To the extent that we take issue with someone's argument, we focus our criticism on specific claims and logic, rather than on an individual. We also are mindful that good discussion involves both listening and speaking; we are careful not to interrupt or talk over one another, as well as to be sure that all have an opportunity to participate. In the realm of virtual meetings, all participants are expected to (a) mute their audio on arrival to the call, and to keep audio

off unless speaking (this cuts down on background noise); (b) keep video on throughout the call; (c) if using a virtual background, ensure that the background is professional in nature and not distracting to others (as most video backgrounds are, for instance).

Short response papers. Some of our readings for class offer examples of the use of qualitative methods, drawn from a variety of substantive issue areas. Each student will be asked to write **"method reviews"** for two such articles, drawn from the specified readings on the syllabus (eligible pieces are denoted with an **[M]**). Your method reviews are due, via Canvas, no later than **Tuesday at 5pm** on the day prior to the class meeting for which the article is assigned. The methods reviews should be relatively short (450 to 600 words); they should focus on summarizing and evaluating the methodological choices made by the author. They should contain the following elements:

- Briefly summarize the author(s)' main descriptive or causal claim. (What is their theoretical argument and/or their core hypothesis?)

- How do(es) the author(s) use empirical evidence to establish or evaluate their central claim? Does the research design involve mixed methods, or a single methodological approach? How are cases or observations selected?

- What is your analysis of the methods, techniques and data employed? Can you identify challenges associated with using such an approach? Can you suggest ways in which – keeping in mind the constraints of time, money and ethics – the approach might be extended or improved?

You'll be asked to sign up for these papers, focused on a specific article, by **February 8.** I'll circulate sign up information after our first class meeting. Each method review accounts for **5 percent of your final course grade.**

Research Project Summary and Research Design. The best way to learn how to craft a political science research project is to craft a political science research project. Students will draft a description of a research project, including a review of literature, a set of theoretical claims and testable hypotheses, and a methods plan. Depending on the student's interest and stage in the program, this research design could aim at an article-length project, a dissertation chapter, or an entire dissertation.

A one to two-page **summary of the research question** that will motivate this research design is due prior to the beginning of class on **Wednesday, February 24.** Your question should be framed in a way that is broad enough to be of interest not only to specialists in a sub-sub-field, but also narrow enough to be tractable in the space of a research paper, article or dissertation. Admittedly, it's difficult to necessarily know which questions need asking without knowing what's been done on a given topic, so while this is a short writing assignment, it will require some background reading and research. You also may find it useful to talk with faculty in your area of interest about what to read and/or how to approach a topic that interests you. The summary accounts for **5 percent** of your final course grade.

A completed **research design** is due by **5pm on May 5 (Dean's Date).** This document should be 20 to 25 double-spaced pages (5000-7000 words), and it should accomplish the following tasks:

- Specify a research question or problem. (This should be a revised version of, the project you propose for the February 24 assignment – recognizing that the process of doing and designing research often leads to changes in course.)

- Situates the question in a research program, via a focused review of existing, relevant scholarship. What have others already argued? What have they found? How can their theoretical approaches be improved upon or synthesized? Note that the literature is not simply an annotated bibliography, or a "he said, she said" that summarizes a bunch of things you've read. Rather, a good literature review identifies what the state of knowledge is, discusses where the shortcomings/openings are, and sets up your own theoretical thinking on the subject.

- Develops one or more descriptive and/or causal claims related to your research question. In doing so, specify the independent and dependent variables of the main hypothesis of interest and alternative hypotheses. Also note the scope – time, geography, political regime and so on – of your claims.

- Discusses measurement and method: what are the relevant concepts, and how do you propose to measure them? What population, case or set of cases would you use to analyze your expectations? Why these cases, versus others? And what sort of evidence will you collect? Be as specific as possible: if you're interviewing elites, which ones, and what will you ask them? If you're consulting an archive, what materials specifically? Note that you are not asked to carry out this research (so that frees you from some material constraints); but you are asked to have a specific plan for how you would do it. (And, indeed, if this is a project you indeed to pursue, it's a good idea to begin the process of seeking IRB approval as well).

You'll be asked to briefly present your project during our class meetings on **April 14 and April 21.** The completed research design, as well as the presentation, account for **40 percent** of your final course grade.

Practical assignments. Finally, you'll be asked to complete two short assignments, which focus on some of the practical elements associated with doing qualitative-based empirical work. Each of these should relate to your research project's question, although you are not required to use these materials in your final research design. (For instance, you might conclude that archival materials are not terribly relevant to your question). Each of these assignments should address the elements specified; provide as much detail as necessary, but try to do so in the space of 4 to 6 pages. Each assignment accounts for **10 percent of the final course grade.**

- **Archival research plan, due March 17.** Identify an archive – availability digitally or via physical visits (assume we are in a post-pandemic world!) – that contains material relevant to your project. Draft a plan for accessing that archive. How do you anticipate using the archival materials in your broader project? Note pertinent logistical information (requirements to gain access, rules and regulations on use of material). Use available information about the archive's holdings to outline and prioritize the materials you would aim to consult, annotating this list with explanations for your choices.

- **Interview preparation, due April 7.** Identify a set of individuals – perhaps by name or title ("government debt management director"), or by broad categories ("workers in factories in

Vietnam," "participants in anti-globalization protests") – whom you aim to interview. Provide a summary of the aim of your interview(s), the reason for choosing these individual(s), and any practical or ethical concerns. What questions will you ask, and why? How will you process and manage the interview data?

Summary of course grading components:

Class participation	**25%**	**[all semester]**
Methods Review (1)	**5%**	**[student choice, by sign up]**
Methods Review (2)	**5%**	**[student choice, by sign up]**
Research Statement	**5%**	**[February 24]**
Archive Preparation	**10%**	**[March 17]**
Interview Preparation	**10%**	**[April 7]**
Final Research Design (and presentation)	**40%**	**[Dean's Date; May 5]**

Schedule of Topics and Reading Assignments

All required readings are found in the books listed as "required" for the course; or are available on the class canvas page (in the module for each week). Readings listed as optional or suggested are not posted to Canvas.

Please note that our February 3 meeting will be a full class meeting, with a substantive discussion. Please read the assigned materials prior to that day's meeting!

Week 1 (February 3): Course Introduction: What Role for Qualitative Methods?

Elman, Colin, Diana Kapiszewski and Arthur Lupia. 2018. "Transparent Social Inquiry: Implications for Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 21(1): 29-47.

> *Optional: Isaac, Jeffrey C. 2015. "From the Editor: For a More Public Political Science," *Perspectives in Politics*, 13(2): 269- 283.

> *Optional: Laitin, David and Rob Reich. 2017. "Trust, Transparency and Replication in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(1): 172-175.

Gerring, John. 2017. "Qualitative Methods." *Annual Review of Political Science* 20(1): 15-36.

Lieberman, Evan. 2016. "Can the Biomedical Research Cycle Be a Model for Political Science?" *Perspectives on Politics* 14(4): 1054–1066. [Not assigned, but in case you're interested: responses to Lieberman's article]

Mahoney, James and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227-249.

> *Optional, for a longer elaboration of the argument, see Goertz, Gary and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

*Optional: Ragin, Charles. 2014. *The Comparative Method: Moving beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

*Optional: Gerardo Munck and Richard Snyder, eds. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Week 2 (February 10): Research Design for Qualitative Methods

Clark, William Roberts. 2020. "Asking Interesting Questions." In Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese, eds., *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations.* (Chapter 1, pp. 7-25).

Keohane, Robert O., Gary King and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapters 1 through 3 (pp. 1-114).

*KKV sparked lots of debate and discussion regarding how to think about, and how to use, qualitative methods within political science. One collection of critiques and responses is Henry Brady and David Collier, eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (2nd edition). Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Mahoney, James. 2010. "After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research," *World Politics* 62(1): 120-147.

Brooks, Marissa, ed. 2017. "Symposium: The Road Less Traveled: An Agenda for Mixed Methods Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 1015-1018. **Note that there are, after the introduction, 5 short articles in the symposium. The entire symposium is assigned and listed individually below:**

- Barnes, Jeb and Nicholas Weller. 2017. "Case Studies and Analytic Transparency in Causal-Oriented Mixed Methods Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 1019-1022.
- Koivu, Kendra and Annika Marlen Hinze, A. 2017. "Cases of Convenience? The Divergence of Theory from Practice in Case Selection in Qualitative and Mixed-Methods Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 1023-1027.
- Niedzwiecki, Sara and David Nunnally. 2017. "Mixed-Methods Research in the Study of Welfare States." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 1028-1031.
- Harbers, Imke and Matthew Ingram. 2017. "Incorporating Space in Multimethod Research: Combining Spatial Analysis with Case-Study Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 1032-1037.Cyr, Jennifer. 2017. "The Unique Utility of Focus Groups for Mixed-Methods Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 1038-1042.

Week 3 (February 17): Concepts and Measurement

[M] Carlson, Melissa, Laura Jakli and Katerina Linos. 2018. "Rumors and Refugees: How Government-Created Information Vacuums Undermine Effective Crisis Management." *International Studies Quarterly* 62(3): 671–685. Optional: the data appendix is here.

Collier, David and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49(3): 430-51.

> *Optional: Adcock, Robert, and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95(3): 529-547.

Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, second edition, Chapter 5 ("Concepts"), pp. 105-140.

> *Optional: the remainder of Gerring's book is a great guide for thinking about concept formation, measurement, and causality in the social sciences.

Keohane, Robert, Gary King and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapters 5 and 6. *These chapters focus on measurement and observation. You also may want to skim Chapter 4, which isn't assigned for class, but which discusses selection and selection bias (relevant for next week as well).*

> *Optional: Another important response to KKV is Henry Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards.* 2010. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sen, Maya and Omar Wasow. 2016. "Race as a Bundle of Sticks: Designs that Estimate Effects of Seemingly Immutable Characteristics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 19(1): 499-522.

Week 4 (February 24): Case Studies, Counterfactuals, Analytic Narratives

Research statement due today

Bennett, Andrew and Alexander L. George. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development,* Chapter 1, pp. 3-36. *The rest of the book also is very useful!*

Collier, David, James Mahoney, and Jason Seawright. 2004 "Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 85-102.

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2(1): 131-50.

[M] Mantilla, Giovanni. 2020. "Social Pressure and the Making of Wartime Civilian Protection Rules." *European Journal of International Relations* 26(2): 443-468.

Ruffa, Chiara. 2020. "Case Study Methods: Case Selection and Case Analysis." Chapter 59 in Luigi Curini and Robert Franzese, eds., *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations, Vol. 2,* pp. 1133-1147.

Seawright, Jason and John Gerring. 2008. <u>"Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options."</u> *Political Research Quarterly* 61(2):294-308.

*Optional: Tarrow, Sidney. 2010. "The Strategy of Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice." *Comparative Political Studies* 43(2): 230-259.

Week 5 (March 3): Process Tracing and Causal Mechanisms

Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel. 2015. *Process Tracing: from Metaphor to Analytic Tool.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1, 2 and 3 (pp. 1-97).

[M] Carnegie, Alison and Auston Carson<u>. "The Disclosure Dilemma: Nuclear Intelligence and International Organizations."</u> *American Journal of Political Science* 63: 269-285. Supporting case information is <u>here.</u>

Morgan, Kimberly. 2016. <u>"Process Tracing and the Causal Identification Revolution."</u> *New Political Economy* 21(5): 489-492.

Ricks, Jacob and Amy Liu. 2018. "<u>Process-Tracing Research Designs: A Practical Guide."</u> *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(4): 842-846.

Van Evera, Stephen. 1997. <u>*Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science.*</u> Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Chapter 2, pp. 49-88.

Weller, Nicholas and Jeb Barnes. 2016. <u>"Pathway Analysis and the Search for Causal Mechanisms."</u> *Sociological Methods & Research* 45(3):424-457.

- Optional: a related, practically-focused piece: Barnes, Jeb and Nicholas Weller, 2017. <u>"Case Studies and Analytic Transparency in Causal-Oriented Mixed-Methods Research."</u> *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50(4): 1019-1022.

- Optional: Weller, Nicholas and Jeb Barnes. 2014. *Finding Pathways: Mixed-Method Research for Studying Causal Mechanisms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Week 6 (March 10): Analytic Narratives and Process Tracing; Research Ethics

American Political Science Association, Human Subjects Research Ad-Hoc Committee. 2020. <u>Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research</u> (20 pp).

[M] Auerbach, Adam Michael and Tariq Thachil. 2020. <u>"Cultivating Clients: Reputation, Responsiveness, and Ethnic Indifference in India's Slums."</u> *American Journal of Political Science* 64: 471-487.

Optional: Auerbach, Adam Michael. 2018. "Informal Archives: Historical Narratives and the Preservation of Paper in India's Urban Slums." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 53: 343-364.

Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 1998. *Analytic Narratives.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Chapter 1, pp. 3-22.

Falleti, Tulia G. and Julia F. Lynch. 2009. "Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Analysis." *Comparative Political Studies* 42(9):1143-1166.

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren Morris Maclean and Benjamin Read. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 2 (pp. 1-81).

The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research [The Belmont Report]. 1979. *The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. (10 pp).*

> Optional: Brooks, Sarah. 2013. "The Ethical Treatment of Human Subjects and the Institutional Review Board Process." In Layna Mosley, ed., *Interview Research in Political Science.* Ithaca, Cornell University Press, pp. 45-66.

> Optional: Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren Morris Maclean and Benjamin Read. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 4 (pp. 119-150).

Pacheco-Vega, Raul and Kate Parizeau. 2018. "Doubly Engaged Ethnography: Opportunities and Challenges When Working With Vulnerable Communities." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 17:1-13.

> Optional: Wood, Elisabeth. 2006. "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones." *Qualitative Sociology.* 29(3): 307-41.

> Optional: Michelitch, Kristen. Ed. 2018. "Symposium: Whose Research Is It? Political Scientists Discuss Whether, How, and Why We Should Involve the Communities We Study." *PS: Political Science& Politics* 51(3). Symposium includes pieces by Lupu, Pepinksy, Zechmeister.

Week 7 (March 17): Research Transparency; Historical Analysis

Archival Research Plan due today

[M] Carpenter, Daniel and Colin D. Moore. 2014. "When Canvassers Became Activists: Antislavery Petitioning and the Political Mobilization of American Women." *American Political Science Review* 108(3): 479-498.

Hale, Thomas. 2015. *Between Interests and Law: The Politics of Transnational Commercial Disputes.* Chapter 1 ("Introduction"), pp. 1-24. Also skim through Hale's QDR deposit, to get a sense of the choices he made regarding how to document her research.

Jacobs, A., T. Büthe, A. Arjona, L. Arriola, E. Bellin, A. Bennett……D. Yashar. 2021. "The Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: Insights and Implications." *Perspectives on Politics* 1-38.

- Optional: the full 250 page report from these deliberations.

- Optional: for more background, see Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT): A Joint Statement by Political Science Journal Editors. 2014 (2 pages). You also may be interested in the presentations from the related workshop; and a November 2015 statement by APSA presidents on DART; as well as March 2015 announcement of the move to pre-publication replication at AJPS, and the discussion of the rationale behind it.]

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren Morris Maclean and Benjamin Read. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 5 (pp.151-189).

St. John, Taylor. 2018. *The Rise of Investor-State Arbitration: Politics, Law and Unintended Consequences.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. Introduction, pp. 1-23. Also skim through St. John's QDR deposit, to get a sense of the choices she made regarding how to document her research. Note how her approach differs from Hale's.

Trachtenberg, Marc. 2006. "Chapter 5: Working with Documents." In Trachtenberg, *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 140-168.

Week 8 (March 24): Historical Analysis, Continued

Elman, Colin, Diana Kapiszewski and Lorena Vinuela. 2010. "Qualitative Data Archiving: Rewards and Challenges." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 43(1): 22-27.

- Learn more about the Qualitative Data Repository by visiting the site and creating an account.

Lustick, Ian. 1996. "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 90(3): 605-618.

[M] Morrison, James. 2016. "Shocking Intellectual Austerity: The Role of Ideas in the Demise of the Gold Standard in Britain." *International Organization* 70(1): 175-207.

Also read Morrison's reflection (4 pp.) on his experience with DART, part of this newsletter.

And look at the extended citation appendix which accompanies Morrison's article.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2014. "Trust, but Verify: The Transparency Revolution and Qualitative International Relations," *Security Studies* 23(4): 663-688.

- For practical guidance on active citation, see Moravcsik, 2013. "A Guide to Active Citation: Version 1.1 for Pilot Projects". NSF Qualitative Data Repository Project, 21 pp.

Thies, Cameron G. 2002. "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives* 3: 351-372.

- Optional: in this Twitter thread (April 2020), Paul Poast offers an example of how he uses historical materials in writing case studies for his book manuscript.

- Optional: for much more guidance, consult Diana Kim's 2020 reading list on archives

Week 9 (March 31): Interviews, Ethnography and Focus Groups

[M] Cramer, Katherine J. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective," *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 517-532.

> Optional: the larger project is Cramer, Katherine J. 2016. *The Politics of Resentment: Rural Consciousness in Wisconsin and the Rise of Scott Walker*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 1 is freely available through the University of Chicago Press site.

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren Morris Maclean and Benjamin Read. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 6 and 7 (pp. 190-265).

Simmons, Erica S and Nicholas Rush Smith. 2019. "The Case for Comparative Ethnography." *Comparative Politics* 51(3): 341-359.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. "Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 255–272.

Week 10 (April 7): Interviews, Again

Interview Preparation Plan due

Bussell, Jennifer. 2020. "Shadowing as a Tool for Studying Political Elites." *Political Analysis* 28(4): 469-486.

Curry, James. 2017. "In-Depth Qualitative Research and the Study of American Political Institutions." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 50(1): 114-120.

[M] Dolan, Lindsay and Ricky Clark. 2021. "Pleasing the Principal: U.S. Influence in World Bank Policymaking." *American Journal of Political Science*. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12531. The data appendix is here.

Mosley, Layna. 2013. Ed. *Interview Research in Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Chapters 1 (introduction), 2 (Lynch), 4 (Bleich and Pekkanen), 6 (Cammett), 9 (Gallagher) and 11 (Leech et al). *Other chapters also may be interesting and useful.*

Week 11 (April 14): Other Field Research Methods and Considerations

Presentations of Research Designs, schedule TBD.

Jensenius, Francesca. 2014. "The Fieldwork of Quantitative Data Collection." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, pp. 402-404.

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren Morris Maclean and Benjamin Read. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 3, 8 and 9 (pp. 82-118; 266-331).

[M] McNamara, Kathleen. 2015. *The Politics of Everyday Europe*: Constructing Authority in the European Union. New York: Oxford University Press, Chapter 4 ("Buildings, Spectacles and Songs"), pp. 62-90

[M] Schon, Justin. 2020. "How Narratives and Evidence Influence Rumor Belief in Conflict Zones: Evidence from Syria." *Perspectives on Politics* 1-14.

Week 12 (April 21): Course Wrap Up and Final Considerations

Presentations of Research Designs, Schedule TBD.

[M] Honig, Dan and Catherine Weaver. 2019. "A Race to the Top? The Aid Transparency Index and the Social Power of Global Performance Indicators." *International Organization* 73(3): 579-610.

[M] Paglayan, Agustina. 2020. "The Non-Democratic Roots of Mass Education: Evidence from 200 Years." *American Political Science Review:* 1-20.

- In this podcast, Paglayan discusses how she uses qualitative case knowledge in this study, as well as how she shares underlying qualitative evidence using Annotation for Transparent Inquiry.

Additional Resources:

1. **Focus Groups**

   Cyr, Jennifer. 2017. *Focus Groups for the Social Science Researcher.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

   Krueger, Richard A. 2009. *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

   CQRM reading list on when to use focus groups.

2. **Interviews**

   Fujii, Lee Ann. 2017. Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach. Routledge.

   Kvale, Steinar, and Svend Brinkmann. 2009. *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

   Rubin, Herbert J. and Irene S. Rubin. 2012. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

3. **Archives and Historical Analysis**

Balcells, Laia and C. Sullivan, C. 2018. "New Findings from Conflict Archives: An Introduction and Methodological Framework." *Journal of Peace Research* 55(2): 137-146.

Harrison, Hope M. 1992. "Inside the SED Archives: A Researcher's Diary," *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 2: 28-32.

Jervis, Robert. 2001. "International History and International Politics: Why Are They Studied Differently?" In Colin Elman and Miriam Elman, eds. *Bridges and Boundaries: Historians, Political Scientists, and the Study of International Relations.* Cambridge: MIT Press, pp. 385-402.

Lieberman, Evan. 2010. "Bridging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide: Best Practices in the Development of Historically Oriented Replication Databases." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 37-59.

Mahoney, James, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. 2003. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pierson, Paul. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

The CQRM reading list on historical methods.

4. **Ethnography**

Schatz, Edward, ed. 2010. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press (2010).

Symposium on Ethnography and Participant Observation. 2017. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 50:1 (January 2017):97-138, articles by Majic, Curry, Kang, Simmons & Smith, Brodkin, and Schatz. [Perspectives from key political science practitioners of political ethnography]

5. **Mixed Methods Approaches**

Lieberman, Evan. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research," *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 435-52.

Small, Mario Luis. 2011. "How to conduct a mixed methods study: Recent trends in a rapidly growing literature." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37:57-86.

6. **Content Analysis and Coding**

Herrera, Yoshiko, Bear Braumoeller et al. 2004. "Symposium: Discourse/Content Analysis." *Qualitative Methods* 2:1 (2004). Contributions by Hardy et al., Crawford, Laffey and Weldes, Hopf, Neuendorf.

Krippendorff, Karl. 2013. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Saldaña, Johnny. 2015. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

7. **Process Tracing**

Andrew Bennett has made his entire course on process tracing and case studies, with 19 video sessions of various lengths, available via the IQMR site.

Beach, Derek and Rasmus Brun Pedersen. 2013. *Process-tracing methods: Foundations and guidelines.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Waldner, David. 2015. "Process Tracing and Causal Inference." *Security Studies* 24(2): 239- 250.

8. **And a few additional recent books (of which there are many!) using qualitative methods:**

Barnes, Carolyn. 2020. *States of Empowerment: Low-Income Families and the New Welfare State.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Entire book is available open access here.

Henning, Randall. 2017. *Tangled Governance: International Regime Complexity, the Troika and the Euro Crisis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. *Uses interviews with policymakers as well as documents from the EU and the IMF. See Chapter 5, on Greece.*

Jurkovich, Michelle. 2020. *Feeding the Hungry: Advocacy and Blame in the Global Fight against Hunger.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kim, Diana. 2020. *Empires of Vice: The Rise of Opium Prohibition across Southeast Asia.* Princeton University Press.

O'Rourke, Lindsay. 2018 *Covert Regime Change: America's Secret Cold War.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Shifrinson, Josh. 2018. *Rising Titans, Falling Giants: How Great Powers Exploit Power Shifts.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press. *Uses archival materials and policymaker interviews; includes them in historiographic databases.*