

Political Science 6802
Research Design and Qualitative Methods in Political Science
Department of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania

Spring 2023 – Mondays 1:45-4:45 – Williams Hall 218

Professor Julia Lynch

Ronald O. Perelman Center for Political Science and Economics, Room 424

Office Hours: TBA and by appointment

Email: jflynch@sas.upenn.edu

Overview:

This seminar is an introduction to principles of research design and to the collection and analysis of qualitative data in the social sciences. It is worth noting that many of the methods traditionally considered to be qualitative actually employ quantitative data, and vice versa; and that many of the principles underlying research design, case selection, and the process of data collection are common across empirically-oriented research methods, whether qualitative, quantitative, or formal. Hence, the course should be useful to students planning to utilize a variety of different kinds of research tools. Readings encompass theory, how-to, and examples drawn from political science and cognate social science disciplines. There are no prerequisites for the course, but some background in statistics and/or an idea of the substantive research questions you would like to pursue will be helpful.

Course requirements:

A. Active and informed participation in seminar discussion (35% of final grade)

Informed, active participation in seminar is a requirement of the course. Read carefully; take notes; come prepared to discuss and participate. A variety of lesson formats offer opportunities for different kinds of participation: oral and written, individual and collaborative, large and small group. You will be graded on both the quality and quantity of your required contributions to the seminar. I encourage you to request an evaluation of your seminar participation within a month of the start of the semester, to make sure that you are on track.

B. Exercises (20% of final grade)

Weekly exercises are designed to give you practice applying the tools we are discussing each week. Think of them as your problem sets for this class. Write-ups of the exercises should generally not require more than 4 double-spaced pages.

Before the start of class, **print out a copy of your exercise and bring it to class with you.** You may need it to share with a partner during class, and you will turn it in at the end of the class session. Exercises turned in after the end of class will not be accepted except in the case of a printer emergency.

Exercises are graded on the following scale: 0 (missing), 1 (needs work), 2 (fine), 3 (excellent). **If you must be absent from class, you may receive credit for the exercise if you turn it in before the start of class.** You may skip one exercise without a grade penalty, but you may find it difficult to participate effectively in class if you have not done the exercise.

C. Papers (45% of final grade)

For this class you will write **two short papers** in which you put into practice the methodological tools covered in the course, selecting from among the six Paper Options provided on the syllabus.

Papers are due in class three weeks after the week in which they were assigned. For example, Paper Option 1, on Process Tracing, is assigned in Week 7, and is thus due at the start of class in Week 10. Paper Option 6 is due on the last day of class. That said, I am flexible about deadlines, so *if you need some leeway, just let me know*. The three-week limit is to prevent you from (a) going overboard on the papers, and (b) loading yourself with work at the end of the semester.

Papers should be no more than 12 pages double-spaced. You can think of these papers as roughly half of a journal article: the methods section plus presentation/ discussion of results, with only the barest nod to an introduction, lit review, synthesis or conclusion. These assignments require that you undertake a small piece of original research *before you can write the paper*. Furthermore, the page limit is likely to demand significant extra time for editing. Because of this, **these papers are likely to take longer to execute than you expect!** Please leave yourself ample time to complete them and to proof-read carefully (grades will be based partly on the quality of your writing).

Some students choose to use the papers to address different aspects of a single substantive problem throughout the course of the semester. This strategy can facilitate a deeper understanding of qualitative methods and research design, as well as intimacy with a potential dissertation topic. However, this is by no means required. Many students, particularly those in their first year, may find it more helpful to use the written assignments to explore a variety of topics over the course of the semester.

Wellness:

1. Take care of yourself. Despite messages we all absorb from the larger environment, **working until exhaustion is not a badge of honor**; instead, it shows that we are out of balance, and/or that we are not working as efficiently as we could be. If you feel that you are having trouble maintaining balance, first, TAKE A BREAK. You deserve to engage in self-preservation. And second, please let me know, and we can talk about strategies for managing workload and effort in the academic part of your life.
2. Please keep in mind that I am immunocompromised, and other members of the class may live with people who are. We are all relying on you to take care of your own health to protect us, as well as yourself! If you are ill, and especially if you are experiencing any COVID-19 symptoms, **you must not come to class**. If you need to miss class, **please let me know with as much lead time as possible if you won't be attending**, so that I can rejigger any group assignments ahead of time.
3. If you have any circumstances that affect your life as a student (e.g. child or elder care duties, a disability or medical issue, financial or other personal concerns), you can help me help you by informing me as early as possible, and by working with me to identify adjustments that will ensure your success in this class.

Incompletes:

An incomplete in the course may be granted in the case of a medical or family emergency. In the event that you must take an incomplete, the remaining work shall be turned in within four weeks of the end of the emergency or the end of the semester, whichever comes later. Please trust that this is for your own protection: You do not want the papers for this course hanging over your head.

Academic integrity and plagiarism:

The University of Pennsylvania's Code of Academic Integrity states: "Since the University is an academic community, its fundamental purpose is the pursuit of knowledge. Essential to the success of this educational mission is a commitment to the principles of academic integrity. Every member of the University community is responsible for upholding the highest standards of honesty at all times. Students, as members of the community, are also responsible for adhering to the principles and spirit of the [...] Code of Academic Integrity." The seven points of this code (on cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, multiple submission, misrepresentation, facilitating dishonesty, and unfair advantage) can be found at http://www.upenn.edu/provost/PennBook/academic_integrity_code_of.

Course Readings:

Readings for each week are listed in recommended reading order. Most readings are available on Canvas or downloadable directly. Please be sure to bring to each class session a physical manifestation of the required readings: books, printouts, easily readable computer files.

Required books (available for purchase at the Penn bookstore and on reserve at Rosengarten):

King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba [KKV]. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (1994).

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean and Benjamin L. Read. *Field Research in Political Science*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press (2014).

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

Mosley, Layna, ed. *Interview Research in Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press (2013).

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

Saldaña, Johnny. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (2015).

*Readings preceded by an asterix are on the Canvas site

How to read:

Readings are meant to be done in the order in which they appear on the syllabus.

Note that some of the files uploaded to Canvas have more than the required pages -- please check the syllabus to be sure you aren't reading more than you need to.

As a cursory glance at the syllabus will reveal, this course has a lot of reading! I do not recommend trying to read every word of every reading. Not all parts of every reading are equally important for the class, or for you. So unless I tell you otherwise, or a weekly assignment requires otherwise, you will do better if you learn to gather the main ideas from a reading quickly and efficiently, filling in the details later as you need to for your exercises and papers. In general, you can focus your energy on the author's main arguments or main points, the types of evidence that they marshal to support those arguments, and the counter-arguments that they raise and refute. Let me know if you are having trouble figuring out how to read effectively, and we can discuss strategies in more detail.

Week 1 (Jan 11)

Epistemology, ontology, methodology

Exercise: BEFORE YOU DO THE READINGS: Draw a word map of the terms (adjectives, nouns, verbs) you associate with qualitative and quantitative research in political science (or your home discipline, if you are not a political scientist). A word map is simply a spatial representation of how you see these terms being related to one another – you can use arrows, proximity, hierarchy, even color to get your meaning across. AFTER YOU DO THE READINGS: Do the same exercise again. Has your map changed at all?

*Bevir, Mark. "Meta-methodology: Clearing the Underbrush." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press (2008), Chapter 3. [read for the main ideas and concepts]

*King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1994). Chapter 1 and pp. 34-49.

*Brady, Henry and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield (2010), pp. 1-10, 15-26, 177-196, and skim Glossary.

*Yanow, Dvora. "Neither Rigorous Nor Objective? Interrogating Criteria for Knowledge Claims in Interpretive Science." In Yanow, Dvora and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, 2nd ed. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe (2014), Chapter 6.

*McClain, Paula D., Gloria Y. A. Ayee, Taneisha N. Means, Alicia M. Reyes-Barriénte, and Nura A. Sedique. "Race, power, and knowledge: Tracing the roots of exclusion in the development of political science in the United States." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4:3 (2016), pp. 467-482.

*Shames, Shauna L., and Tess Wise. "Gender, diversity, and methods in political science: A theory of selection and survival biases." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50:3 (2017), pp. 811-823.

*Lieberman, Evan S. "Can the biomedical research cycle be a model for political science?" *Perspectives on Politics* 14:4 (2016), pp. 1054-1066.

Recommended:

*James Mahoney, "After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research," *World Politics* 62:1 (January 2010), pp. 120-147. [A basic introduction to much of what is to come in this course]

*Achen, Christopher. "Why Do We Need Diversity in the Political Methodology Society?" *The Political Methodologist* 21:2 (2014), pp. 25-28.

*Mona Lena Krook. *Teaching Gender and Politics: Feminist Methods in Political Science*. *Qualitative Methods* 7:1 (2009), pp. 24-29.

Zuberi, Tukufu, and Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, eds. *White logic, white methods: Racism and methodology*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2008.

Week 2 (Jan 23)

Concepts, indicators, measures

KKV Ch 2 (pp 49-74), Ch 5 (pp150-68). [A refresher on measurement à la KKV -- i.e. with a focus on efficiency and bias in the context of random variables]

*Goertz, Gary. *Social Science Concepts: New and Completely Revised Edition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (2020), Chapters 1-3.

*Sartori, Giovanni. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *The American Political Science Review* 64:4 (1970), pp. 1033-46 [you can skim the rest].

*Locke, Richard, and Kathleen Thelen. "Apples and Oranges Revisited: Contextualized Comparisons and the Study of Comparative Labor Politics" in *Politics & Society* 23:3 (1995), pp. 337-367.

Exercise: Pick a concept that is used in political science (or your home discipline, if you are not a political scientist) that you think is particularly well operationalized and measured (by at least one author). It could be very abstract (e.g. justice, regime), very concrete (e.g., occupation, campaign advertisement), or something in between (e.g. social cleavage, political socialization, stability). Diagram the concept's dimensions, specify the measures, and discuss the intension/extension. What is it about the concept and/or its operationalization that makes it work well?

Recommended:

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

*"Symposium: Conceptualizing and Measuring Ethnic Identity." *Qualitative Methods* 7:1 (2009), pp. 29-45.

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

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

Carmines, Edward and Richard Zeller. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications (1979).

Week 3 (Jan 30)

Making data

Saldaña, Johnny. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (2015).

The entire book is assigned, but you may want to skim Ch 2 after p. 57 (unless you are interested in audio or visual sources); some of Ch 3 pp. 124-197 (skim types of coding that are of little interest to you); and Ch 4 and Ch 5 (which are geared toward grounded theorizing, which is less frequently used in the empirical subfields of political science).

*Reay, Trish, Asma Zafar, Pedro Monteiro, Vern Glaser, Tammar B. Zilber, John M. Amis, Johanna Mair. "Presenting Findings from Qualitative Research: One Size Does Not Fit All!" *The production of*

managerial knowledge and organizational theory: new approaches to writing, producing and consuming theory 59 (2019), pp. 201-216

Exercise:

Locate a small body of short texts, images, or artifacts (e.g. recent op-eds in the DP, emails from professors, t-shirts in your drawer, billboards on your way to campus). 5-10 items is plenty. Pick a method of coding and apply it; write an analytic memo.

Week 4 (Feb 6)

Explanation

*Gerring, John. *Social Science Methodology*, 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press (2012), Chapter 8 ("Causal Arguments").

King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1994), Chapter 3.

*Copi, Irving M, and Carl Cohen. "Causal Connections: Mill's Methods of Experimental Inquiry." In *Introduction to Logic*. London: Macmillan (1994), Chapter 12.

*Wendt, Alexander. "On Constitution and Causation in International Relations." *Review of International Studies* 24:5 (1998), pp. 101-118.

*Mahoney, James. "Strategies of Causal Inference in Small-N Analysis." *Sociological Methods and Research* 28:4 (2000), pp. 387-424.

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

Exercise: Write down a substantive causal or constitutive question. Concoct a plausible variable-centered *and* mechanism-centered answer for that question. Then say what empirical observations would be needed, and why, to convince you that each of these explanations is correct. Note: this is harder than it sounds! You may want to draw one or more pictures to accompany this exercise.

Recommended:

*Mahoney, James. "Toward a Unified Theory of Causality," *Comparative Political Studies* 41:4/5 (2008), pp. 412-436.

*Grzymala-Busse, Anna. "Time Will Tell? Temporality and the Analysis of Causal Mechanisms and Processes." *Comparative Political Studies* 44:9 (2011), pp. 1267-97.

*McAdam, Douglas, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly. "Methods for Measuring Mechanisms of Contention" *Qualitative Sociology* 31:4 (2008), pp. 307-331.

*Falleti, Tulia and Julia Lynch. "From Process to Mechanism: Varieties of Disaggregation." *Qualitative Sociology* 31:4 (2008), pp. 333-339.

Week 5 (Feb 13)

Case studies (1)

*George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press (2004), Chapter 4.

*Campbell, Donald. "Degrees of Freedom and the Case Study." *Comparative Political Studies* 8 (1975), pp. 178-193.

*Gerring, John. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press (2007), Chapter 3 ("What is a Case Study Good For?").

*Gerring, John. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press (2007), Chapter 5 ("Techniques for Choosing Cases").

*Soss, Joe. "On Casing a Study Versus Studying a Case." In Erica Simmons and Nicholas Rush Smith, eds. *Rethinking Comparison*. (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming October 2021).

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

*Lynch, Julia. "Can One Country Be Better Than Two for Comparative Politics?" *Italian Politics and Society* 60 (2005), pp. 8-10.

Exercise: Each student will be assigned a technique for selecting cases from Gerring Chapter 5. For the exercise, outline a lesson plan for a 5-7 minute lesson in which you will teach the case selection technique to the rest of the class. Your lesson plan should include an explanation of when to use the technique and what it is especially good for; how to go about selecting cases; and an existing or made-up example of its application to a research problem.

Week 6 (Feb 20)

Case studies (2)

King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1994), Chapter 4.

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

*Collier, David, James Mahoney, and Jason Seawright. "Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias" RSI Supplemental Chapter 1.

*MacLean, Lauren Morris. *Informal Institutions and Citizenship in Rural Africa*. (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Chapter 1.

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

*Slater, Dan and Daniel Ziblatt. "The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Comparison."

Comparative Political Studies 46:10(2013), pp. 1301-1327. [Read first 14 pages; skim the rest.]

*Ruzzene, Attilia. "Drawing lessons from case studies by enhancing comparability." *Philosophy of Social Science* 42:1 (2012), pp. 99-120.

Exercise: Select a quantitative study that you admire. Design and briefly describe a study using comparative case studies that could research (more or less) the same question as the original quantitative study. Say (1) why you selected the cases that you selected, using what method of case selection; (2) what your case-based study would accomplish that the quantitative study could not, and why; and (3) what advantages the original, quantitative approach has over your case-based approach.

** *This type of question appears frequently on the CP comps. This is a good opportunity to get feedback on a practice answer.*

Week 7 (Feb 27)

Process tracing

*Hall, Peter A. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics." In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press (2003), pp. 337-372.

*Beach, Derek and Rasmus Brun Pedersen. "The Three Different Variants of Process Tracing and Their Uses." Chapter 2 in *Process-tracing methods: Foundations and guidelines*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (2013).

*Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel. "Process Tracing: From Philosophical Roots to Best Practices." Chapter 1 in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (2013, Cambridge University Press).

*Collier, David. "Process Tracing: Introduction and Exercises." To Accompany *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, 2nd Ed. Beta Version (September 22, 2010). [You do NOT have to do the exercises, but DO read the Sherlock Holmes story.]

*Wilde, Melissa. "How Culture Mattered at Vatican II: Collegiality Trumps Authority in the Council's Social Movement Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 69:4 (2009), pp. 576- 602.

*Lynch, Julia. *Age in the Welfare State: The Origins of Social Spending on Pensioners, Workers and Children*. New York: Cambridge University Press (2006), Chapter 6.

Exercise: Consider the article by Melissa Wilde. What is the process that Wilde traces, and why does she need to trace it? How does Wilde go about "tracing the process:" What argumentative steps does the analysis go through? What kinds of tests does she employ? What techniques did she use to generate the evidence used in the process tracing?

Paper Option 1: Identify a process that is of political significance. Start by identifying, for yourself, the practical, operational steps will you need to go through to trace the process. In the paper, trace the process, and make a political science argument based on your findings.

Warning: Many students have great difficulty with process tracing, but don't realize that

they are not doing it successfully until it's too late. I recommend submitting a draft to me before the due date in order to make sure that you are on the right track.

Recommended:

*Slater, Dan and Erica Simmons. "Informative Regress: Critical Antecedents in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Political Studies* 43:7 (2010), pp. 886-917.

*Morgan, Kimberly. "Process tracing and the causal identification revolution." *New Political Economy* 21:5 (2016)

*Goertz, Gary and James Mahoney. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Causal Mechanisms and Process Tracing." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 8:2 (2010), pp. 24-30.

Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (2013, Cambridge University Press), entire.

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

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

Week 8 (Mar 13)

In-depth interviewing

*Lamont, Michèle and Ann Swidler. "Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing." *Qualitative Sociology* 37: (2014), pp. 153-171. [you can skim the first part about methodological debates in sociology]

Mosley, Layna, ed. *Interview Research in Political Science*. Cornell University Press (2013). Introduction (Mosley), Chapters 1 (Lynch), 2 (Bleich and Pekkanen), 11 (Leech et al).

Rubin, Herbert and Irene Rubin. *Qualitative Interviewing. The Art of Hearing Data*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (2012), Chapters 6-9.

*Soss, Joe. "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered View of Interviewing for Interpretive Research." Chapter 8 in Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, 2nd ed. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe (2014), pp.161-182.

Exercise: Think of a question – ANY question - to which you would like to know the answer. Then write several interview questions that would help you elicit the information you need to answer the question. Find a few examples of the types of people you would need to interview, and ASK THE QUESTIONS. (Don't worry about representative sampling.) Which questions elicited the most useful information? Why? How did you feel while you were asking the questions? How did your respondents seem to feel when they were answering them?

Paper Option 2: Use data from in-depth interviews utilizing open-ended questions to answer a question with some relevance for political science. Your paper should include (a) a brief presentation of the question you set out to answer, (b) a description and justification of your sampling procedures (c) an explanation of your coding scheme and data analysis, (d) a presentation of your results, and (e) a discussion of any potential limitations of your study. You should also include an appendix, which does not count toward the page limit, listing the main questions you needed in order to answer your research question (some of which you may have discovered you needed only after you have done a few interviews).

Recommended:

*Nichols, Michael. *The Lost Art of Listening*. New York: The Guilford Press (1995), pp. 61-68, 125-35.

*Berg, Bruce L. *Qualitative Research methods for the Social Sciences*, 7th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon 2009), pp. 127-150.

*Cyr, Jennifer. "The pitfalls and promise of focus groups as a data collection method." *Sociological Methods and Research* 45:2 (2015), pp. 231-259.

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

*Hochschild, Jennifer. *What's Fair? American Beliefs about Distributive Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, pp. 15-45 and 292-308.

Week 9 (Mar 20)

Ethnography and participant observation

*Geertz, Clifford, *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books (1973), Ch 1.

*Emerson, Robert, Rachel Fretz, and Linda Shaw. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press (1995), Chapters 1-3 (through p. 52).

*Wedeen, Lisa. "Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13 (2010), pp. 255-272.

*Simmons, Erica and Nicholas Rush Smith. "Comparison with an Ethnographic Sensibility" *PS* (2017) 50:1 pp. 126-30.

*Pader, Ellen. "Seeing with an Ethnographic Sensibility: Explorations Beneath the Surface of Public Policies." In Yanow, Dvora and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, 2nd ed. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe (2014), Chapter 10.

*Behl, Natasha. "Diasporic researcher: An autoethnographic analysis of gender and race in political science." *Politics, Groups and Identities* 5:4 (2017), pp. 580-598.

*Pachirat, Timothy. "The Political in Political Ethnography: Dispatches from the Kill Floor." In Schatz, Edward, ed. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (2010), Chapter 6.

Exercise: Spend at least one hour observing something that is of political or social significance. It's best to do this exercise in person rather than online if at all possible. What did you do/see/hear/smell/taste/feel? What did you learn? (How) did your presence affect what you saw or learned?

Paper Option 3: Design and undertake a small study involving ethnographic or participant observation. You may observe/participate in an online activity for this study. Depending on the density of the data environment in which you are observing, plan to spend 4-8 hours observing. Write up your results. Consider what you learned from this study that other methods would not have yielded, and vice versa.

Recommended:

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

*Fenno, Richard. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company (1978), Appendix - Notes on Method: Participant Observation.

Star, Susan Leigh. "The ethnography of infrastructure." *The American Behavioral Scientist*; 43:3 (1999), pp. 377-391.

Week 10 (Mar 27)

History as data

*Lustick, Ian. "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 90:3 (1996), pp. 605-18.

*Thies, Cameron. "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives* 3:4 (2002), pp. 351-372.

*Vitalis, Robert. "The Past is Another Country." In Ellen Perecman and Sara Curran, eds. *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: Essays & Bibliographic Sources on Research Design and Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (2006), Chapter 1.

*Kim, Diana S. "Taming Abundance: Doing Digital Archival Research (as Political Scientists)." *PS: Political Science & Politics* (2022) 55(3): 530-38.

*"From the Archives: Innovative Use of Data in Comparative Historical Research." *Trajectories: Newsletter of the Comparative Historical Section of the ASA* (2008), contribution by **Wilde**.

* Farmer, Ashley. "Archiving While Black." <https://www.aaihs.org/archiving-while-black/>

*Harrison, Hope. "Inside the SED Archives: A Researcher's Diary." *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* 2 (1992), begins on p. 20.

Recommended:

*Trachtenberg, Marc. *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (2006), Chapter 5.

*Subotić, J. (2021). Ethics of archival research on political violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 58(3), 342–354.

*Finnegan, Cara A. “What Is This a Picture Of?: Some Thoughts on Images and Archives.” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2006, pp. 116–23.

*Gaikwad, Nikhar, Veronica Herrera and Robert Mickey. “Text-Based Sources: Final Report of QTD Working Group II.1” December 2018.

Archival Silences website.

<https://humanities.princeton.edu/humanities-council-programs/working-groups/humanities-council-working-groups/archival-silences/>

Exercise: Think of a concrete research question in political science (or your home discipline) that interests you. Write it down. Imagine an archive that you think would help you answer this question, and explain what would be in it and why. Then identify a real archive in the world that comes close to your ideal. Learn as much as you can about the structure of that archive and its rules of operation. Finally, based on this information, say whether this archive would be helpful to you in answering your question.

Paper Option 5: Locate an archive that you suspect will allow you to answer a specific research question. Enumerate a sample of materials from that archive that you believe will help you to answer your question: what documents would you request, and for what purpose? (Your sample may comprise the universe of all potentially relevant materials, but you will need to explain what is “relevant” and why.) Request and read these documents (you may read a sub-sample if necessary), and do your best to answer the question that you set out to answer. Discuss any limitations that the archive or your sampling technique imposed on your ability to make good causal or descriptive inferences.

Recommended:

*Trachtenberg, Marc. *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (2006), Chapter 5.

Week 11 (Apr 3)

Field Experiments, Natural Experiments, and Quasi-Experiments

*Campbell, Donald and H. Laurence Ross, “The Connecticut Crackdown on Speeding: Time-Series Data in Quasi-Experimental Analysis.” *Law & Society Review* 3:1 (1968), pp. 33-54.

*McDermott, Rose. “Experimental Methods in Political Science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* V. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews (2002), pp. 31-61.

*Dunning, Thad. “Design-Based Inference: Beyond the Pitfalls of Regression Analysis.” In Brady, Henry and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield (2010), Chapter 10.

*Posner, Daniel. "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Review* 98:4 (2004), pp. 529-545.

*MacLean, Lauren Morris. *Informal Institutions and Citizenship in Rural Africa*. (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Chapter 1 (review) and Chapter 2.

Exercise: Think of a political science question you would like to answer, and then imagine a scenario in which you could use a *field experiment or natural experiment* (NOT a survey experiment or lab experiment) to answer it. Make sure that you identify what the treatment is, what the units of observation are, and how the treatment is assigned.

Paper Option 4: Design and conduct an experiment or quasi-experiment to answer a social question. Write up your results and assess the experiment's validity and any limitations of your research design.

Recommended:

*Dunning, Thad. "Natural and Field Experiments: The Role of Qualitative Methods." *Qualitative Methods* 6:2 (2008), pp. 17-23.

*Milgram, Stanley, Leon Mann and Susan Harter, "The Lost-Letter Technique: A Tool of Social Research." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 29:3 (1965), pp. 437-438.

Dunning, Thad. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences. A Design-Based Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press (2012).

Druckman, James et al. *Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press (2011). [Mainly lab and survey experiments.]

Mutz, Diana C. *Population-Based Survey Experiments*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (2011).

Week 12 (Apr 10)

Content analysis and discourse analysis

Krippendorff, Karl, *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (2013 – but earlier editions are also fine). [You can skim the earlier theory chapters, focus on the how-to aspects.]

*Krippendorff, Karl. "Testing the Reliability of Content Analysis Data: What is Involved and Why." In *The Content Analysis Reader*, ed. Karl Krippendorff and Mary Angela Bock.. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (2009).

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

*Clifford, Scott, and Jennifer Jerit. "How Words Do the Work of Politics: Moral Foundations Theory and the Debate over Stem Cell Research." *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 75, no. 3, 2013, pp. 659–671.

Exercise: Think of a question that you would like to answer using content analysis or discourse analysis of materials that can be accessed easily (i.e. no web scraping) on the web

sites of one or more academic journals. Write a sampling procedure and codebook that could be used by a partner in class to conduct a miniature content or discourse analysis to answer this question. Construct an Excel spreadsheet into which your partner can enter the results of her/his coding. [Feel free to exceed the normal 2-page limit for this assignment, but keep in mind that your partner will only have about 20 minutes to collect your data for you.] We will use these materials in class, so make sure that they are in a readily accessible format when you come to class.

Paper Option 6: Design and undertake a small research project involving content or discourse analysis. Be sure to specify any sampling or coding procedures (although you may use different words to describe these practices if you are conducting discourse vs. content analysis). Write up your methods and results. Include your codebook as an appendix, which will not count toward the page limit.

Recommended:

Krippendorff, Karl and Mary Angela Bock. *The Content Analysis Reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage (2009).

*Shapiro, Gilbert and John Markoff. "A Matter of Definition." In Carl Roberts, ed. *Text Analysis for the Social Sciences: Methods for Drawing Statistical Inferences from Texts and Transcripts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum (1997), Chapter 1.

Fairclough, Norman and Isabela Ietcu Fairclough. *Political Discourse Analysis*. New York: Routledge (2012).

*McMillan, Sally. "The Microscope and the Moving Target: The Challenge of Applying Content Analysis to the World Wide Web." *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 77:1 (2000), pp. 80-99.

*Jan Vansina. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press (1985), Chapter 7.

Week 13 (Apr 17)

Research ethics

*Goodman, Howard. "Studying prison experiments." *Baltimore Sun*, July 21 1998.

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

*National Science Foundation. "Interpreting the Common Rule for the Protection of Human Subjects for Behavioral and Social Science Research." (No date). www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/hsfaqs.jsp

*University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board. "Is IRB Review Required?" (March 2009) <https://irb.upenn.edu/sites/default/files/Is%20IRB%20Review%20Required.pdf>

MacLean, Lauren Morris. "Neither God, Nor Native: The Power of the Interviewer in Political Science Research." In Mosley, Layna, ed. *Interview Research in Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (2013), Chapter 5.

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

*Teele, Dawn. "Reflections on the Ethics of Field Experiments." In Dawn Teele, ed. *Field Experiments and Their Critics: Essays on the Uses and Abuses of Experimentation in the Social Sciences*. New Haven: Yale University Press (2014): 115-140.

*"Symposium: Transparency in Qualitative and Multi-Method Research." In *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research*, Spring 2015, Vol. 13, No. 1.

Exercise: Imagine three potential dissertation topics that you could imagine doing and that might be ethically problematic. What would make these projects problematic? For which of these would IRB review be required? How could you modify the IRB review process to ensure that the proposed work would be conducted ethically, or not at all?

Week 14 (Apr 24)

Field work

*Lieberman, Evan, Julia Lynch and Marc Morjé Howard. "Symposium: Field Research." *Qualitative Methods* 2:1 (2004), pp. 2-15.

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean and Benjamin L. Read. *Field Research in Political Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press (2014). Chapters 1-4, 10.

See also Kapiszewski et al's web site on Digital Fieldwork:

<http://sigla.georgetown.domains/digitalfieldwork/>

*Symposium on "Fieldwork in Political Science: Encountering Challenges and Crafting Solutions." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 47:2 (2014).

*Harbin, M. Brielle. "Who's Able to Do Political Science Work? My Experience with Exit Polling and What It Reveals about Issues of Race and Equity." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 54: 1 (2021), pp. 144-146.

*Lin, Ann Chih. *Reform in the Making: The Implementation of Social Policy in Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (2000). Appendix 2. On Being Who You Are: Credibility, Bias, and Good Research.

*Krause, P., Szekely, O., Bloom, M., Christia, F., Daly, S., Lawson, C., . . . Zakayo, A. (2021). "COVID-19 and Fieldwork: Challenges and Solutions." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 54(2), 264-269. doi:10.1017/S1049096520001754

Exercise: Think of a research project that involves field research and that is of a scope appropriate for a roughly 30-page seminar paper, dissertation chapter, or journal article. Say where you would do your field research, and estimate how much time and money you will need for each field site. Construct a "to-get" list to guide your field research, and identify any items that can be done *before* leaving for the field.

Recommended:

Barrett, Christopher and Jeffrey Cason. *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press (1997).

Silvia, Paul. *How to Write a Lot: A Practical Guide to Productive Academic Writing*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association (2007).

Evans, Elrina and Caroline Grant, eds. *Mama. PhD. Women Write about Motherhood and Academic Life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press (2009).