

**Political Science 276**  
**Qualitative Methods**  
**Friday 9-12**  
**Stephan Haggard**

This course provides an introduction to multi-method research in political science, but with an emphasis on its qualitative component. It approaches the issue from two angles: as an emerging body of methodological work on how qualitative techniques can be used to support causal claims; and by considering examples of good empirical work. Although taught in 10, 3-hour sessions the course is broken into four modules and 20 segments.

Requirements for the course include the following. First, all students will write two short assignments (2-4 pages) based on the prompt or another question that might interest you. These will count for 30% of your grade (15%) each.

In addition, you can choose one of the following (60%):

- Three additional short assignments drawn entirely from the reading.
- A prospectus (10-15 pages) for a qualitative design, detailing the theory you want to test and the data that you would need to do the work.
- A proposal and pilot of a qualitative dataset (again, 10-15 pages).
- A chapter from your dissertation that involves a qualitative design.
- Any other proposal that is reasonable.

The remainder of the grade—10%--will be for participation and quizzes if there is an indication that reading is not being done.

Three books are suggested for purchase. Parts of Gary Goertz, *Multimethod Research, Causal Mechanism and Case Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Princeton University Press, 2017) will be assigned but I suggest you purchase and read the whole book in parallel with the course; it is an excellent guide. We will also be reading all of Katherine Kramer, *The Politics of Resentment: Rural Consciousness in Wisconsin and the Rise of Scott Walker* (Chicago 2016).

There are three books from which we are reading roughly half of the book, and they will be posted on Canvas as there are no stable URLs for them. If you would prefer to have hard copies, they are: Elizabeth Wood, *Forging Democracy from Below: Insurgent Transitions in South Africa and El Salvador*, Daniel Ziblatt, *Conservative Parties and the Growth of Democracy*; and Stephan Haggard and Robert Kaufman, *Dictators and Democrats: Masses, Elites and Regime Change*. For those interested in IR, I strongly recommend Todd Sechser and Matthew Fuhrmann, *Nuclear Weapons and Coercive Diplomacy*.

Office hours: W 11:00-12:30, Th. 11:30-1:30 RBC 1425. A sign-up sheet is posted on the door or shoot me an email and I will pencil you in; also by appointment.

## September 27. Introduction: The Lay of the Land (Week 1)

### Session 1. The Core Debates

“Causal inference” is increasingly associated with a particular research design: the randomized controlled trial and the identification of average treatment effects within populations. Alternative approaches, for example using observational data, are effectively ranked by the extent to which they approach this ideal. The premise of this class is that this assertion is fundamentally normative, that experimental designs yield results that are also ultimately correlational, and that those findings—no less than case studies—are vulnerable to serious problems of external validity. We also have an interest in singular causation (“why did Y happen?”) as well as findings related to populations (“what is the average treatment effect of X on Y?”). There are a variety of alternative ways of thinking about causation. The first session outlines the evolution of the field and some of this basic terrain.

Nancy Cartwright, “How to Learn about Causation in the Single Case,” Durham University CHES Working Paper 2017-04 (December 2017) [here](#).

James Mahoney, “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research,” *Political Analysis* 14 (2006): 227-249 [here](#).

### ***Recommended***

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

Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Cornell University Press, 1997), a quirky guide by a prominent IR theorist that is still relevant.

Henry Brady and David Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Lanham: Littleman and Rowfield, 2010. First published in 2004, this was the opening salvo against KKV.

John Gerring, *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. (Cambridge University Press, 2012), Ch. 12, “Varying Approaches to Causal Inference,” pp. 327-358.

Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney, *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences* (Princeton University Press, 2012).

### Session 2. Concept Formation, Measurement Validity and “Mere” Description

The emphasis on causal inference has shifted attention away from concept formation, measurement validity and “mere” description. But concepts are at the core of both qualitative and quantitative analysis and inferences will be flawed unless concepts are coherent and

measured properly. In addition to a general treatment, we look at two exercises in concept formation, one of potential DVs, the other of a chosen IV.

Robert Adcock and David Collier, "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research," *American Political Science Review* 95, 3 (September 2001): 529-546 [here](#).

Susan Stokes, Thad Dunning, Marcelo Nazareno and Valeria Brusco, *Brokers, Voters and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 3-22 [here](#).

Jessica Weeks, *Dictators at War and Peace* (Cornell University Press, 2014), Ch. 1 (14-36) and Ch. 2 (37-41 only) [here](#).

### *Recommended*

David Collier and John Gerring, eds. *Concepts and Method in Social Science* (Routledge 2009), an extended treatment of Sartori's contribution including original essays.

Gary Goertz, *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide* (Princeton 2006).

John Gerring, "Mere Description," *British Journal of Political Science* 42 (2012): 721-46.

Sean Yom. "From Methodology to Practice: Inductive Iteration in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies*, 28:5 (2015), 616-644.

Marcus Kreuzer, "The Structure of Description: Evaluating Descriptive Inferences and Conceptualizations," *Perspectives on Politics* 17, 1 (March 2019) [here](#).

**Assignment.** Outline the logic of the typologies developed by Weeks or Stokes. On what dimensions does the concept in question vary? Does the typology incorporate causal assumptions?

## **October 4. More Basics: Bayesian Approaches and Within-Case Causal Inference (Week 2)**

### **Session 1. Bayesian Approaches: The Inevitability of Iteration**

Qualitative researchers frequently talk about iteration: the inevitability of moving back and forth between theory and data. This process of iteration has recently been formalized by the adoption of Bayesian approaches to qualitative research.

Tasha Fairfield and Andrew Charman, "A Dialogue with the Data: The Bayesian Foundations of Iterative Research in Qualitative Social Science," *Perspectives on Politics* 17, 1 (2019) [here](#).

### *Recommended*

For a formal treatment of the Bayesian logic, see Macartan Humphreys and Alan Jacobs, “Mixing Methods: A Bayesian Approach,” *APSR* 109, 4 (November 2015).

Tasha Fairfield and Andrew Charman, “Explicit Bayesian Analysis for Process Tracing: Guidelines, Opportunities, and Caveats,” *Political Analysis* (2017).

## ***Module I: Process Tracing, Within-Case Causal Inference and Case Selection***

### **Session 2. The Mechanism Approach to Causation and Within-Case Causal Inference**

Goertz argues that within-case causal inference is the main function of cases in the social sciences. We start by considering the basics of the process-tracing or causal process observations approach, which rests on a “mechanisms” conception of cause, and the rapid growth of mechanisms approaches in the program evaluation literature. I will also talk about the role of counterfactual analysis and narrative.

Derek Beach and Rasmus Brun Pedersen, *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines* (University of Michigan Press, 2013), Chs. 2, 3 and 5 [here](#).

Brad Astbury and Frans L. Leeuw, “Unpacking Black Boxes: Mechanisms and Theory Building in Evaluation,” *American Journal of Evaluation* 3, 3: 363-381 [here](#).

#### *Recommended*

David Collier, “Understanding Process Tracing,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44,4 (2011): 823-30 and the related exercises [here](#).

James Mahoney, “The Logic of Process Tracing in the Social Sciences,” *Sociological Methods and Research* 41, 4 (2012) 570-597.

Jack Levy, “Counterfactuals and Case Studies” in Box-Steffenmeister, Brady and Collier, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* (2008).

Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey Checkel eds. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge, 2015. Has a number of examples of process-tracing in action.

Derek Beach and Rasmus Brun Pedersen. *Causal Case Studies: Foundations and Guidelines for Comparing, Matching, and Tracing* (University of Michigan Press, 2016).

Beach, Derek and Rasmus Brun Pedersen. *Process-tracing methods* (University of Michigan Press, 2019).

## **October 11. Case Selection**

### **Sessions 1 and 2. The Logic of Case Selection in Multimethod Designs**

Much of the remainder of the course will work through methods and examples of conducting within-case or cross-case qualitative analysis. However, for most students at UCSD these will be paired with quantitative analysis in a multi-method design. We therefore need to match a discussion of within case causal inference and comparative analysis (taken up in more detail below) with an understanding of how to select cases from various quantitative designs, whether experimental or observational.

Gary Goertz, *Multimethod Research, Causal Mechanism and Case Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Princeton University Press, 2017), Ch. 3.

Jason Seawright, *Multi-Method Social Science: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Tools* (Cambridge University Press, 2016), entire [here](#).

### *Recommended*

Evan Lieberman, “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research.” *American Political Science Review* 99, 3 (August 2005) [here](#).

Two standard treatments that bear reading are Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (MIT Press, 2004) and John Gerring, *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices* (Cambridge, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2017).

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

Colin Elman, John Gerring and James Mahoney, *Case Study Research: Putting the Quant into the Qual*. Special issue of *Sociological Methods and Research* 45,3 (August 2016) discusses case analysis in the context of a variety of different statistical techniques, including matching. [Here](#).

**Assignment (strongly recommended).** On p. 83, Seawright outlines the menu of choices for selecting cases. Pick one and discuss its logic and drawbacks, taking issue with Seawright if you think it appropriate.

## **October 18. Within-Case Causal Inference: Examples (Week 3)**

The standard use for process tracing is to test whether cases plausibly support causal mechanisms stipulated in theories and demonstrated through panel or cross-sectional quantitative designs. However, probabilistic models often assume linear or “linear like” causal relationships or relatively simple interactions. Qualitative designs may have inherent advantages for testing complex, multi-stage causal theories; as a result, they open the possibility of thinking about such theories in the first place.

### **Session 1. Using Process Tracing to Test for Causal Mechanisms**

Kenneth Schulz, *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy* (Cambridge University Press, 2001), Chs. 5-7 [here](#).

## **Session 2. Testing Complex Process-Oriented Theories**

Elizabeth Wood, *Forging Democracy from Below: Insurgent Transitions in South Africa and El Salvador* (Cambridge 2003), Chapters 1-4 and 8. On Canvas.

**Assignment.** In two-three pages, diagram and discuss the causal argument that Wood or Schulz proposes and how it is tested. For Schulz it means outlining the logic of moving from quantitative analysis to case selection: consider the Fashoda case in Chapter Five and *one* of the cases in Chapter Six. For Wood, this involves considering the arc of the four chapters on a single case.

## **October 25. Game Theory, Behavioral Approaches and Qualitative Design (Week 4)**

For some time, there has been an extended discussion among methodologists in political science about how to test formal models. This effort has largely gelled around a project called Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models or EITM (website is [here](#); Granato provides an introduction and Goertz Ch. 6 offers a critique). But it is a well-known secret that many game theorists test their work through qualitative designs, and there have been efforts to systematize the approach (for example, in the “analytic narratives” project). These efforts typically attempt to show that some case demonstrates or even validates the theory through within-case causal inference. What are the nature of these tests and what evidence is required for them, in particular about mental states such as preferences and beliefs? In addition, we need to take into account the additional complications raised by the emergence of the behavioral revolution, particularly in international relations, which has introduced a variety of individual level characteristics that are theoretically salient, such as time and risk preferences, beliefs about fairness and emotion.

### **Session 1. Game Theory and Qualitative Designs I: Basic Logic and Rationalist Examples**

Peter Lorentzen, Taylor Fravel and Jack Paine, “Qualitative Investigation of Theoretical Models: The Value of Process Tracing,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 29, 3 (2017): 467-491 [here](#).

Monica Nalepa, “Capture Commitments: An Analytic Narrative of Transitions with Transitional Justice. *World Politics* 62:341–80 [here](#).

Muhammet Bas and Andrew Coe, “A Dynamnic Theory of Nuclear Proliferation and Preventive War,” *International Organization* 70 (Fall 2016) [here](#). Note that this piece does double-duty, as it is also an outstanding example of large-N qualitative analysis (LNQA).

*Recommended*

For an introduction to the belief-desire model of action and the role of mental states in it, see Jan Elster, *Explaining Social Behavior: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences* (Cambridge 2015).

Gary Goertz, *Multimethod Research, Causal Mechanism and Case Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Princeton University Press, 2017), Ch. 6.

Jim Granato, Melody Lo and M.G Sunny Wong. “A Framework for Unifying Formal and Empirical Analysis. *American Journal of Political Science* 54:783–97.

Robert Bates, Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal and Barry Weingast, *Analytic Narratives* (Princeton University Press, 1998).

For some IR examples of formal theory and cases, see Leslie Johns, “A Servant of Two Masters: Communication and the Selection of International Bureaucrats,” *International Organization* 61 (Spring 2007): 245–275 [here](#); Branislav Slantchev, *Military Threats: The Cost of Coercion and the Price of Peace* (Cambridge 2011), Ch. 6 on the Korean War.

## **Session 2. Behavioral Approaches**

Emilie Hafner-Burton, Stephan Haggard, David A. Lake and David Victor, “The Behavioral Revolution and International Relations,” *International Organization* 71 (Supp. 2017), pp. S1–S31 [here](#).

Rathbun, B., Kertzer, J., & Paradis, M. (2017). Homo Diplomaticus: Mixed-Method Evidence of Variation in Strategic Rationality. *International Organization*, 71(S1), S33-S60 [here](#).

*Recommended.*

Todd H. Hall, “On Provocation: Outrage, International Relations, and the Franco-Prussian War,” *Security Studies*, 26:1 (2017): 1-29 [here](#).

**Assignment.** Pick one of the empirical pieces and describe how the theory is mapped onto to the narrative and qualitative material. What are the parameters of the model that are being tested? What is the nature of the evidence that is—or can—be provided about the mental states of the actors (beliefs, preferences, emotions)?

## **Module II: Comparative Analysis**

### **November 1. Comparative Historical Analysis (Week 5)**

The traditions of comparative historical analysis and historical institutionalism trace their methodological roots to Mill’s *System of Logic*: the methods of agreement, difference [counterintuitively known as the most similar systems design] and the combined method of agreement and difference. The logical underpinnings of Mill’s method open on to conceptions of cause related to necessary, sufficient, necessary and sufficient and the INUS and SUIN



conditions. But comparative historical analysis and historical institutionalism has also raised a variety of other questions, including critical junctures, path dependence and sequencing.

### **Session 1. The Basics**

Kathleen Thelen, “Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 2 (1999), 369-404 [here](#).



Jim Mahoney, “The Logic of Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences,” *Comparative Political Studies* 42, 1 (2009): 114-146 [here](#).

*Recommended.*

Paul Pierson and Theda Skocpol, “Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science,” in Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner, eds., *Political Science: The State of the Discipline* (New York: Norton, 2002), 693-721.

James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschmeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge 2003) and James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen, eds. *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis* (Cambridge 2015) pull together both examples of such work in particular areas and theoretical pieces. Not covered here is the interesting discussion of institutional change opened up by Kathy Thelen in *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain the United States and Japan* (Cambridge 2004) and the concepts of “drift” and “conversion” outlined in Jacob Hacker, Paul Pierson and Kathleen Thelen, “Drift and Conversion: Hidden Faces of Institutional Change” in Mahoney and Thelen 2015.

Sidney Tarrow, “The Strategy of the Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice,” *Comparative Political Studies* 43, 2 (2010) [here](#). This piece is strongly recommended; reviews a number of highly successful examples.

Daniel Slater and Daniel Ziblatt, “The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Comparison.” *Comparative Political Studies* 46:10 (2013): 1301-1327.

Orfeo Fioretos, Tulia G. Falletti, and Adam Sheingate, “Historical Institutionalism in Political Science,” in Fioretos, Falletti, and Sheingate, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Historical Institutionalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Colin Elman, “Explanatory Typologies in Qualitative Studies of International Politics,” *International Organization* 59 (Spring 2005): 293-326 [here](#).

### **Session 2. Critical Junctures and Path Dependence**

Giovanni Capoccia and Daniel Keleman, “The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism,” *World Politics* 59 (2007): 341-369 [here](#).



Leonard Arriola, *Multiethnic Coalitions in Africa: Business Financing of Opposition Election Campaigns* (Cambridge 2013), Chapters 2-4 [here](#).

Kellee Tsai, "Adaptive Informal Institutions and Endogenous Institutional Change in China." *World Politics* 59 (2006): 116-141 [here](#).

*Recommended.*

Paul Pierson, "Positive Feedback and Path Dependence," in Pierson, *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton University Press, 2004), 17-53.

Boas, Taylor. "Conceptualizing Continuity and Change: The Composite-Standard Model of Path Dependence," *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 19 (2007): 33-54.

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

Hillel David Soifer, "The Causal Logic of Critical Junctures," *Comparative Political Studies* 45 (2012): 1572-1597.

**Assignment.**

- Arriola makes reference to critical junctures and path dependence in his comparative analysis of Kenya and Cameroon. What is the logic of the critical juncture explanation, and what are the mechanisms explaining the observed path dependence?
- What is the logic of Tsai's argument concerning institutional change? Could it be quantified, and if so, what would the benefits and drawbacks be?

## **November 8. Comparative Historical Analysis Continued (Week 6)**

We continue with a sophisticated example that combines within-case and cross-case historical analysis before turning briefly to Qualitative Comparative Analysis or QCA. This field has exploded and become quite technical, with distinctive softwares and tests that are increasingly quantitative in form. I will outline the logic and we will consider a prominent fuzzy-set example that is rooted in case analysis.

### **Session 1. QCA**

Presentation by Alex Gomide on QCA. Read Roberto Rocha Coelho Pires and Alexandre Gomide, "A "New Democratic-Developmental State" in Brazil? A comparative analysis of governance arrangements, state capacities and policy results."

*Recommended:*

James Mahoney, "Long-run Development and the Legacy of Colonialism in Latin America," *American Journal of Sociology* (July 2003): 50-106 [here](#).

Carsten Q. Schneider and Claudius Wagemann. *Set-Theoretic Methods for the Social Sciences: A Guide to Qualitative Comparative Analysis*. (Cambridge University Press 2012) and Schneider's syllabus to his advanced course for a sense of the field [here](#). For a critical symposium on the topic—and Collier's objections--see the symposium in the QMMR Newsletter [here](#).

## **Session 2: Large-N Qualitative Analysis**

Many phenomena of interest to political scientists involve relatively rare events: wars and civil wars, financial crises, famines, genocides, regime changes. As a result, there has been a new interest in whether both theories and extant quantitative tests might be interrogated through large-N qualitative designs and even those that interrogate *all* cases of the phenomenon in question. These sessions consider the logic of this approach, including “thin” case coding as a type of within-case causal inference and the use of distributions and anomalous cases to develop theory and refine testing.

Gary Goertz, *Multimethod Research, Causal Mechanism and Case Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Princeton University Press, 2017), Ch. 6.

AND

For those interested in comparative politics Stephan Haggard and Robert Kaufman, *Dictators and Democrats: Masses, Elites and Regime Change* (Princeton University Press, 2016), chapters 1-3. [here](#). Scan the dataset at [here](#).

OR

For those interested in IR, Todd Sechser and Matthew Fuhrmann, *Nuclear Weapons and Coercive Diplomacy* (Cambridge University Press, 2017) [here](#). Skim 1 and 2, read Part III (Roadmap and Chapters 5 and 6).

*Recommended.*

Gary Goertz and Stephan Haggard, “Generalization, case studies, and within-case causal inference: Large-N Qualitative Analysis (LNQA),” forthcoming, *Oxford Handbook of the Philosophy of Political Science*.

For other IR examples, in addition to Bas and Coe (game theory week) see Jack Snyder J and E. D. Borghard. “The cost of empty threats: a penny, not a pound.” *American Political Science Review* 105, 3 (2011): 437–456 [here](#). Allison Carnegie and Austin Carson, “The Spotlight's Harsh Glare: Rethinking Publicity and International Order,” *international Organization* 72 (Summer 2018).

## ***Module III. Methods of Qualitative Analysis: The Variety of Data***

### **November 15. Documentary and Interview Sources (Week 8)**

In this module, we take a different approach to the problem of qualitative designs: a consideration of what the source material is from which qualitative accounts are constructed. As we have already seen from examples such as Stasavage, “qualitative” accounts can be anchored by quantitative data, particularly time trends on parameters of interest. But we often want to explain discrete events and thus actions, which can require chronologies that can be very tight (think of actions surrounding a crisis or a change in political regime). Depending on the nature of the theory being tested, we sometimes want to know the preferences, beliefs, intentions and other mental states of the actors. We consider the issues surrounding use of both primary and secondary documents and interviews of various sorts in getting at these issues.

### **Session 1. Using Primary and Secondary Documents**

Cameron Thies, “A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations.” *International Studies Perspectives* 3 (2002): 351–372 [here](#).

Keren Yarhi-Milo, *Knowing the Adversary: Leaders, Intelligence and Assessment of Intentions in International Relations* (Princeton 2014), Ch. 1 (14-35) and Chs. 8-10 [here](#).

*Recommended.*

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

Andrew Moravcsik, “Did Power Politics Cause European Integration? Realist Theory Meets Qualitative Methods,” *Security Studies* 22:4 (2014), 773-790 and Sebastian Rosato, “Theory and Evidence in *Europe United: A Response to my Critics*,” *Security Studies* 22:4 (2014), pp. 802-820. An exchange in which Moravcsik argues Rosato’s realist model of European integration is fundamentally flawed because of selective use of primary and secondary evidence.

### **Session 2. The Variety of Interview Data**

Diana Kapiszewski, Lauren M. Maclean and Benjamin Read, *Field Research in Political Science* (Cambridge University Press, 2015), Ch. 6 (Ch. 7 is on ethnography if interested). On TED

Oisín Tansey, “Process Tracing and Elite Interviewing: A Case for Non-Probability Sampling,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40, 4 (2007) [here](#).

*Recommended.*

Steiner Kvale and Svend Brinkmann, *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing* (Sage, 2009)

Colin Robson, *Real World Research* 3rd edition (Wiley, 2011).

**Assignment.** Under what theoretical circumstances would primary or interview data not only be desirable but necessary to make causal claims? If appropriate, draw on Yarhi-Milo.

## **November 22. Qualitative Work in Support of Field Experiments and Ethnographic Approaches (Week 9)**

Ethnography is not the preserve of interpretivists alone; it can also be used to support experimental field designs and other research methods. We start with new work combining field experiments with qualitative research (particularly open-ended interviewing) before turning to some interpretivist examples. One central area in which interpretivism has had a powerful influence is in the study of contentious politics, where mobilization depends in part on the *framing* of the particular injustice. How do we study these frames? Katherine Kramer's study of Wisconsin goes a step farther, identifying a "rural consciousness" that shapes virtually all aspects of politics.

### **Session 1. Qualitative Support for Experimental Designs**

Elizabeth Levy Palluck, "The Promising Integration of Qualitative and Quantitative Methods," *Annals of the American Academy* 628 (2010), 59-71 [here](#).

*Recommended.*

Elizabeth Wood, "Field Research" in Carles Boix and Susan Stokes, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (2009) [here](#) for examples of fieldwork that are immersive.

Dean Karlan and Jacob Appel, *Failing in the Field: What We Can Learn When Field Research Goes Wrong* (Princeton: 2016).

James Copestake, Marlies Morsink and Fiona Remnant, *Attributing Development Impact: The Qualitative Impact Protocol Case Book*. Practical Action Publishing 2019,

### **Session 2. Ethnography 1: Social Frames and Contentious Politics**

Sidney Tarrow, *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics* (Cambridge 2011, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition), Ch. 7. On Canvas.

Armstrong, Elizabeth A., and Suzanna M. Crage, "Movements and Memory: The Making of the Stonewall Myth," *American Sociological Review* 71:5 (October 2006), pp. 724-751 [here](#).

Start Katherine Kramer, *The Politics of Resentment: Rural Consciousness in Wisconsin and the Rise of Scott Walker* (Chicago 2016); we will discuss next week.

*Recommended*

Sidney Tarrow, *The Language of Contention: Revolutions in Words 1688-2012* (Cambridge 2013).

Kevin O'Brien and Lianjiang Li, *Rightful Resistance in Rural China* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).

**Assignment.**

- Why is Palluck's proposal qualitative? What is the qualitative component exactly and what does it do that the experimental design can't? Pay particular attention to her description of her own field experiment.
- Tarrow is making a theoretical point about the importance of frames, but it would appear to virtually require a qualitative, interpretivist method. Or?

**November 29. Thanksgiving: no class.**

**December 6. "Deep" Ethnography and Ethical Issues (Week 10).**

**Session 1. Ethnography 2: Interpretivist Focus Group Immersion**

Katherine Kramer, *The Politics of Resentment: Rural Consciousness in Wisconsin and the Rise of Scott Walker* (Chicago 2016), read at the entire book.

*Recommended.*

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

Symposium: Ethnography and Participant Observation: Political Science Research in this "Late Methodological Moment" *Political Science and Politics* 50, 1 (2017) [here](#). Very useful collection with contributions touching on all subfields.

***Module IV. Professional and Ethical Issues***

**December 6 (2). Professional and Ethical Issues**

Here we do not address the broader question of human subjects but of the transparency of qualitative data. Is it possible to have standards that are common to quantitative and qualitative information, and if not, why not? The question is roiling the discipline.

Arthur Lupia and Colin Elman, "Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency," *PS: Political Science and Politics* (January 2014), pp. 19-42 (including Appendices A and B) [here](#).

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

Moravcsik, Andrew. "Qualitative Transparency: Pluralistic, Humanistic and Policy-Relevant," *Newsletter of the APSA International History and Politics Section* (Winter 2016), pp. 17-23 [here](#).

Isaac, Jeffrey C. "In Praise of Transparency, but not DA-RT," *Newsletter of the APSA International History and Politics Section* (Winter 2016)