

University of Toronto, St. George
Department of Political Science
POL 2505 (H 1 S): Qualitative Methods in Political Research
Spring 2017

Instructor:	Shivaji Mukherjee
Email:	shivaji.mukherjee@utoronto.ca
Class Time and Location:	Monday 5-8 pm; SSH 3130
Office Hours and Location:	Monday 1-2 pm; TBA

Course description:

This course surveys qualitative methods used in political science research. After briefly reviewing qualitative and quantitative research traditions and elements of research design and concept formation, the course covers the practical uses of specific qualitative methods, including case studies, comparative historical analysis, archival research, interviewing, participant observation, ethnography, and mixed-method strategies. Examples used will come largely from comparative politics and international relations. Most of the readings will be readings by well-known methodologists, and also recent important studies using such methods. Also, there will be readings from some 'how to' textbooks on these different methods. Some weeks will have examples of studies that use these methods, which allow us to see how well known scholars have used these different qualitative methods.

One goal of the course is to get some practical 'hands-on' experience in actually doing interviews or participation observation with human subjects in Toronto. The other goal of the course is to require students to develop a first draft of a research proposal similar to the dissertation prospectus. This will allow 2nd year students to make a first attempt at defining their dissertation prospectus which you need to submit at the end of your 3rd year.

Pre requisite for course

This course is intended for 2nd or 3rd year PhD students, who will be given preference. It is not intended for MA or undergraduate students. It is recommended that students have done the core course in one of the subfields in the political science PhD program, and are aware of basic methodological approaches. The core course seminar in comparative politics, or in international relations would be most helpful, or even in any of the other sub fields which expose somewhat to methods of different types.

Goal of the course:

The goal of the course is to broadly expose students to different types of qualitative methods, and also to think about how to integrate qualitative with quantitative methods towards the end of the course. The goal is not to learn *only* about those research skills which you envision to use in your *own* dissertation. There is a broad set of research methods, and whether or not you plan to use it in your dissertation, you should be aware of as many research methods as possible. You should approach the course in that spirit of becoming trained in different kinds of methods, and become

a broadly trained scholar. The purpose is to help you become a well-trained political scientist, who is aware of different methods.

The second goal of the course is for you to try and write a research proposal which tries to engage with a question which may become your dissertation proposal. There will be two chances to do this, first as a short proposal based on the first 1/3rd of the course on case studies etc. and then at the end a longer research proposal which can make use of any research methods in the course or from outside.

Course Requirements and Marking Scheme:

1) Class participation (25%): This course is a seminar. Students are expected to read the assigned readings before class and participate in class discussion, based around themes common to that week's readings. Discussion points can include answering basic questions about the readings, raising questions or puzzles you have about some readings, trying to look for connections between the different readings, or weaknesses in one or more readings, and applying the readings to the example for that week. I will keep track of student participation. Grades depend on the quality of participation and not quantity.

- Suggestion: One useful idea is to create a Note to yourself for every week of class, where you briefly summarize the main points of the week's readings, and then develop some questions or criticisms of these readings. Also you should jot down ideas of how the methods for that week may or may not help you address your research question. This will not be graded but will be useful for you when you develop your final research design paper as we go along the semester. It will also help you in class participation.

2) Presentation (10%): Besides regular class participation, each student will have to do one 10 minute presentations based on a week's readings, where they will discuss the readings for that week and then bring up important questions and debates. This will help lead the discussion that day. You will need to sign up for which week you prefer to present.

3) Interviews and write-up (30%): This will be due in Week 9, March 13th. Start making contacts for interviews by Week 6, February 13, or maybe even earlier! This will be time consuming. Students are expected to make contacts and do actual interviews 'in the field', based on such methods we read and learn about in class. The topic should be of your own choosing, but make sure to discuss with me beforehand. Since it is not possible to go for field-work in the middle of the semester, one idea would be to choose a topic which is most similar to your own research interest, and then interview subjects or observe situations in Toronto, to give you practice which you can make use of when you go for field-work related to your dissertation in the future. For example, if you are interested in studying political parties in Brazil, maybe you can interview local politicians or people from Brazilian origin about their views on this topic. If you are interested in studying Canadian politics, this should be the easiest, since you should be able to access subjects in your research topic here in Toronto, or close by. *This will require advance planning, so you should start thinking about this early in the course.*

Some students last year, did phone interviews or skype interviews with people in other countries, and this is also possible, but a face to face interview allows you to develop certain skills which a phone/ skype interview will not allow you.

Once you have completed your interviews, and participant observation, you need to write up the experience as field notes, and transcribe the interviews. You will then share this with the class, and each of you will read one other students' interviews, and if possible we will discuss these in class.

Instructions: more instructions will be provided when I set up the assignment on blackboard, but below are some brief instructions:

- *Interview:* Interview two people on the same topic, trying to find answer to a particular question that interests you. Then write up your field notes, memos, observations about access to the subject, and also transcribe your interview as much as possible, and prepare to distribute and present in class. Describe your preparations, what worked, what did not work and why, and what you learned about field work.

4) Research Proposal/ prospectus (15% for first paper, 20% for final prospectus = total 35%):

You need to submit 2 research proposals:

- *First research paper:* This will be due end of **Week 5, February 6**. The first one will be around **1000** words, where you will briefly describe your research question or puzzle, how it addresses a gap in the literature, and then try to develop a research design based on *comparative case study, selection bias, or comparative historical analysis* done in class by Week 5 to address this question. It will serve as both a first attempt at framing your research question for your dissertation prospectus, and also a problem set which asks you to engage with the first 4-5 weeks of the syllabus.
- *Final paper:* **This is due on April 3rd, last day of class**. The will be like a dissertation prospectus of around **3000 words** which you will submit on blackboard the last day of class. It can build on the comparative case study research design, but also use other research designs like interviews, participant observation etc. to develop the research design part of what could possibly be a question you address in your dissertation prospectus.
 - **Option 1:** The final assignment is to write a research design paper of about 3000 words which is similar to a mini-dissertation prospectus. It should follow a standard format and include your research question, why this question is important, review the literature on this topic and point out gaps in the literature that this question addresses, and then develop a research design using research methods learned in this course or combined with other research methods that will help answer this question.
 - See the last week of syllabus for list of prospectuses, and the graduate office in our department will share recent prospectuses with you.
 - As a template for this paper, you may look at formats that grant-agencies specify, like the SSHRC, the USIP dissertation fellowship, and the Social Science Research

Council (SSRC), which is mentioned in the syllabus. Maybe I will try to get a few good prospectuses of senior PhD students and we can discuss those in class. Here is a link about writing proposals, which I list in the last week of class also:

http://www.ssrc.org/programs/publications_editors/publications/art_of_writing_proposals.page

- **Option 2:** If you are still not decided on the topic for your dissertation prospectus, then you can write up a research design for a standard research paper on a topic of your choosing, using one or more methods learned in this class, or mixing it with other methods too. However, if you choose this option you need to discuss with me beforehand. You should focus mostly on the research design part of the paper, along with some brief literature review and theory/ hypotheses.

List of due dates (from above, in case it is not clear—I have also mentioned these below embedded below the dates):

- **Week 5, February 6:** Research paper draft 1 focusing on selection bias, comparative case method, or comparative historical analysis
- **Week 9, March 13:** Submit interview notes and transcription.
- **Week 12, April 3rd:** Research prospectus draft 2, the final version of the prospectus focusing on the research design.
- **Ongoing every week:** discussion and class participation
- **Choose your week:** Presentation of topic for 10-12 minutes

Course policies and procedures:

Contacting the instructor:

Please drop by my office at SSH during office hours (listed at top of syllabus). Office hours are a good time to discuss readings, clarify any points you did not understand during lecture, and also discuss research paper topics. If you cannot make the regular office hours, please email me to set up an alternative time. I should respond quickly to emails, but do allow for 48 hours for me to respond, and if you do not get an email back, then send a reminder email.

Procedures to hand in papers:

Submit through Turnitin: It is encouraged that you also turn in each of our research papers through turnitin.com. To learn about how to submit your work to turnitin, see the following site. <http://www.teaching.utoronto.ca/teaching/academicintegrity/turnitin/guide-students.htm>

Read the following from Turnitin's terms of use carefully, and then decide whether you do not want to use turnitin.com:

“Normally, students will be required to submit written assignments to Turnitin.com for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their assignments to be included as source documents in the Turnitin.com reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of the Turnitin.com service are described on the Turnitin.com web site” (www.Turnitin.com).

If you have an objection to the use of Turnitin for the submission of your work, please make an appointment to speak personally with me to discuss alternative arrangements, which will usually require you to hand in all your rough drafts and notes made while preparing the research paper. A guide for students is available from the University of Toronto's Office of Teaching Advancement, at: <http://www.utoronto.ca/ota/turnitin/TurnitinGuideForStudents.pdf>

Procedures to hand in late papers: Submit them on blackboard, it should show when you submitted.

Late penalty: Papers handed in any time after the start of lecture on the due date will be treated as late. There will be a penalty of 5 points out of 100 per late day (including weekends and holidays), i.e. if your paper would have received 90 out of 100, it will now receive an 85 if it is one day late.

Rough drafts and hard copies of papers, and graded work: Students are strongly advised to keep rough/ draft work and hard copies of their essays and assignments before handing it in. These should be kept until marked assignments have been returned and the grades posted on ROSI. You should also keep electronic version of your essays on your hard disk, as well as backed up copies on external hard drives, or sky drives, so that you do not lose your course materials and work. This will be important in case your handed in essay gets lost.

Extensions for papers: Extensions will only be granted in extenuating circumstances and with appropriate supporting documentation. If you have medical reasons for not meeting the paper deadline, an acceptable doctor's note on the official U of T Medical Note form must be submitted to me within one week of the late assignment. Extensions are at my discretion and please do not assume that you will be granted one. Assignments in other courses are not grounds for an extension, though if you have a lot of courses, then . If you think you have a valid reason to request an extension and know ahead of time, please email me as soon as possible.

Appealing grades: If you have concerns about your grades, please email me a detailed written statement explaining why you believe your grade is unjustified, within one week from the date you received your grade, along with your paper. Once an appeal is submitted, I will examine the paper again. *Please note that your grade may go down, go up or remain unchanged after this process.*

Accessibility: The University of Toronto is committed to accessibility. If you require accommodations or have accessibility concerns, please contact Accessibility Services as soon as possible at <http://www.accessibility.utoronto.ca/>

Plagiarism and Academic Dishonesty:

While you are encouraged to look online, and to consult other authors and sources on these topics, you should always cite any articles, books or authors from which you use data or ideas. Without such intellectual honesty, the enterprise of research is compromised. This is one of the most serious crimes in academia, so you should make sure you understand what to avoid, and don't do it, because it is not worth the minor advantage of getting a slightly better grade. The

university takes plagiarism very seriously, and this can lead to punishment ranging from getting a 0 in the course, to expulsion from the university.

If you are ever in doubt, ask me about whether something is plagiarism. Just as a basic thumb rule, to avoid plagiarism, you must give citations when using other people's ideas, even if you are paraphrasing them in your own words. If you are using other people's words verbatim, you must put quotes around them, and then cite the source as a footnote or endnote. Basically, you have to make sure that you acknowledge any ideas or thoughts or words from others, and this may be formal ideas taken from other people's articles or books, or even informal ideas developed when having conversations with others. You should especially remember that material taken from the web must be quoted and cited in the same manner as if it came from a book or printed article, and the date when you downloaded the materials from the web site should also be mentioned.

See last page if this syllabus for more information on how to avoid plagiarism.

READINGS:

Books required for purchase (will order them in U Toronto bookstore):

- Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton, 1994)
- Henry Brady and David Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry 2nd ed.* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2010)
- Robert Emerson, Rachel Fretz and Linda Shaw. 1995. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- John Lofland, David Snow, Leon Anderson and Lyn Lofland. 2006. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis.* Belmont, CA : Wadsworth/Thomson Learning. 4th ed.

Books/ Texts to be reserved at library:

- James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (MIT Press, 2005)
- Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton, 1994)
- Henry Brady and David Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry 2nd ed.* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2010)
- Charles Ragin, *Fuzzy-Set Social Science* (Chicago, 2000)

- Charles Ragin. 2008. *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Edward Schatz, ed., *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power* (Chicago, 2009)
- Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (MIT Press, 2005)
- Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, John. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices* (Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Goertz, Gary, *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005)
- James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge University Press, 2003)
- Marc Trachtenberg, *The Craft of International History* (Princeton University Press, 2006)
- Robert Emerson, Rachel Fretz and Linda Shaw. 1995. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- John Lofland, David Snow, Leon Anderson and Lyn Lofland. 2006. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA : Wadsworth/Thomson Learning. 4th ed.

Course Outline

Week 1, January 9: Introduction—overview of syllabus, the importance of qualitative methods in political science

PART 1: COMPARATIVE CASE STUDIES, HISTORICAL MEHTODS, POSITIVIST METHODS

Week 2, January 16: Concept formation, Measurement: Qualitative vs Quantitative

- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *The American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033–1053.
- Collier, David, and James E. Mahoney, "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Alternative Views of Categories in Comparative Analysis," *American Political Science Review* 87:4 (December 1993): 845-55.
- David Collier and Steven Levitsky, "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research," *World Politics*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (April 1997) pp. 430-451.

- Gerring, John. 1999. "What makes a concept good? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences." *Polity* 31, 3: 357-393. (skim)

Recommended:

- Adcock, Robert N., and David Collier, "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research," *American Political Science Review* 95:3 (September 2001): 529-46.
- Goertz, Gary, *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), Chapter 2 "Structuring and Theorizing Concepts"*. Also chapters 1 and 3.
- George and Bennett chap 1, 6, 11
- Gerring, John., "Concepts: General Criteria" and "Strategies of Definition," pp. 35-86 in Gerring, *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Elman, Colin. "Explanatory Typologies in Qualitative Studies of International Politics," *International Organization* 59 (2005), pp. 293-326
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, "Descriptive Inference," in King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), chap. 2 (pp. 46-63)
- Henry Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004). Chapter 3, pp. 62-67 (Measurement). Chapter 12, pp. 202-09 ("Conceptualization and Measurement")
- Bevir, Mark, and Asaf Kedar. "Concept Formation in Political Science: An Anti-Naturalist Critique of Qualitative Methodology." *Perspectives on Politics* 6, no. 03 (2008): 503-517.

Week 3, January 23: Case Study 1: Case Selection and Selection Bias

How to do Case selection:

- John Gerring, *Case Study Research*, Chapters 2, and 5.
- George, Alexander & Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Study and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Ch. 1, 4.

Is Selection bias a problem?

- Barbara Geddes, "How the Cases you Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis* 2, 1990: 131-150
- Collier, David, and James Mahoney, "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research," *World Politics* 49 (October 1996), pp. 56-91

Example:

- Ashutosh Varshney. 2001. "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond" *World Politics* 53 (3): 362-98

additional

- King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton, 1994), Chapters 4 (especially section 4.3 on selection bias)
- Collier, Mahoney and Seawright, Chapter 6 “Claiming too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias”) in Brady and Collier ed. *Rethinking Social Inquiry*.
- F. Douglas Dion, “Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study,” *Comparative Politics* 30(2), January 1998: 127-146
- John Gerring. 2004. “What is a case study and what is it good for?” *American Political Science Review* 98 (2): 341-54.
- John Gerring, “Is There a (Viable) Crucial-Case Method?” *Comparative Political Studies* 40(3), 2007: 231-253
- Charles Ragin and Howard Becker, eds., *What is a Case?* (Cambridge UP, 1992), introduction
- Harry Eckstein, “Case-Study and Theory in Micro-Politics,” in Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, eds., *Handbook of Political Science*, vol. 7 (Addison-Wesley, 1975), 79-138
- Robert K. Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Method* (Sage, 1994), 99-146.
- Alexander George, “Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured Focused Comparison,” in Paul Lauren, ed., *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy* (New York: Free Press, 1979), 43-68

Week 4, January 30: Case Study 2: The Comparative Method (Mill’s Method), Necessary and Sufficient Conditions

- Ragin, Charles (1987) *The Comparative Method* (University of California Press), Chapter 3 (Case Oriented Comparative Methods) and Chapter 4 (The Variable Oriented Approach). Also skim Preface (pages vii – xv).
- George, Alexander & Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Study and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Ch. 8 (“Comparative Methods: Controlled Comparison and Within-Case Analysis”)
- Slater, D & Ziblatt, D. (2013). “The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Case Comparison.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 46(10):1301-1327.

Example:

- Maya Tudor. “Explaining Democracy’s Origins: Lessons from South Asia”, *Comparative Politics*, April 2013.

Recommended readings:

- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. “Comparative politics and the comparative method.” *APSR* 65 (3): 682-93.
- Snyder, Richard. 2001. “Scaling Down: The Subnational Comparative Method.” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 36(1): 93–110.

- Adam Przeworski & Henry Teune, *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry* (Interscience, 1970)
- Goertz, Gary, ed. *Necessary Conditions* Chapters 2 and 4
- For those interested in Fuzzy set/ QCA or Necessary/ Sufficient conditions:
 - Ragin, Charles (1987) *The Comparative Method* (University of California Press), Chapter 6, 7 and 8.
 - Ragin, Charles C. *Fuzzy-set Social Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
 - Katz, Aaron, Matthias vom Hau, and James Mahoney. 2004. *Explaining the Great Reversal in Spanish America: Fuzzy Set Analysis versus Statistical Analysis*. Providence, RI: Brown University. (mimeo)
 - Janoski, Thomas, and Alexander M. Hicks. *The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State, Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics*. Cambridge, UK ; New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp.320-345. [R]
 - Blake, Charles H., “The Enactment of National Health Insurance: A Boolean Analysis of Twenty Advanced Industrial Democracies,” *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law*, Volume 26, Number 4, August 2001.
 - Mahoney, James, Erin Kimball, and Kendra Koivu (2009) ‘The Logic of Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences’ *Comparative Political Studies*
 - (Fuzzy set QCA): Timothy P. Wickham-Crowley, “A Qualitative Comparative Approach to Latin American Revolutions”, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* March 1991 32: 82-109 (skim)

Week 5, February 6: Comparative Historical Analysis —path dependency, contingency, Process Tracing

- Mahoney, James. 2000. “Path dependence in historical sociology.” *Theory and Society*, 29.
- Paul Pierson, “Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics,” *American Political Science Review* 94(2), June 2000: 251-267
- James Mahoney. *Colonialism and Post-colonial development in Latin America*. Chapters 1 and TBA.

Recommended:

- Slater, Dan, and Erica Simmons. “Informative Regress: Critical Antecedents in Comparative Politics.” *Comparative Political Studies* 43, no. 7 (July 1, 2010): 886–917.
- Mahoney, James, and Kathleen Thelen, eds. 2010a. *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003) , Chapters 1, 6.
- Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen (eds.) 2015. *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kathleen Thelen, “Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics, *Annual Review of Political Science* 2, June 1999: 369-404

- Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman, “Complex Causal Relations and Case Study Methods: The Example of Path Dependence,” *Political Analysis* 14(3), 2006: 250-267
- JS Sekhon, “Quality Meets Quantity: Case Studies, Conditional Probability and Counterfactuals,” *Perspectives on Politics* 2(2), 2004: 281-93
- Colin Crouch and Henry Farrell, “Breaking the Path of Institutional Development? Alternatives to the New Determinism,” *Rationality and Society* 16(1), 2004: 5-43
- James Fearon, “Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science,” *World Politics* 43, January 1991: 169-195
- Gary King and Langche Zeng, “When Can History Be Our Guide? The Pitfalls of Counterfactual Inference,” *International Studies Quarterly* 51(1), March 2007, 183-210
- George, Alexander & Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Study and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Chapter 10: “Process-tracing and historical explanation”
- Giovanni Capoccia and R. Daniel Kelemen, “The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism,” *World Politics* 59(3), 2007: 341-369
- Andreas Schedler, “Mapping Contingency,” in Ian Shapiro and Sonu Bedi, eds., *Political Contingency: Studying the Unexpected, the Accidental, and the Unforeseen* (New York University Press, 2007), pp. 54-78 [CP]
- *How to do archival research:*
 - Trachtenberg, chapters 3,5,6,7. Look also at Appendices, and his website: <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/>
 - Ian Lustick, “History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias,” *American Political Science Review* 90, 1996: 605-618 [ELEC]
 - Theda Skocpol and Margaret Sommers, “The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry,” in *Social Revolutions in the Modern World* (Cambridge, 1994), 72-98 [CP]
 - Lieberman, Evan. "Bridging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide: Best Practices in the Development of Historically Oriented Replication Databases." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13 (2010): 37-59 [skim]
 - Cameron G. Thies, “A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations.” *International Studies Perspectives* 3, 2002: 351-72
 - Marc Bloch, *Historian’s Craft*.

Feb. 6th: ASSIGNMENT: SUBMIT YOUR FIRST DRAFT OF RESEARCH PAPER ON BLACKBOARD. IT SHOULD BE AROUND 500-1000 WORDS. YOU CAN PROPOSE ANY OF THE COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY OR COMPARATIVE HISTORICAL ANALYSIS RESEARCH DESIGNS WE HAVE STUDIED SO FAR.

PART 2: INTERVIEWS, FIELD WORK, PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION ETC.

Week 6, February 13: Interviewing 1: Field research, Access and getting into the field, Interviewing

- Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2007. "Field Research." In *Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles Boix and Susan Stokes (Oxford University Press).
- John Lofland, et al. 2006. Introduction and Chapters 1-3 from *Analyzing Social Settings*.
- Robert Emerson, Rachel Fretz and Linda Shaw. 1995. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 1 and 2.
- H. Russell Bernard. 2002. "Interviewing: Unstructured and Semistructured." Chapter 9 of *Research Methods in Anthropology. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 3rd edition. Altamira Press.

Example:

- Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2003. Chapters 1 & 2 of *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil war in El Salvador*.

Recommended readings:

- Joe Soss, "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered Approach to In-Depth Interviews for Interpretive Research." In D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method* (M.E. Sharpe, 2006) [CP]
- Frederic Charles Schaffer, "Ordinary Language Interviewing." In D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method* (M.E. Sharpe, 2006) [CP]
- Edward Schatz, ed., *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power* (Chicago, 2009), chapters by Zirakzadeh, Wood

Week 6 ASSIGNMENT: MAKE CONTACTS WITH PEOPLE FOR INTERVIEWS.

Week 7, February 27: Interviewing 2: Taking field notes, Coding interviews, Managing Interview data, challenges of interpretation & analysis

Guest: XXX will come around 6 pm

- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2010. "Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence." *Journal of Peace Research* 47(2): 231–41.
- Robert Emerson, Rachel Fretz and Linda Shaw. 1995. *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapters 3, 4 and 6.
- H. Russell Bernard. 2002. "Field Notes: How Take Them, Code Them, Manage Them." Chapter 14 of *Research Methods in Anthropology. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 3rd edition, 365-89. Altamira Press.

Example:

- Paul Brass, *Theft of an Idol*. Chapters 3 “Theft of an Idol” (skim Chapter 2 “Background”).

Recommended readings:

- Herbert Rubin and Irene Rubin, *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data* (Sage, 2005), chapters 4-5.

Week 7 ASSIGNMENT: INTERVIEW 2 PEOPLE ON THE SAME RESEARCH QUESTION. WRITE UP YOUR NOTES, MEMOS, OBSERVATIONS, SELF-CRITICISMS, CHALLENGES YOU FACED. TRANSCRIBE YOUR INTERVIEWS. PREPARE TO PUT UP ON BLACKBOARD.

Week 8, March 6: Participant Observation/ Ethnography

- H. Russell Bernard. 2002. “Participant Observation” Chapter 13 of *Research Methods in Anthropology. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 3rd edition. Altamira Press.
- Edward Schatz, ed., *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power* (Chicago, 2009), chapters by Schatz, Pachirat.
- Wedeen, Lisa. “Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13, no. 1 (2010): 255–272.

Example:

- James Scott. 1998. *Weapons of the weak*. New Haven: Yale University Press. **Chapter 1.**

Recommended readings:

- Karl G. Heider, “The Rashomon Effect: When Ethnographers Disagree,” *American Anthropologist* 90(1), March, 1988: 73-81 [ELEC]
- Michael Burawoy, “Teaching Participant Observation.” In Michael Burawoy, editor, *Ethnography Unbound* (University of California Press, 1991), 291-300.
- Fenno, Richard. 1978. Appendix -Notes on Method: Participant Observation. From *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Little, Brown, and Company, 249-295.
- Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation Of Cultures*. Basic Books, 1977, chapter 1, “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture” (pp. 3-32), and chapter 15, “Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight” (pp. 412-454)*

Week 8 ASSIGNMENT: BY NOW YOU SHOULD HAVE TRIED TO INTERVIEW 2 PEOPLE ON THE SAME RESEARCH QUESTION. PUT UP YOUR NOTES, MEMOS, OBSERVATIONS, SELF-CRITICISMS, CHALLENGES YOU FACED. TRANSCRIBE YOUR INTERVIEWS. PREPARE TO DISCUSS IN CLASS IN NEXT FEW WEEKS. PUT UP ON BLACKBOARD.

Week 9, March 13: Challenges during field work: Sensitive topics, researcher identity, ethics of fieldwork (may need an extended 3 hour class)

Note: Dean Sharpe, Research Ethics Board Manager--Social Sciences and Humanities, will give a talk on research ethics, and then we will discuss the readings

- Fujii, Lee Ann, 2014. "Five stories of accidental ethnography: Turning unplanned moments in the field into data." *Qualitative research*.
- Wood, Elisabeth. 2006. "The ethical challenges of field research in conflict zones." *Qualitative Sociology* 29 (3): 373-86.
- Sluka, Jeffrey A. 2007. "Reflections on Managing Danger in Fieldwork: Dangerous Anthropology in Belfast," in *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader*. Antonius C. G. M. Robben and Jeffrey A Sluka eds: Blackwell, pp. 259-70.
- The DA-RT petition and debate today and why qualitative scholars are opposing the DA-RT requirements.

Recommended

- John Lofland, David Snow, Leon Anderson and Lyn Lofland. 2006. Chapter 4 from *Analyzing Social Settings*.
- Huggins, Martha K. & Marie-Louise Glebbeek, Eds. 2008. Selections. *Women Fielding Danger: Negotiating Ethnographic Identities in Field Research*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- April 2009. *PS: Political Science & Politics* Symposium "Fieldwork, Identities, and Intersectionality: Negotiating Gender, Race, Class, Religion, Nationality, and Age in the Research Field Abroad." Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 287-328.
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayIssue?jid=PSC&volumeId=42&issueId=02&id=5293164>
- *Fieldwork under fire*

WEEK 9 ASSIGNMENT: SUBMIT YOUR INTERVIEWS. READ ONE OTHER PEOPLE'S NOTES AND COME PREPARED TO DISCUSS IN CLASS NEXT WEEK.

PART 3: MIXING METHODS AND WRITING A RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Week 10, March 20: *Debate between qualitative and quantitative methods. KKV etc. response by Brady, Collier etc.*

- King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton, 1994), Chapters 1, & 2.
- Henry Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2004). Skim chapters 1, 2, and read 12, 13.

- Mahoney, James, “After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research,” *World Politics* 62:1 (January 2010).
- Goertz, Gary and James Mahoney. 2006. A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research. *Political Analysis* 14: 227-49. (skim)

Recommended Readings:

- Alford, Robert. 1995. Review of KKV. *Contemporary Sociology* 24 (3): 424-27.
- Edward Schatz, ed., *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power* (Chicago, 2009), chapter by Allina-Pisano

Week 11, March 27: Mixed methods research design

- Lieberman, Evan S. “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research.” *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 03 (2005): 435–452.
- Rohlfing, Ingo. “What You See and What You Get Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research.” *Comparative Political Studies* 41, no. 11 (November 1, 2008): 1492–1514.
- Ahmed, Amel, and Rudra Sil. “When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism—or, Why We Still Need Single-Method Research.” *Perspectives on Politics* 10, no. 04 (2012): 935–953.
- Evan Lieberman, “Nested analysis: towards the integration of comparative-historical analysis with other social science methods. ” Chapter 9 in Mahoney and Thelen (eds.) 2015. *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. (e-book in library)

Example:

- Tariq Thachil, “[Embedded Mobilization](#)”, *World Politics*, [Volume 63, Number 3, July 2011](#).

Recommended:

- Mahoney and Goertz new book ...
- Brady and Collier, chapter 14
- Dunning, Thad. 2008. [Natural and Field Experiments: The Role of Qualitative Methods](#). *Qualitative Methods* 6 (2).
- [“Symposium: Multi-Methods Work, Dispatches from the Front Lines,”](#) *Qualitative Methods*, Spring 2007, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 9-27.
- Sekhon, Jasjeet S. 2004. “Quality Meets Quantity: Case Studies, Conditional Probability, and Counterfactuals.” *Perspectives on Politics* 2(02): 281–293.

ASSIGNMENT: SUBMIT SECOND DRAFT OF RESEARCH DESIGN PAPER, DEVELOPING ON THE FIRST DRAFT, OR MAKING CHANGES TO INCORPORATE OTHER METHODS. SUBMIT

ON BLACKBOARD, AND THOSE WHO WANT TO PRESENT (MAX. 5 STUDENTS) CAN PRESENT IT NEXT CLASS, OTHERS WILL SERVE AS DISCUSSANTS.

Week 12, April 3: How to write a research prospectus

- **Prospectus examples:**
 - <https://www.brown.edu/academics/political-science/graduate/dissertation>
 - <http://politicalscience.yale.edu/academics/graduate-program/program-requirements#prospectus>
- **Grant-writing strategies:**
 - http://www.ssrc.org/programs/publications_editors/publications/art_of_writing_proposals.page
 - Developed by Adam Przeworski (Department of Political Science, New York University) and Frank Salomon (Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin) on behalf of the Social Sciences Research Council (SSRC).

WILL TRY TO GET PANEL OF SENIOR STUDENTS WHO HAVE RECENTLY DEVELOPED THEIR PROSPECTUS

STUDENT PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL/ PROSPECTUSES. MAY BE A LONGER SESSION THAN USUAL.

ASSIGNMENT: THOSE STUDENTS WHO WANT TO PRESENT THEIR RESEARCH PAPERS, WILL DO IT TODAY, THE REST OF US WILL READ AND COMMENT.

ASSIGNMENT: APRIL 3 -- SUBMIT THE FINAL RESEARCH PAPER/ DESIGN PROPOSAL.