

## QUALITATIVE METHODS (GPOL 6195)

Fall 2018  
Thursdays, 4.00-5.50 p.m.  
6 East 16th Street, Room 911

Sanjay Ruparelia  
Associate Professor of Politics  
6 East 16 Street, Room 725  
[ruparelia@newschool.edu](mailto:ruparelia@newschool.edu)  
(646) 909-3083

### Overview

This course provides a survey of qualitative methodology in social research. Its principal aims are twofold: to offer a critical introduction to several key debates in the field and an opportunity for you to practice the methods and tools we study. The first part of the course examines the aims, logics and modes of inquiry in the qualitative tradition. We evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of describing, interpreting and explaining the political world through intensive case studies and small-N comparisons vis-à-vis extensive statistical analyses that comprise the foundation of quantitative research. The second part of the course examines several core tasks in designing any research, and practical strategies for tackling them. Topics include the formation, measurement and elucidation of concepts; choosing, studying and generalizing cases; comparative research strategies; tracing causal processes over time; and counterfactual reasoning. The third part of the course examines, and gives you a chance to employ, particular methods to collect, analyze and evaluate qualitative data. We consider the ethics, politics and realities of doing fieldwork; conducting archival research, in-depth interviews and participant observation; and designing and carrying out surveys.

### Requirements & Assessment

Attendance: You are expected to attend each class and read all the set material in advance. Attendance comprises 15% of your final grade.

Participation: The success of the class depends on your active and informed participation. Being active means engaging constructively in discussion; being informed entails careful reading of the set material. To encourage both activities each student is required to post a set of questions and comments (approximately 1-2 pages) in the Discussion section on Canvas by 6.00 p.m. each Wednesday prior to class. Your commentaries are worth 15% of your final grade.

Short theoretical paper: You are required to write a short paper (8-10 pages, double-spaced, 12-point font) that appraises one of the following statements:

*Either:*

“When things happen in a sequence affects how they happen.”

Charles Tilly, *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*

*Or:*

“... Understanding human affairs starts and ends with our experience of the actual; but because it turns on what is causally and practically possible, it cannot produce knowledge, will rarely be general, and cannot simply consist in deploying a theory.”

Geoffrey Hawthorn, *Plausible Worlds*

The aim of your short paper is to critically assess the contention put forward in each statement in light of our course readings. Your papers should not be a mere summary of the latter but develop a position by engaging their respective premises, arguments and evidence. Each paper will be assessed for its clarity of exposition, grasp of the relevant material and strength of the argument put forward. Your short paper, which is due by 5.00 p.m. on October 29, comprises 20% of your final grade.

Final methods paper: To research an empirical question, and use a set of methods and tools, is a practical activity. Since the point of the course is to introduce you to different qualitative techniques, and the advantages and limitations of each, learning by doing is essential. Thus the major requirement of the course is to write a final paper (18-20 pages, double-spaced, 12-point font) that seeks to answer a clear empirical question through a qualitative research design, and to present your findings at the concluding workshop for the course on December 14. Your paper, which is due at the workshop, is worth 50% of your final grade.

Ideally, your final paper will explicate the methodological foundations of your current research agenda. If you are in the PhD program, it could be your proposed dissertation project. If you are in the MA program, it could be a topic you wish to explore in greater depth during your studies, or your proposed final MA paper.

Listed below are a series of questions to help you complete several methodological tasks. Since they are related and iterative in nature, you should consider, develop and refine your answers to these questions through the semester as we engage the readings for each topic.

The first set concern the conceptual foundations, selection of cases and comparative analytic strategies that orient your study:

1. Identify the key concept, or concepts, of your research project. How do you define or propose to elucidate it/them? How will you measure or calibrate it/them?
2. What case, or cases, will you study? Why and how did you select it/them? What is your case a study of? How generalizable are its findings likely to be?
3. Identify the frame of comparison that defines your project. What cases will you compare and why did you select them? How does your strategy of comparison explain key outcomes of similarity/difference? What broader generalizations will you be able to infer?

The second set of questions concern specific methods that may be important for your study: archival research, in-depth interviews, participant observation and survey techniques:

1. Does your project entail archival research? Why is it important to retrieve and analyze such material? What archives do you propose to visit? How will you access them, and evaluate the credibility and significance of the material you may find?
2. Does your project require interviews? Whom do you propose to interview and why? What type of interview will you conduct and what questions will you pose? How will you access your interviewees, conduct your interview, and evaluate the credibility and significance of their respective answers?
3. Does your project require participant observation? Why? Where and how do you propose to conduct such research, and of whom and what? How will you access these sites, and evaluate the credibility and significance of your observations?
4. Does your project entail a survey? What questions will you ask? How do you propose to design the survey, identify potential respondents and administer the survey? What

broader population does your sample represent? Why did you design the survey in this manner?

Since many of your research projects are likely to focus other cities, regions and countries, we need to find ways of practicing specific techniques here. Thus studies that entail archival research can investigate what resources exist in New York city or nearby, and develop a catalogue, rationale and plan regarding other significant collections located elsewhere. Projects employing in-depth interviews can seek out the views of locally based experts (academics, writers, practitioners) on the scholarly literature that pertains to their subject, suggestions regarding individuals, organizations and communities to contact in their anticipated field sites, and advice on potential risks. Similarly, studies involving surveys can design a questionnaire and seek critical feedback from such experts on related matters. And ethnographic projects can document a local version of the setting they anticipate studying in the field.

Unless you propose to study potentially vulnerable human subjects, the preceding methodological exercises will likely be exempt from the regulations of the New School's Human Research Protection Program (HRPP). See:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/oByaeu3ALzC2ZMXcwM216SodJRkk/view>

However, since many of your projects will eventually requiring interacting with human subjects, it is important for you to understand its policies, regulations and processes:

<https://www.newschool.edu/provost/research-support-human-subjects-research/>

Thus it is important to understand the protocol review process. Accordingly, you will be required to complete its key forms, and submit them along with your final paper. Please give special attention to the following sites/forms:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/oByaeu3ALzC2Zd2MwdkQ5V1J6aTg/view>

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/oByaeu3ALzC2ZOHdPWERNSHFCMDA/view>

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ReIPeG8ixakKVOc9M9mAAAsRKXZV-J2iA/view>

## **Course Material**

### Required

There are two required texts for the course:

- Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: scientific inference in qualitative research* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994)
- Diana Kapiszewski, Lauren M. MacLean and Benjamin L. Read, *Field Research in Political Science: practices and principles* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

*Designing Social Inquiry* is now a famous text, widely available, so please obtain a copy through your preferred bookstore or website. I will order copies of *Field Research in Political Science* via Barnes & Noble. All other readings will be available on Canvas.

### Recommended

The following volume, which critically responds to *Designing Social Inquiry*, is highly recommended. We will be reading several chapters from the first edition (2004), which are absent in the second edition (2010)—hence my not assigning it for purchase. However, it is a key text in current methodological debates in political science, and thus valuable to know and have.

- Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: diverse tools, shared standards* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Ltd., 2004)
- Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: diverse tools, shared standards, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Ltd., 2010)

Finally, you may find interesting the following two volumes, which contain reflections by several eminent scholars on the empirical, theoretical and methodological choices that influenced their respective intellectual trajectories:

- Alan Sica and Stephen Turner (eds), *The Disobedient Generation: social theorists in the sixties* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2005)
- Geraldo L. Munck and Richard Snyder (eds), *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007)

## **University Policies and Resources**

Please note the following policies, resources and procedures of the university:

### Disabilities

In keeping with the University's policy of providing equal access for students with disabilities, any student with a disability who may need academic accommodations should contact the Office of Student Disability Services: <https://www.newschool.edu/student-disability-services/>

### Incompletes

A Grade of I (Incomplete) will be assigned only if a student has filed a request for a grade of incomplete with the instructor and the instructor approves the grade. Unless the instructor submits a regular letter grade within the period of time required by the student's academic program, a grade of I or GM will automatically convert to F or N as described below.

Graduate students: Grades of I and GM for graduate students convert to N one year after the end date of the course. Unreported grades for graduate students convert to a GM two weeks after the official end date of the course. (PhD students at The New School for Social Research should consult their school's catalog for additional policy information about grades of Incomplete.)

Graduate students who are permitted to retake a class to make up a grade of Incomplete must register for the course and pay tuition as an auditor.

### Libraries

The New School Library offers frequent research workshops for students, the day, time, and location of which are posted to the Library webpage each semester. The Library also provides one-on-one support for students who in conducting research for a paper or project require additional assistance. Students can contact the library about scheduling a one-on-one appointment with a reference librarian.

### Academic Integrity

The New School views "academic honesty and integrity" as the duty of every member of an academic community to claim authorship for his or her own work and only for that work, and to recognize the contributions of others accurately and completely. This obligation is fundamental to the integrity of intellectual debate, and creative and academic pursuits.

Academic honesty and integrity includes accurate use of quotations, as well as appropriate and explicit citation of sources in instances of paraphrasing and describing ideas, or reporting on research findings or any aspect of the work of others (including that of faculty members and other students). Academic dishonesty results from infractions of this “accurate use”. The standards of academic honesty and integrity, and citation of sources, apply to all forms of academic work, including submissions of drafts of final papers or projects.

All members of the University community are expected to conduct themselves in accord with the standards of academic honesty and integrity. Students are responsible for understanding the University’s policy on academic honesty and integrity and must make use of proper citations of sources for writing papers, creating, presenting, and performing their work, taking examinations, and doing research. Through syllabi, or in assignments, faculty members are responsible for informing students of policies with respect to the limits within which they may collaborate with, or seek help from, others. Individual divisions/programs may require their students to sign an Academic Integrity Statement declaring that they understand and agree to comply with this policy. The New School recognizes that the different nature of work across the schools of the University may require different procedures for citing sources and referring to the work of others. Particular academic procedures, however, are based in universal principles valid in all schools of The New School and institutions of higher education in general. This policy is not intended to interfere with the exercise of academic freedom and artistic expression.

Academic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to:

- cheating on examinations, either by copying another student’s work or by utilizing unauthorized materials
- using work of others as one’s own original work and submitting such work to the university or to scholarly journals, magazines, or similar publications
- submission of another students’ work obtained by theft or purchase as one’s own original work
- submission of work downloaded from paid or unpaid sources on the internet as one’s own original work, or including the information in a submitted work without proper citation
- submitting the same work for more than one course without the knowledge and explicit approval of all of the faculty members involved
- destruction or defacement of the work of others
- aiding or abetting any act of academic dishonesty
- any attempt to gain academic advantage by presenting misleading information, making deceptive statements or falsifying documents, including documents related to internships

Further information on what constitutes plagiarism and the appeals process can be found at <https://www.newschool.edu/about/university-resources/policies/>

## *Aims, logics and modes of inquiry*

### **Week 1 (September 6): Introduction**

Overview of course. Discussion of your research projects.

### **Week 2 (September 13): Quantitative approaches**

#### Required:

- Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune, “Comparative research and social science theory,” in idem, *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry* (New York: Wiley, 1970), pp. 17-31.
- Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: scientific inference in qualitative research* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 3-149 and 208-230 (skim the rest).
- Donald P. Green and Alan S. Gerber, “Reclaiming the experimental tradition in political science,” in Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner (eds), *Political Science: the state of the discipline* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2002), pp. 805-833.

#### Suggested further reading:

- Carl G. Hempel, “The function of general laws in history,” in Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (eds), *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995), pp. 43-55.
- Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (New York: Routledge Classics, 2002)
- Milton Friedman, “The methodology of positive economics,” in May Brodbeck (ed.), *Readings in the Philosophy of the Social Sciences* (New York: MacMillan, 1968), pp. 508-529.
- David D. Laitin, “The perestroika challenge to social science,” *Politics & Society* 31, 1 (March 2003): 163-184.
- Thad Dunning, *Natural experiments in the social sciences: a design-based approach* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

### **Week 3 (September 20): Qualitative approaches**

#### Required:

- Peter Hall, “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. 373-404.
- Geraldo L. Munck, “Tools for qualitative research,” in Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: diverse tools, shared standards* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Ltd., 2004), pp. 105-122.
- Charles C. Ragin, “Turning the tables: how case-oriented research challenges variables-oriented research,” in Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: diverse tools, shared standards* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Ltd., 2004), pp. 123-138.
- David Collier, Henry E. Brady and Jason Seawright, “Critiques, responses and trade-offs: drawing together the debate,” in Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: diverse tools, shared standards* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Ltd., 2004), pp. 195-228.

- James Mahoney, “After KKV: the new methodology of qualitative research,” *World Politics*, 62, 1 (January 2010): 120-147.

Suggested further reading:

- Charles Taylor, “Interpretation and the sciences of man,” in Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (eds), *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995), pp. 181-213.
- Bent Flyvbjerg, *Making Social Science Matter: why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Jon Elster, *Explaining Social Behavior: more nuts and bolts for the social sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Charles Tilly and Robert E. Goodin, *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow, *Interpretive Research Design: concepts and processes* (New York: Routledge, 2011)

*Tasks and strategies of analysis*

**Week 4 (September 27): Forming, measuring and elucidating concepts**

Required:

- Giovanni Sartori, “Concept misformation in comparative politics,” *American Political Science Review*, 64, 4 (December 1970): 1033-1053.
- David Collier and James Mahon, “Conceptual stretching revisited: adapting categories in comparative analysis,” *American Political Science Review*, 87, 4 (December 1993): 845-855.
- Gary Goertz, “Concepts, theories, and numbers: a checklist for constructing, evaluating, and using concepts or quantitative measures,” in Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 97-118.
- Fredric Charles Shaffer, “Why do concepts need elucidating?” and “Grounding: elucidating how people understand a concept,” in idem, *Elucidating Social Science Concepts: an interpretivist guide* (New York: Routledge, 2016), pp. 1-54.
- 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.
- Charles C. Ragin, “Measurement versus calibration: a set-theoretic approach,” in Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 174-198.

Suggested further reading:

- Quentin Skinner, “Meaning and understanding in the history of ideas,” *History and Theory*, 8, 1 (1969): 3-53.
- Reinhart Koselleck and Michaela Richter, “Introduction and prefaces to the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*,” *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, 6, 1 (2011): 1-37.
- John Gerring, “What makes a concept good? a criterial framework for understanding concept formation in the social sciences,” *Polity*, 31, 3 (Spring 1999): 357-393.

- Gary Goertz, *Social Science Concepts: a user's guide* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006)
- Mark Bevir and Asaf Kedar, "Concept formation in political science: an anti-naturalist critique of qualitative methodology," *Perspectives on Politics*, 6, 3 (September 2008): 503-517.

## **Week 5 (October 4): Choosing, studying and generalizing cases**

### Required:

- Harry Eckstein, "Case study and theory in political science," in Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (eds), *Handbook of Political Science, volume 7* (Reading: Addison-Welsey, 1975), pp. 79-139.
- Bent Flyvbjerg, "The power of example," in idem, *Making Social Science Matter: why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 66-87.
- Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, "Part Two—How to Do Case Studies", in idem, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2005), pp. 73-124.
- John Gerring, "Techniques for case selection," in idem, *Case Study Research: principles and practices* ((New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 86-150.
- Robert H. Bates, "From case studies to social science: a strategy for political research," in Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 172-186.

### Suggested further reading:

- Barbara Geddes, "How the cases you choose determines the answers you get," *Political Analysis*, 2 (1990): 131-50.
- Andrew Abbott, "What do cases do?" in idem, *Time Matters: on theory and method* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2001), pp. 129-160.
- John Gerring, "What is a case study and what is it good for?" *American Political Science Review*, 98, 2 (May 2004): 341-354.
- Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, "Case studies and the philosophy of science," in idem, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2005), pp. 127-150.
- Jason Seawright, *Multi-method social science: combining qualitative and quantitative tools* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016)

## **Week 6 (October 11): Making comparisons**

### Required:

- Arend Lijphart, "Comparative politics and the comparative method," *American Political Science Review*, 65, 3 (September 1971): 682-693.
- Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers, "The uses of comparative history in macrosocial inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 22, 2 (April 1980): 174-197.
- Charles Ragin and David Zaret, "Theory and method in comparative research: two strategies," *Social Forces*, 61, 3 (March 1983): 731-754.
- Stanley Lieberson, "Small n's and big conclusions: an examination of the reasoning in



comparative studies based on a small number of cases,” in Charles Ragin and Howard Becker (eds), *What is a Case? exploring the foundations of social inquiry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 105-118.

- James Mahoney, “Strategies of causal assessment in comparative-historical analysis,” in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds), *Comparative-Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 337-372.

#### Suggested further reading:

- Alasdair MacIntyre, “Is a science of comparative politics possible?” in idem, *Against the Self-Images of the Age: essays on ideology and philosophy* (New York: Schocken Books, 1978), pp. 260-284.
- Charles Ragin, *The Comparative Method: moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987)
- Stanley Lieberman, “More on the uneasy case for using Mill-type methods in small-n comparative studies,” *Social Forces* (June 1994): 1225-1237.
- Frederick Engelstad and Kalleberg Ragnvold (eds), *Comparative Social Research: methodological issues in comparative social science, volume 16* (Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing, 1997)
- Gary Goertz and James Mahoney, *A Tale of Two Cultures: qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012)

### **Week 7 (October 18): Tracing causal processes over time**

#### Required:

- Andrew Abbott, “From causes to events,” in idem, *Time Matters: on theory and method* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), pp. 183-205.
- Paul Pierson, “Big, slow-moving, and ... invisible: macrosocial processes in the study of comparative politics,” in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 177-207.
- Peter A. Hall, “Systematic process analysis: when and how to use it,” *European Management Review*, 3 (2006): 24-31.
- Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, “Process tracing: from philosophical roots to best practices,” in idem (eds), *Process Tracing: from metaphor to analytical tool* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 3-38.
- David Waldner, “What makes process tracing good? causal mechanisms, causal inference, and the completeness standard in comparative politics,” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel (eds), *Process Tracing: from metaphor to analytical tool* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 126-152.
- Derek Beach, “Process-tracing methods in social science,” *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics* (January 2017): <http://politics.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-176>

#### Suggested further reading:

- Peter Hedström and Richard Swedberg (eds), *Social Mechanisms: an analytical approach to social theory* (New York: Cambridge University Press 1998)
- Andrew Abbott, *Time Matters: on theory and method* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001)

- Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, “Comparative methods: controlled comparison and within-case analysis,” in idem, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2005), pp. 151-180.
- Nathaniel Beck, “Is causal process observation an oxymoron?” *Political Analysis*, 14, 3 (Summer 2006): 347-352.
- Peter Hedström and Petri Ylikoski, “Causal mechanisms in the social sciences,” *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36, (2010): 49–67.

## **Week 8 (October 25): Reasoning counterfactually**

### Required:

- Geoffrey Hawthorn, “Counterfactuals, explanation and understanding,” in idem, *Plausible Worlds: possibility and understanding in history and the social sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), pp. 1-38.
- James Fearon, “Counterfactuals and hypothesis testing in political science,” *World Politics*, 43, 2 (January 1991): 169-195.
- Philip E. Tetlock and Aaron Belkin, “Counterfactual thought experiments in world politics: logical, methodological and psychological perspectives,” in idem (eds), *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics: logical, methodological and psychological perspectives* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), pp. 1-38.
- Richard Ned Lebow, “Counterfactual thought experiments,” in idem, *Forbidden Fruit: counterfactuals and international relations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), pp. 29-68.
- Jack S. Levy, “Counterfactuals, causal inference and historical analysis,” *Security Studies*, 24 (2015): 378-402.

### Suggested further reading:

- David Lewis, *Counterfactuals* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973)
- Ernest Sosa (ed.), *Causation and Conditionals* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975)
- Adam Przeworski, “Is a comparative science of politics possible?” in Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 147-172.
- Richard Evans, *Altered Pasts: counterfactuals in history* (Lebanon, NH: Brandeis University Press, 2013)
- James Mahoney and Rodrigo Barrenechea, “The logic of counterfactual analysis in case-study explanation,” *The British Journal of Sociology* (2017): 1-33.

*Methods and tools for collecting, analyzing and evaluating data*

## **Week 9 (November 1): Doing fieldwork**

### Required:

- Ronald Watts, “In search of the holy grail: projects, proposals and research design, but mostly about why writing a dissertation proposal is so difficult,” in Ellen Perecman and Sara R. Curran (eds), *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: essays and bibliographic sources on research design and methods* (New York: Sage, 2006), pp. 175-196.

- Elizabeth Jean Wood, “Field research,” in Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 123-146.
- Diana Kapiszewski, Lauren M. MacLean and Benjamin L. Read, “Preparing for fieldwork”, “Managing in the field” and “Thinking outside the (archive) box,” in idem, *Field Research in Political Science: practices and principles* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 82-189.
- H. Russell Bernard, “Field notes: how to take them, code them, manage them,” *Research Methods in Anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition* (Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2002), pp. 365-89.
- Andrew Schrank, “Bringing it all back home: personal reflections on friends, findings and fieldwork,” in Ellen Perecman and Sara R. Curran (eds), *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: essays and bibliographic sources on research design and methods* (New York: Sage, 2006), pp. 217-236.

The following documents are part of the protocol review process at the New School. Please review them. You will be required to submit the relevant form with your final paper.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/oByaeu3ALzC2ZeUF5RU5jalY2Rms/view>

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/oByaeu3ALzC2ZZXFtOXJIUzl5eTg/view>

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1fpfPFagpyo\\_XFioOzZVNQ-8Hv1cHiAWU/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1fpfPFagpyo_XFioOzZVNQ-8Hv1cHiAWU/view)

#### Suggested further reading:

- Adam Przeworski and Frank Solomon, “On the art of writing proposals: some candid suggestions for applicants to Social Science Research Council competitions,” (Social Science Research Council, 1995)
- John Lofland, David Snow, Leon Anderson and Lyn Lofland, *Analyzing Social Settings: a guide to qualitative observation and analysis, 4<sup>th</sup> edition* (Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, 2006)
- Annette Lareau and Jeffrey Shultz (eds), *Journeys Through Ethnography: realistic accounts of fieldwork* (New York: Routledge, 2018)
- Kathleen M. Dewalt and Billie R. Dewalt, *Participant Observation: a guide for fieldworkers, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition* (Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2011)
- Robert Emerson, Rachel Fretz, and Linda Shaw, *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011)

### **Week 10 (November 8): Reading archives**

#### Required:

- Carlo Ginzburg, “Checking the evidence: the judge and the historian,” *Critical Inquiry*, 18, 1 (Autumn 1991): 79-92.
- Ian Lustick, “History, historiography, and political science: multiple historical records and the problem of selection bias,” *American Political Science Review*, 90, 3 (September 1996): 605-618.
- Richard J. Evans, “Historians and their facts” and “Sources and discourses,” in idem, *In Defence of History* (London: Granta, 1997), pp. 75-102 and 103-128.
- Ann Laura Stoler, “Colonial archives and the arts of governance,” *Archival Science*, 2, 1-2 (2002): 87-109.

- Marc Trachtenberg, “The critical analysis of historical texts” and “Working with documents,” in idem, *The Craft of International History: a guide to method* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 51-78 and 140-168.

Suggested further reading:

- John H. Goldthorpe, “The uses of history in sociology: reflections on some recent tendencies,” *The British Journal of Sociology*, 42, 2 (June 1991): 211-230.
- Michel-Rolph Trouillot, *Silencing the Past: power and the production of history* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1995)
- Cameron G. Thies, “A pragmatic guide to qualitative historical analysis in the study of international relations,” *International Studies Perspectives*, 3, 4, (November 2002): 351–372.
- Alexis E. Ramsey, Wendy B. Sharer, Barbara L’Eplattenier and Lisa Mastrangelo (eds), *Working in the Archives: practical research methods for rhetoric and composition* (Southern Illinois University Press, 2009)
- Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010)

**Week 11 (November 15): Getting, conducting and evaluating interviews**

Required:

- H. Russell Bernard, “Interviewing: unstructured and semi-structured,” *Research Methods in Anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition* (Lanham, MD: Altamira Press, 2002), pp. 210-250.
- “Symposium: interview methods in political science,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35, 4 (2002): 663-688.
- Diana Kapiszewski, Lauren M. MacLean and Benjamin L. Read, “Interviews, oral histories and focus groups” and “Appendix”, *Field Research in Political Science: practices and principles* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 190-233 and 412-415.
- Frederic Charles Schaffer, “Ordinary language interviewing,” in Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds), *Interpretation and Method: empirical research methods and the interpretative turn* (New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 183-193.
- Joe Soss, “Talking our way to meaningful explanations: a practice-centered view of interviewing for interpretative research,” in Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea (eds), *Interpretation and Method: empirical research methods and the interpretative turn* (New York: Routledge, 2013), pp. 161-182.

Suggested further reading:

- John Lofland, David Snow, Leon Anderson and Lyn Lofland, *Analyzing Social Settings: a guide to qualitative observation and analysis* (Wadsworth Publishing, 2005)
- Tamara Giles-Vernick, “Oral histories as methods and sources,” in Ellen Perecman and Sara R. Curran (eds), *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: essays and bibliographic sources on research design and methods* (New York: Sage, 2006), pp. 85-102.
- Susan E. Short, “Focus group interviews,” in Ellen Perecman and Sara R. Curran (eds), *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: essays and bibliographic sources on research design and methods* (New York: Sage, 2006), pp. 103-116.

- Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin, *Qualitative Interviewing: the art of hearing data*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition (New York: Sage, 2012)
- Robert S. Weiss, *Learning from Strangers: the art and method of qualitative interview studies* (New York: Free Press, 1995)

\*\*\*November 22: Thanksgiving—No Class\*\*\*

## Week 12 (November 29): Observing participants in their contexts

### Required:

- Clifford Geertz, “Thick description: toward an interpretive theory of culture,” in idem, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), pp. 3-33.
- James Clifford, “On ethnographic authority,” *Representations*, 1, 2 (Spring 1983): 118-146.
- Michael Buroway, “The extended case method,” *Sociological Theory*, 16, 1 (March 1998): 4-33.
- Lisa Weeden, “Reflections on ethnographic work in political science,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 13 (June 2010): 255-272.
- Diana Kapiszewski, Lauren M. MacLean and Benjamin L. Read, “Site-intensive methods: ethnography and participant observation,” *Field Research in Political Science: practices and principles* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 234-265.

### Suggested further reading:

- Richard Fenno, “Appendix—notes on method: participant observation,” in idem, *Home Style: house members in their districts* (Boston: Little, Brown, & Company, 1978), pp. 249-295.
- Herbert J. Gans, “The participant observer as a human being: observations on the personal aspects of fieldwork,” in Robert G. Burgess (ed.), *Field Research: a sourcebook and field manual*, 5<sup>th</sup> impression (New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 80-93.
- H. Russell Bernard, “Participant observation,” in idem, *Research Methods in Anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition (Lanham, MD: Altamira Press, 2011), pp. 256-290.
- Edward Schatz (ed.), *Political Ethnography: what immersion contributes to the study of power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009)
- Timothy Pachirat, *Among Wolves: ethnography and the immersive study of power* (New York: Routledge, 2018)

## Week 13 (December 6): Designing and carrying out surveys

### Required:

- Henry E. Brady, “Contributions of survey research to political science,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 33, 1 (March 2000): 47-57.
- Sam D. Sieber, “The integration of fieldwork and survey methods,” in Robert G. Burgess (ed.), *Field Research: a sourcebook and field manual*, 5<sup>th</sup> impression (New York: Routledge, 2005), pp. 269-290.

- Albert Park, “Using survey data in social science research in developing countries,” in Ellen Perecman and Sara R. Curran (eds), *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research: essays and bibliographic sources on research design and methods* (New York: Sage, 2006), pp. 117-142.
- H. Russell Bernard, “Interviewing II: questionnaires,” in idem, *Social Research Methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition* (New York: Sage 2012), pp. 215-260.
- Diana Kapiszewski, Lauren M. MacLean and Benjamin L. Read, “Surveys in the context of field research,” *Field Research in Political Science: practices and principles* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), pp. 266-298.

Suggested further reading:

- Sidney Verba, “Cross-national survey research: the problem of credibility” in Ivan Vallier (ed.), *Comparative Methods in Sociology* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1971), pp. 309-56.
- Nora Cate Schaeffer and Stanley Presser, “The science of asking questions,” *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29 (2003): 65-88.
- Floyd J. Fowler, *Survey Research Methods (Applied Social Research Methods), 5<sup>th</sup> edition* (New York: Sage, 2013)

**Weeks 14 & 15: (December 14): Workshop to present your research**

Please note that our workshop takes place on a Friday: further details to be announced.

Final papers, with the requisite IRB forms, are due.