

## Seminar: Introduction to Qualitative Methods

*Note – This seminar is for SPS researchers only.*

**1st Term, Academic Year 2023-2024**

**Mondays, 9.00-11.00**

**First Seminar Session: 02.10.23**

**Last Seminar Session: 06.12.23**

**Emeroteca, Sala del Capitolo, Seminar Rooms 2, 3 & 4, Badia Fiesolana  
Sala Seminario Mansarda, Schuman Centre**

Instructor: [Jeffrey T. Checkel](#)

Office: Villa Sanfelice, SF-02

E-Mail: [jeffrey.checkel@eui.eu](mailto:jeffrey.checkel@eui.eu)

Office Hours: Mondays, 12:00-14:00

Contact: Pia Dittmar ([pia.dittmar@eui.eu](mailto:pia.dittmar@eui.eu))

### Description

This is a course about how to evaluate and conduct rigorous, epistemologically plural qualitative research. It will both introduce you to key concepts and methods – cause and case studies, positionality and ethnography, say – and show how they work in practice. Seminar sessions will be divided in two – a conceptual introduction and overview that is then followed by examples drawn from key topics and sub-fields within SPS. The goal is not for you to become methodologists, but to be smart consumers and users of qualitative methods in your own studies and reading.

The course has three parts. We begin with two sessions on foundational issues: philosophy, theory, causation and ethics. Methods can flow from various philosophical starting points; process tracing and ethnography – for example – are distinct techniques for gathering and evaluating data that draw upon different epistemologies. The chosen epistemology, in turn, attunes the scholar to certain research questions and not others; to seeing theory's role in different ways; to differing understandings of cause; and to contrasting appreciations of ethics. Why do proponents of case studies champion their causal power while saying little about the ethics in play, while – for the ethnographer – ethics stand front and center, but causality – if even discussed – is bounded, contextualized and local?

The bulk of the course then provides an introduction to a number of qualitative methods. Each seminar session introduces a particular technique, provides a critical net assessment, and explores how the method works in practice. The latter is accomplished by drawing upon empirical research in the social and political sciences. In the last two sessions, we look to the future, exploring the cutting-edge for students of qualitative research: research transparency and mixed methods.

The seminar concludes with a half-day workshop – on 6 December – where researchers assess and critique each other's efforts at operationalizing various qualitative methods.

The seminar is worth 20 credits.

### Learning Outcomes

- An understanding of the varying links among philosophy, theory, cause, ethics and your choice of and assessment of a particular qualitative method.
- For the six core qualitative methods – case studies, sites and comparison; comparative historical analysis; process/practice tracing; textual/discourse analysis; fieldwork/ethnography; interviewing – an appreciation of the method’s content, its strengths and weaknesses, and an ability to assess applications.
- An understanding of the growing importance of transparency in qualitative methods, and the trade-offs necessary to attain this goal.
- An appreciation of the role(s) played by qualitative methods in mixed-method designs, and the challenges involved in executing such designs.

SPS’s third-term course offerings build on these learning outcomes by providing detailed operationalizations and hands-on training in particular qualitative methods.

### Format

During the September Programme, SPS offers a [‘Preparatory Workshop: Introduction to Qualitative Methods.’](#) In structuring this seminar, we assume you have the background knowledge provided in that workshop – on philosophy, ethics, interviews and ethnography – either because you participated in it or have had graduate coursework on the topics it covered.

For all ten seminar weeks, the group as a whole meets during the first hour, when the goal is to convey the basics of a particular method. The hour starts with a mini-lecture by Checkel; his comments will be based on lecture notes distributed ahead of time. SPS Part-Time Professor for Qualitative Methods [Sam Ritholtz](#) will then briefly respond to Checkel. The purpose of these first two interventions - which will last 40-45 minutes maximum – is to set the stage for and provoke a broader group discussion in the last 20 minutes of the first hour. In preparing for this discussion, please consider the ‘discussion questions’ for that particular session.

The seminar’s second hour is then devoted to researcher-led discussion and debate, focusing on applications of a particular method. Here, researchers take the lead. Each week, a group of you will prepare a memo to structure our discussions, and an assigned researcher discussant will get things going by critiquing the memo.

Our last meeting of the term is different: a workshop on 6 December, 13.00-18.00, on ‘Qualitative Methods in Action.’ Here, we will again break into two groups; the workshop’s purpose is to use the ‘power of the group’ to promote collective learning on qualitative methods at an applied/operational level. Our raw material will be the writing exercise all researchers will prepare and circulate by Friday, 1 December. During the workshop, researchers will take turns critiquing each other’s work, offering suggestions for how to make the chosen methods more operational.

### Readings

Books to be read – mostly key sections - include the following.

- Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editors, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

- della Porta, Donatella and Michael Keating, Editors, *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Fujii, Lee Ann, *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach* (London: Routledge, 2017)
- Gerring, John, *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices, Second Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017)
- Grimm, Jannis, Kevin Koehler, Ellen M. Lust, Ilyas Saliba and Isabell Schierenbeck, *Safer Field Research in the Social Sciences: A Guide to Human and Digital Security in Hostile Environments*, Sage Research Methods (London: Sage Publications, 2020)
- Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren MacLean and Benjamin Read, *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)
- Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen, Editors, *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)
- Mosley, Layna, Editor, *Interview Research in Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013)
- Simmons, Erica and Nicholas Smith, Editors, *Rethinking Comparison: Innovative Methods for Qualitative Political Inquiry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021)

One note on the readings: In several cases, articles/chapters have the phrases ‘international relations,’ ‘IR theory,’ or ‘international studies’ in their titles. Relax! I have not made this an IR theory seminar (☺). When selecting a reading from IR, I have made sure that its argument and logic apply across the various subfields in political science and sociology.

Seminar readings are accessible in a variety of ways.

- Books & Chapters in Books: Most books are available electronically from the EUI Library. In the reading list below, these are indicated by (**E-Book**); this provides the direct hyperlink to the book.
- Difficult-to-Access Materials: This includes readings that are difficult – or impossible – to access electronically. Nearly all of these will be uploaded to the seminar [Brightspace](#) page.
- Journal Articles: These are easily obtained electronically through the EUI Library.

If you encounter any problems accessing seminar readings, please contact Pia Dittmar.

## Requirements

There are three requirements; to receive credit for the seminar, you need a passing mark in all three.

- 1) **Seminar Discussions**: Active participation in them.
  - ➔ For the discussion part of the seminar – the second hour - the class will be divided in two. Your participation in these discussions on a regular basis is required. *If you sit there week after week and say nothing, you will not pass the course.*
- 2) **Group Preparation of Discussion Memo**: Once over the course of the term.

- ➔ **Group Composition:** There will be approximately 30 researchers taking the seminar. For the discussion hour, we will divide the group in two, with Checkel taking 15 researchers (Cluster #1) and Ritholtz the other 15 (Cluster #2). Within each cluster, researchers should form as many groups as possible with two members each, and, if necessary, one or two ‘groups’ with 1 member. In both Cluster #1 and #2, each group signs up as discussion leader for one of the 9 available course weeks (Sessions 2-10).
- ➔ **Group Assignment:** In both Cluster #1 and #2, if your group is responsible for a particular session, then you will take the lead in our discussions during it. For this to work, please - *by 12.00/noon the Friday before our Monday seminar* - upload to Brightspace a 5-7 page (double-spaced) memo.

In these memos, you should *focus on applications and ‘what’s in it for me’ / ‘how do I use it.’* Let me give a few examples. Say you are responsible for session #9 on qualitative transparency. Your memo might address how you understand transparency, its pluses and minuses, its use in practice (the application readings), and how you would operationalize transparency in a hypothetical qualitative research design. Or, say you have the session on process/practice tracing (session #5). Here, your memo could assess the two application readings for that week – why are they good, or bad uses of the method – and work through how you would set up and operationalize process/practice tracing in a hypothetical study. With these hypothetical studies/designs, it is of course all for the better if they are drawn from your own projects.

The memos’ purpose is to move our discussions from the conceptual and theoretical (what is ethnography and how do positivists and interpretivists use it differently) to the applied and operational (is this a good application of ethnography and, if so, why; how do we operationalize access and ethics in different ethnographic field settings).

3) **Writing Exercise:** Due on 01.12.23, by 16.00.

- ➔ It should be 10 pages in length (double-spaced). There are two possible formats for your paper.

**Format A:** Start with the central research question of your thesis and your tentative theoretical argument for answering it. What qualitative methods will you need to answer that question and test/probe your theory? Here, the bulk of the review will be spent operationalizing your methods. How, exactly, will they be used? Are there particular data challenges to consider? How will you ensure the methods are used ethically?

**Format B:**

Choose any topic or method covered in the syllabus and critically assess the current state of debate over, applications of, or the strengths and weaknesses of it. In the jargon, you are writing a ‘critical review.’

With Format B, be strategic. If you are a qualitative researcher, pick a method or topic (ethics, say) that will likely play a key role in your dissertation. If you are a quantitative researcher, choose one of the more frequently used qualitative methods in your area of research, so you can better evaluate work done in that tradition. Example: You are a quantitative researcher planning to study civil wars with advanced statistical methods. For your critical review, it would then make sense to consider fieldwork and case-study methods, as a growing number of scholars are studying civil conflicts with them.

\*\*\*\*\*

For either format, you are required to read deeper into the relevant literature. It is not sufficient to summarize what we already have read and discussed in class!

A final comment: Papers in either format – and especially format A – will be very helpful in fleshing out key parts of your thesis prospectus, which is due on 24.05.24.

## Schedule

- Session 1 (2 October) – Doing Qualitative Methods I: Context; Philosophy & Theory
- Session 2 (9 October) – Doing Qualitative Methods II: Cause & Research Ethics
- Session 3 (16 October) – Case Studies, Sites and Comparison: Design and Execution
- Session 4 (23 October) – Comparative Historical Analysis
- Session 5 (30 October) – Process Analytics: Process Tracing & Practice Tracing
- Session 6 (6 November) – Textual & Discourse Analysis
- Session 7 (13 November) – Fieldwork & Ethnography
- Session 8 (20 November) – Interviewing
- Session 9 (27 November) – The Cutting Edge I: Qualitative Transparency
- Session 10 (4 December) – The Cutting Edge II: Qualitative Mixed-Method Designs
- Workshop (6 December) – Qualitative Methods in Action

## Seminar Topics & Readings

### Session 1 – Doing Qualitative Methods I: Context; Philosophy & Theory

#### *Context: Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences*

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

Simmons, Erica and Nicholas Smith, “Theory and Imagination in Comparative Politics: An Interview with Lisa Wedeen,” in Erica Simmons and Nicholas Smith, Editors, *Rethinking Comparison: Innovative Methods for Qualitative Political Inquiry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021) – Chapter 13. ([E-Book](#))

Emmons, Cassandra and Andrew Moravcsik, “Graduate Qualitative Methods Training in Political Science: A Disciplinary Crisis,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53/2 (April 2020): 258-264.

Schwartz, Stephanie and Kate Cronin-Furman, “[III-Prepared: International Fieldwork Methods](#),” *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 21/1 (Spring 2023): 1-9.

#### *Philosophy of Social Science and Theory*

##### *Nuts and Bolts*

della Porta, Donatella and Michael Keating, Editors, *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) – Chapters 1-2. ([E-Book](#))

Van Evera, Stephen, “Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories: A User’s Guide,” in *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997) – Chapter 1. ([E-Book](#))

Bauböck, Rainer, “Normative Political Theory and Empirical Research,” in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating, Editors, *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) – Chapter 3. ([E-Book](#))

### *Applications*

Johnson, James, “Consequences of Positivism: A Pragmatist Assessment,” *Comparative Political Studies* 39/2 (2006): 224-52.

Hall, Peter, “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics,” in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Editors, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) – Chapter 11. ([E-Book](#))

### **Discussion Questions**

- What is philosophy of social science and why does it matter?
- What is positivism? What is interpretism? How do they differ? Which is a better?
- How do philosophical starting points influence our thinking about cause, theory, data, ethics and methods?
- What are the roles of deduction and induction in theory development?
- What are the differences among normative, problem-solving and critical theory?
- What is the relation between theory and method? In developing a research design, which comes first?

## **Session 2 – Doing Qualitative Methods II: Cause & Research Ethics**

### *Nuts and Bolts*

Kurki, Milja, *Causation in International Relations: Reclaiming Causal Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) – Chapters 1-2. ([E-Book](#))

Hedstroem, Peter and Petri Ylikoski, “Causal Mechanisms in the Social Sciences,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 36 (2010): 49–67.

European Commission, DG Research and Innovation, “[Ethics in Social Science and Humanities](#)” (Brussels: European Commission, October 2018).

American Political Science Association, “[Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research](#)” (Washington, DC: Spring APSA Council Meeting, 4 April 2020).

### *Applications*

Wood, Elisabeth Jean, “The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones,” *Qualitative Sociology* 29/3 (2006): 373-86.

Hoover Green, Amelia and Dara Kay Cohen, “[Centering Human Subjects: The Ethics of ‘Desk Research’ on Political Violence](#),” *Journal of Global Security Studies* 6/2 (June 2021).

Barnfield, Matthew, “Misinformation in Experimental Political Science,” *Perspectives on Politics* (FirstView, 28.10.22: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592722003115>).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> For a blog version of Barnfield’s argument, see “[Against Misinformation as Method in Political Science](#),” *The Loop: ECPR’s Political Science Blog* (21.11.22).

## Discussion Questions

- What is cause? (There's a simple question - ☺.)
- Situated understanding, causal mechanisms, and causal effects are all equally valuable ways to help us explain and understand the social world. Discuss.
- What is the relation between epistemology and ethics?
- How do ethics play out in differing research contexts? Consider three: elite interviews of Commission bureaucrats in Brussels; a field experiment in Sierra Leone; fieldwork among Roma in Hungary.
- Are the ethical aspects of your thesis finished or just beginning when the EUI Ethics Committee approves your ethical framework?
- Ethics do not matter for quantitative researchers. Discuss.

## **Session 3 - Case Studies, Sites and Comparison: Design and Execution**

### *Nuts and Bolts*

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005) – Chapter 1.

Gerring, John, *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices, Second Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017) – Chapters 1-3, 7-8, 11. ([E-Book](#))

Simmons, Erica and Nicholas Smith, Editors, *Rethinking Comparison: Innovative Methods for Qualitative Political Inquiry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021) – Chapters 1, 6. ([E-Book](#))

### *Applications*

Bakke, Kristin, “Copying and Learning from Outsiders? Assessing Diffusion from Transnational Insurgents in the Chechen Wars,” in Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editor, *Transnational Dynamics of Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) - Chapter 2. ([E-Book](#))

Simmons, Erica and Nicholas Smith, “Comparisons with an Ethnographic Sensibility: Studies of Protest and Vigilantism,” in Erica Simmons and Nicholas Smith, Editors, *Rethinking Comparison: Innovative Methods for Qualitative Political Inquiry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021) – Chapter 12. ([E-Book](#))

## Discussion Questions

- When developing a research design, do we opt for comparative case studies or a multi-sited approach?
- What is a case study? What kinds of questions and puzzles is it especially helpful in answering?
- Case studies are always built on a processual, mechanism-based understanding of cause. Discuss.
- What is a multi-sited approach? What kinds of questions and puzzles is it especially helpful in answering?
- What does it mean to speak of validity and transparency in case study or multi-sited research?
- What are the narrative, methodological and data attributes of a rigorously executed case study or multi-sited approach?

## **Session 4 - Comparative Historical Analysis**

### *Nuts and Bolts*

Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen, Editors, *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapters 1, 6, 8, 9. ([E-Book](#))

### *Applications*

Gibson, Christopher, *Movement-driven Development: The Politics of Health and Democracy in Brazil* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019) – Chapters 1, 4. ([E-Book](#))<sup>2</sup>

### **Discussion Questions**

- Comparative historical analysis (CHA) is a method (or should that be design?!) uniquely well placed to capture temporal dynamics. Discuss.
- If case studies play key roles in CHA, what are the typical within-case methods employed by these scholars?
- What role do path dependence and critical junctures play in CHA?
- How would you recognize a critical juncture if it were to walk through the door?

### **Session 5 - Process Analytics: Process Tracing & Practice Tracing**

#### *Overview*

Checkel, Jeffrey T., “[Process Tracing - Between Broadening and Deepening](#),” Methods Seminar, Department of Social Policy and Intervention, University of Oxford, May 2023.

#### *Nuts and Bolts - Positivist*

Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editors, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapters 1, 10, Appendix. ([E-Book](#))

Zaks, Sherry, “Updating Bayesian(s): A Critical Evaluation of Bayesian Process Tracing,” *Political Analysis* 29/1 (2021): 58-74.

#### *Nuts and Bolts - Interpretive*

Pouliot, Vincent, “Practice Tracing,” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editors, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapter 9. ([E-Book](#))

### *Applications*

Schwartz, Rachel and Scott Straus, “What Drives Violence against Civilians in Civil War? Evidence from Guatemala’s Conflict Archives,” *Journal of Peace Research* 55/2 (2018): 222–235.

Pouliot, Vincent, *International Pecking Orders: The Politics and Practice of Multilateral Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016) – Appendix. ([E-Book](#))

### **Discussion Questions**

- What is process tracing and how does it differ from historical chronologies?

---

<sup>2</sup> The EUI Library does have Gibson as an e-book. If the link provided here does not work, just access it through the Library Catalogue.



- What role do causal mechanisms and social practices play in process tracing / practice tracing?
- How would you know a rigorous application of process tracing / practice tracing if it were to walk through the door?
- How visible and explicit should the process/practice tracing method be in the write up of your results?
- For many, formalization (Bayesianism, set theory, directed acyclic graphs) is the cutting edge in process tracing. What are the pluses and minuses of such efforts?

## Session 6 - Textual & Discourse Analysis

### *Nuts and Bolts*

Grimmer, Justin, Margaret Roberts, and Brandon Stewart, “Social Science Research and Text Analysis,” in Justin Grimmer, Margaret Roberts, and Brandon Stewart, *Text as Data: A New Framework for Machine Learning and the Social Sciences* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2022) – Chapter 2.

Neumann, Iver, “Discourse Analysis,” in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, Editors, *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) – Chapter 5. ([E-Book](#))

Hansen, Lene, *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War* (London: Routledge, 2006) – Chapters 1, 5. ([E-Book](#))

### *Applications*

Price, Richard, “A Genealogy of the Chemical Weapons Taboo,” *International Organization* 49/1 (1995): 73-103.

Windfeld, Frederik Carl, Marius Hauge Hvithamar and Lene Hansen, “Gothic Visibilities and International Relations: Uncanny Icons, Critical Comics, and the Politics of Abjection in Aleppo,” *Review of International Studies* (FirstView, 18.01.23: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210522000547>).

## Discussion Questions

- What are the strengths and limitations of computational text analysis as a way to access the social world and use language?
- What is discourse as a method and what types of research questions can it best answer?
- What role do social power and productive power play in discourse analysis?
- How would you recognize a good, systematic application of discourse if it were to walk through the door?
- Discourse analysis has an agency problem. Discuss.

## Session 7 - Fieldwork & Ethnography

### *Nuts and Bolts - Fieldwork*

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren MacLean and Benjamin Read, *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapters 1, 3, 4, 7. ([E-Book](#))

### *Nuts and Bolts - Ethnography*

Geertz, Clifford, “*Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture*,” in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (NY: Basic Books, 1973) – Chapter 1. ([E-Book](#))

Delamont, Sara and Paul Atkinson, “The Ethics of Ethnography,” in Ron Iphofen and Martin Tolich, Editors, *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics* (London: Sage Publications, 2018) – Chapter 7. ([E-Book](#))

### ***Applications - Fieldwork***

Grimm, Jannis, Kevin Koehler, Ellen M. Lust, Ilyas Saliba and Isabell Schierenbeck, *Safer Field Research in the Social Sciences: A Guide to Human and Digital Security in Hostile Environments*, Sage Research Methods (London: Sage Publications, 2020) – Chapters 2, 3 and 4. ([E-Book](#))

### ***Applications - Ethnography***

Gusterson, Hugh, “Ethnographic Research,” in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, Editors, *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) – Chapter 7. ([E-Book](#))

Wood, Elisabeth Jean, “Ethnographic Research in the Shadow of Civil War,” in *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003) – Chapter 2. ([E-Book](#))

### **Discussion Questions**

- Fieldwork involves significant preparation. Discuss.
- How does a researcher decide what is ethical when she is conducting fieldwork?
- What is ethnography and how does it differ from conducting a case study?
- What is the difference between cultural ethnography and political ethnography?
- What matters more to an ethnographer: Interviews or participant observation?
- Access and positionality play key – and very differing – roles in ethnography. Discuss.

### **Session 8 - Interviewing**

#### ***Nuts and Bolts - Positivist***

Mosley, Layna, Editor, *Interview Research in Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013) – Introduction, Chapters 1, 3, 9. ([E-Book](#))

#### ***Nuts and Bolts – Interpretive***

Fujii, Lee Ann, *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach* (London: Routledge, 2018). ([E-Book](#))

#### ***Applications***

Leech, Beth, Frank R. Baumgartner, Jeffrey M. Berry, Marie Hojnacki and David C. Kimball, “Lessons from the ‘Lobbying and Policy Change’ Project,” in Layna Mosley, Editor, *Interview Research in Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013) - Chapter 11. ([E-Book](#))

Fujii, Lee Ann, "Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence," *Journal of Peace Research* 47/2 (2010): 231–241.

### **Discussion Questions**

- Political scientists and sociologists, on the one hand, and ethnographers, on the other, conduct interviews in fundamentally different ways. Do you agree or not? Why?
- How would you conduct an interview ethically?
- How does one deal with lies, dissimulation and (faulty?) memory when interviewing?
- How do your gender, nationality, status, and interview questions affect the interview process? (And why do we have two different names for these dynamics: interviewer effects and positionality?)

### **Session 9 – The Cutting Edge I: Qualitative Transparency**

#### ***Nuts and Bolts***

Jacobs, Alan and Tim Buthe, "The Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: Insights and Implications," *Perspectives on Politics* 19/1 (2021): 171-208.

Rinke, Eike Mark and Alexander Wuttke, "Open Minds, Open Methods: Transparency and Inclusion in Pursuit of Better Scholarship," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 54/2 (2021): 281-84.

Kapiszewski, Diana and Elisabeth Wood, "Ethics, Epistemology, and Openness in Research with Human Participants," *Perspectives on Politics* 20/3 (2022): 948-964.

#### ***Applications***

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

Symposium, "[Varieties of Transparency in Qualitative Research](#)," *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 19/1 (Spring 2021): 6-32.

### **Discussion Questions**

- What are the epistemological foundations of the debate over research transparency?
- What are the pluses and minuses of using Active Citation / Annotation for Transparent Inquiry (ATI) and constructing a transparency index?
- Qualitative transparency and quantitative replication are essentially the same. Or fundamentally different? Or ...?
- There is no such thing as a free lunch in social science research: More effort devoted to research transparency means less time for theory development, ethics and the like. Discuss.

### **Session 10 – The Cutting Edge II: Qualitative Mixed-Method Designs**

#### ***Nuts and Bolts***

Lieberman, Evan, "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research," *American Political Science Review* 99/3 (2005): 435-452.

Ahmed, Amel and Rudra Sil, "When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism - Or, Why We Still Need Single-Method Research," *Perspectives on Politics* 10/4 (2012): 935-53.

### *Applications*

Dunning, Thad, “Improving Process Tracing: The Case of Multi-Method Research,” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editors, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapter 8. ([E-Book](#))

Hopf, Ted, “Making Identity Count: Constructivism, Identity, and IR Theory,” in Ted Hopf and Bentley Allan, Editors, *Making Identity Count: Building a National Identity Database* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) – Chapter 1. ([E-Book](#))

### **Discussion Questions**

- Mixed methods are all the rage, but they are not easy to execute. Discuss.
- When is it appropriate to use a mixed-method design? When is it not?
- Do experimental designs of necessity require the use of qualitative methods?
- Can one mix methods across epistemological boundaries – combining discourse analysis with, say, a process-tracing case study?