

POLS 645-1: Qualitative Research Methods
Department of Political Science
Northern Illinois University

Fall 2017
Mondays, 12:30-3:10
DuSable Hall 464

Instructor: Dr. Aarie Glas
Office: Zulauf Hall 412
Office Hours: M 3:15-4pm; T 10am-12pm; and by appointment
Email: aglas@niu.edu

I. Overview

This course introduces graduate students to core issues concerning qualitative research methods and methodology. In particular, it is designed to push students to think about methods while putting together their own dissertation prospectus. The core aims are three-fold: to generate an awareness of the underlying logic of various methods used in qualitative research; to explore the tradeoffs involved when selecting between approaches; and to afford students hands-on experience early in their graduate studies that they can draw on as they work on their dissertations.

This course is designed as a graduate level introduction to qualitative methods with a substantive focus drawn from the sub-fields of Comparative Politics and International Relations. This course is necessarily selective and is not exhaustive. For example, we do not directly take on issues of counterfactual reasoning or the particularities of area studies, and we do not focus directly on survey research. It is up to students to seek out further literatures and expand beyond the confines of this introductory course in designing their own research.

II. Learning Objectives

By the end of this course, students will:

- Be able to link qualitative methodologies to wider theoretical and conceptual debates;
- Be familiar with a number of specific research methods including interview research, participant observation, case studies, and the use of archival sources;
- Understand the constraints and tradeoffs among different methods;
- Be able to read works in the social sciences with an eye to the methodology and methods employed by authors, and;
- Be able to confidently make use of diverse of methods in their own research

III. Grade Distribution

1. Class Participation (including Weekly Responses): 20%
2. Critical Essay: 15%
3. Field Assignment: 20%
4. Research Proposal Presentation and Summary: 15%
5. Research Proposal: 30%

IV. Requirements

1. Class Participation: Students are expected to attend having read and reflected upon *all* the required readings each week in advance of our Seminars. Students are required to engage actively and thoughtfully in discussions each week, *and* to provide one written Weekly Response to the week's *required* readings each Seminar (collectively 20%).

Each week, as your Instructor, I will provide a brief survey of the readings and/or some broader debates to commence our discussion and I will guide discussion as needed during the Seminar. However, it is expected that student-led and student-dominated discussion will characterize our Seminars. Please bring the required reading materials, your notes, and your discussion questions (see below) to each Seminar.

Weekly Responses should reflect on *all* the required readings for the week. They need not be terribly detailed, but should highlight the core arguments and some key examples or illustrations used across the required readings. Moreover, they must include three (3) to six (6) critical discussion questions students will raise during the Seminar. Responses must be one (1) page single-spaced (1 inch margins, size 12 font) excluding the discussion questions which can be on the back of the single page. Responses are due at the conclusion of each Seminar. *No late Responses are accepted* for any reason. Weekly Responses are not formally assessed. They serve as the foundation for student participation. Participation assessment will reflect the quality and consistency of contributions and the quality of all Weekly Responses.

2. Critical Essay: Students are required to write a short (6-8 page, double-spaced) critical essay (15%). Do not exceed 8 double-spaced pages. The essay requires engagement with required and *recommended* readings from a number of weeks to compare, contrast, and evaluate the possibility of reconciling the Positivist and Interpretivist traditions in social science research. Specific details will be provided in Seminar 1. The Essay will be evaluated on the strength of your argumentative thesis, the logic and evidence used to support it, your mastery of a breadth of reading material, and the quality of your writing. The Critical Essay is due in hardcopy at the start of Seminar 5.

3. Field Assignment: Choose from one (1) of the following assignment options (20%). Further details will be provided early in the semester. Field Assignments are due at the start of Seminar 12. Each option requires hands-on work and a formal analysis drawing on weekly required and recommended readings, as students see fit.

- A. Participant Observation: attend a local event and observe closely for at least 3 hours (e.g. a DeKalb/Sycamore town hall meeting, a university association function, a political rally, a social event, etc.). Ask yourself: what political and/or cultural practices and constructions did you witness? How to do assess meaning? Submit two items: (1) a detailed write-up of your field notes and (2) a 6-8 page analysis of your observations, including your rationale for investigating your event. Your analysis should articulate the expectations you had, the conclusions you draw from observations, and your reflections on the process of conducting participant observation.
- B. Interview: Conduct an interview (structured or semi-structured) with a person of your choice. This could be an ‘elite’ (e.g. politician, diplomat, industry expert, working professional, etc.) or ‘non-elite’ (e.g. protestor, working-class laborer, rural family, etc.). The interview should last at least 50 minutes and must be recorded (speak to me if recording is not possible). Submit three items: (1) a full, verbatim transcript of the interview (if possible), (2) a write-up of your field notes, and (3) a 5-7 page analysis of your interview. Your analysis should state the research interest (or question), the choices made in designing, preparing and soliciting the interview, your findings, and your assessment of the utility of your method and of the experience more generally.
- C. Discourse Analysis I. Choose a body of written work (e.g. Congressional records, executive documents, a series of newspaper articles over a specific time period, a set of speeches, etc.). Conduct a discursive analysis of the language, metaphors, and symbols employed. Your analysis should be roughly 6-8 pages.
- D. Discourse Analysis II. Choose a major paradigmatic book from International Relations or Comparative Politics (you may draw from another subfield with my approval in office hours). Write a discourse analysis of the work as you see fit. Your essay should be 6-8 pages and should offer an analysis of the text as well as reflections on the method itself.
- E. Archival Work: If you are interested in conducting archival work, or an approximation thereof, please consult me on or before Week 3 to make arrangements. Approval will only be provided if sufficient archival material is readily available to you.

Note: Options A and B may require formal ethics approval through the IRB. This can take time. If you wish to choose options A or B, consult with me and visit or speak with the Office of Research Compliance and Integrity *prior* to Week 3. Please visit: <http://niu.edu/divresearch/compliance/human/index.shtml> to start familiarizing yourself with the IRB requirements in advance of Week 3.

4. Research Proposal Presentation and Summary: Students are required to write and present a preliminary version of their Research Proposal in Seminar 13 or 14, as decided by lottery (collectively 15%). The Presentation should be roughly 20 minutes *and* also requires leading and engaging in a question-answer discussion period afterward with the class. It is expected that presenters will solicit feedback from their colleagues in the course and incorporate it into a revised Research Proposal (see below). The Presentation

(including handling of questions) is worth 7.5% of the course grade. Assessment will reflect the strength and cohesiveness of the proposal, the clarity of the presentation itself, the strength of response to questions, and the overall ability to present and lead a discussion.

Student presenters are required to provide a Summary (7.5%) of their preliminary Proposal to the class three (3) days in advance of their presentation (3-4 pages, double-spaced). Specific requirements and suggestions for the Presentation and Summary will be provided early in the semester.

5. Research Proposal: Students are required to submit a 12-20 page research proposal. This is intended as a means of drafting a doctoral, masters, or major research project. It should: (a) state your research question; (b) survey relevant literature for existing answers; (c) posit a well-developed research methodology; (d) articulate and defend your case selection; (e) discuss your preliminary hypotheses; and, (f) outline the particular methods you will employ as well as the utility and limitations of your approach. The finalized Research Proposal is due before 4pm seven (7) days after the Research Proposal Presentation date. Further details will be provided.

Note: Students should think about their proposed research early in the semester and begin to familiarize themselves with the relevant literature(s). While entirely preliminary, a well-drafted and cohesive research proposal for a major research project is expected at the end of this term.

V. Submission of Assignments

All course assignments are required in **hardcopy** and to be double-sided, stapled, and clearly presented. Student names, student numbers, course code, and Instructor name should be clearly visible on a title page or header, and page numbers are required. All submitted work must be clearly and formally cited and a bibliography provided (bibliography *does not* count towards page length restrictions), for all assignments *except* for Weekly Responses where no bibliographies are required. No assignment will be accepted by email, unless your Instructor formally asks for them (which may be the case with the Research Proposals) or unless it is agreed to in advance of the submission due to extenuating circumstances.

A **late penalty of 4% per day** (including weekends) will be levied *up to five (5) days* at which point the assignment will not be accepted and will receive a zero. Late assignments are due in hardcopy to the Department of Political Science and *not* by email. A late penalty will be applied as per the notation by Departmental staff.

Extensions and accommodations are possible for documented medical or family emergencies or when agreed to with me, well in advance of a due date. Wherever possible, speak to me as early as possible in the semester to discuss complications or requests for accommodation. Leniency may be possible. However, it is more likely weeks in advance of a due date than the week of or after a due date has passed. Note that no

accommodation is guaranteed and students are expected to plan ahead to complete all written work on or before the relevant due date. Also note that no late Weekly Responses are accepted for any reason.

VI. Course Materials

Please obtain (purchase, rent, borrow, appropriate, etc.) as soon as possible, the following course materials. They are available for purchase at the NIU Bookstore and a number of online retailers. They are also available in hardcopy and/or electronically from the Library. These are *required* texts and we will rely on them in full or in large part throughout the course:

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

Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwatz-Shea, eds. (2006), *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Edward Schatz, ed. (2009), *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lee Ann Fujii (2017), *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach*. New York: Routledge.

The following texts are *recommended* for this course or for your own familiarization beyond. These readings offer useful introductory or complementary discussions to the required course materials and a number are used directly in our course:

Howard S. Becker (1998), *Tricks of the Trade: How to think about your while you're doing it*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, eds. (2008), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. (2010), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

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

Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett (2005), *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Science*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. (2014), *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

VII. A Note on Seminar Readings

Weekly Seminar readings are divided into *required* and *recommended* readings in the below Seminar Plan (required readings are not labeled). The required readings are just that: required. These may include key theoretical discussions regarding each week's topic and specific exemplars (especially those noted by * below). Students must have accessed, read, and reflected on them prior to each week's discussion. Most required readings are drawn from journal sources that are available electronically through the NIU library or from the core texts noted above. Required readings that are not available electronically or are not within the core texts noted above will be left on reserve in the Library or provided electronically through the course Blackboard page, when copyright permits. It is up to students to ensure they access these readings in a timely and efficient manner. This may require coordination with other students in the course or accessing the readings well in advance of specific Seminars, so please do not leave readings to the last minute.

The recommended readings are suggestions for further reading. Many will help inform course assignments and students' own research designs. Often, they include further and more detailed exemplars (again, noted with * below), which students can explore while developing their own research agenda.

VIII. Office Hours

Office Hours will be held weekly (as noted on page 1). These are drop-in times and all students are always welcome to attend to discuss anything related to the course, or anything else you feel that I could potentially help with. No RSVP is required. Students are encouraged to visit as often as they like. If you cannot meet during this period, please email me well in advance to arrange an alternative time, and I am sure I can accommodate your schedule.

IX. Email Contact

I will (try to) answer questions by email when appropriate. Please use the **course code** somewhere in the subject line and ensure you make use of your **official NIU email address** for all communications. Those two requirements help ensure that emails are received and read in a timely manner. A 24-48 hour turnaround time should be anticipated, so please do not leave questions to the last minute.

Substantive questions regarding course materials and discussions or concerns or questions about the assignments are best discussed in Office Hours and not by email. Alternatively, please feel free to raise questions at the onset of our Seminars for the benefit of all your colleagues in the course. As a rule of thumb, if a question or a welcomed response is longer than three or so sentences, it is likely a topic to chat about in Office Hours or in our Seminars.

X. Our Space and Issues of Accessibility

Together, we will foster a comfortable, engaging, and accessible scholarly environment. All students should feel welcome to attend and speak freely in our Seminars and in Office Hours. To this end we will approach this course as colleagues, and we will treat each other with respect and dignity at all times.

NIU, and myself as your Instructor, are committed to making reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities. If any disabilities may impact on coursework or other academic requirements, please notify both your Instructor and the Disability Resource Center (Tel. 815-753-1303) on the fourth floor of the Health Services Building as soon as possible, and within the first two weeks of the start of this course. If you would rather not speak to your Instructor, note that the Disability Resource Center can assist students in making appropriate accommodations with Instructors discretely.

If you have any concerns about the course or your ability to access or engage with the course material or our discussions – at any point throughout the semester – please also feel free to contact me by email or speak to me in person, whenever. I will happy to assist as best as I am able. I am also happy to raise any issues or concerns you may have on your behalf with the Department or NIU directly.

XI. Preferred Names and Pronouns

Class rosters and University data systems are provided to faculty with the student's legal name and legal gender marker. As an NIU student, you are able to change how your preferred/proper name shows up on class rosters. This option is helpful for various student populations, including but not limited to: students who abbreviate their first name; students who use their middle name; international students; and transgender students. As your Instructor, I am committed to using your proper name and pronouns.

We will take time during our first class together to do introductions, at which point you can share with all members of our Seminar what name and pronouns you use, as you are comfortable. Additionally, if these change at any point during the semester, please let me know and we can develop a plan to share this information with others in a way that is safe for you.

Should you want to update your preferred/proper name, you can do so by looking at the following guidelines and frequently asked questions:

<http://www.niu.edu/regrec/preferredname/index.shtml>

<http://www.niu.edu/regrec/preferredname/preferrednamefaq.shtml>

XII. Academic Integrity

Students are expected to have read and to abide by NIU's Student Code of Conduct (<http://www.niu.edu/conduct/student-code-of-conduct>).

This course will take academic misconduct seriously. All work submitted must be a student's own in full. While graduate students should be entirely familiar with issues of academic (dis)honesty, please take NIU's Online Tutorial on Academic Integrity to re-familiarize yourself if you have doubts or concerns (<http://www.niu.edu/ai/students/>) and/or speak to me in Office Hours.

Any student in this course found to have plagiarized (accidentally or otherwise) the work of another individual (including, but not limited to other students and from existing scholarship) will receive a failing grade in this course and may be subject to additional sanctions by the University. If you have any questions throughout the course relating to academic practices, academic integrity, and issues of plagiarism please speak to me and/or consult the links noted above.

Note: With the above in mind, please ensure that all drafts, preliminary work, and research notes, as well as all *graded and returned* course assignments, are retained until course grades are finalized by the Registrar. As your Instructor, I may request to review either draft or finalized material at any point during the course and/or discuss student assignments in person.

XIII. Seminar Plan:

Seminar No.	Date	Topic
Seminar 1.	August 28	Introduction
<i>Labo[u]r Day</i>	September 4	<i>No Seminar</i>
Seminar 2.	September 11	What are Qualitative Methods?
<i>Dr. Glas is MIA</i>	September 18	<i>No Seminar</i>
Seminar 3.	September 25	The Positivist Tradition
Seminar 4.	October 2	The Interpretivist Tradition
Seminar 5.	October 9	Case Studies
		Critical Essay Due
Seminar 6.	October 16	Participant Observation and Ethnography
Seminar 7.	October 23	Interviewing
Seminar 8.	October 30	Archival Research and Historiography
Seminar 9.	November 6	Discourse Analysis
Seminar 10.	November 13	Critical Junctures, Temporality, and Path Dependence
Seminar 11.	November 20	Process Tracing
Seminar 12.	November 27	Mixed Methods
		Field Assignment Due
Seminar 13.	December 4	Student Presentations (and Course Evaluation)
Seminar 14.	December 11	Student Presentations

Note: topics and readings may be subject to change at the discretion of your Instructor. Any change to the required readings will be posted at least seven (7) days prior to the relevant Seminar. Any change in the above schedule (e.g. the cancellation or rescheduling of a Seminar) will be noted as soon as possible by your Instructor.

XIV. Detailed Seminar Plan

Seminar 1. Introduction

Please read the Syllabus in full!

Seminar 2. What are Qualitative Methods?

James Mahoney and Gary Goertz (2006), “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research” *Political Analysis* 14 (3): pp. 227-249.

Henry E. Brady, David Collier, and Jason Seawright (2010), “Refocusing the Discussion of Methodology” in Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers: pp. 15-31.

Peter Hall (2003), “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research,” in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: pp. 373-404.

Rudra Sil and Peter J. Katzenstein (2010), “Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics: Reconfiguring Problems and Mechanisms across Research Traditions.” *Perspectives on Politics* 8: pp. 411-431.

Recommended

Steven Bernstein, Richard. N. Lebow, Janice Gross Stein, and Steven Weber (2000), “God gave physics the easy problems: Adapting social science to an unpredictable world.” *European Journal of International Relations* 6 (1): pp. 43-76.

Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. (2010), *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. Chapters 3, 4, 8 and 11.

John Gerring (2012), *Social Science Methodology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Esp. Chapter 1).

Alexander Wendt (1998) “On Constitution and Causation in International Relations” *Review of International Studies* 24: pp. 101-117.

Richard Ned Lebow (2009), “Constitutive Causality: Imagined Spaces and Political Practices” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 38 (2): pp. 211-239.

Mary Hawkesworth (2006), “Contending Conceptions of Science and Politics: Methodology and the Constitution of the Political,” in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. 27-49).

Seminar 3. The Positivist Tradition

Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994), *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapters 1-3 (pp. 3-115).

*Jessica Allina-Pisano (2009), "How to tell an axe murderer: an essay on ethnography, truth, and lies" in *Political Ethnography* (pp. 53-73).

Recommended

Timothy McKeown (1999), "Case Studies and the Statistical Worldview: Review of King, Keohane, and Verba's *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*" *International Organization* 53(1): pp. 161-190.

Karl Popper (1970), "Normal Science and its Dangers", in Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave eds., *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: pp. 51-58.

Henry E. Brady, David Collier, and Jason Seawright (2010), "Critiques, Responses, and Trade-Offs: Drawing Together the Debate" in *Rethinking Social Science Inquiry* (pp. 135-159).

John Gerring (2008) "The Mechanismic Worldview: Thinking Inside the Box." *British Journal of Political Science* 38:1: pp. 161-179.

Thomas Kuhn (1996), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

John Gerring (2005), "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17(2): pp. 163-198.

Jack S. Levy (2007), "Qualitative methods and cross-method dialogue in political science." *Comparative Political Studies* 40(2): pp. 196-214.

James Johnson (2006), "Consequences of Positivism: A Pragmatist Assessment," *Comparative Political Studies* 39(2): pp. 224-252

Andrew Bennett (2003), "A Lakatosian Reading of Lakatos: What Can We Salvage from the Hard Core?" in Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman eds., *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*. Cambridge MIT Press: pp. 455-494.

Martin Hollis and Steve Smith (1991), *Explaining and Understanding in International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (especially Chapter 3).

George Thomas (2005), "The Qualitative Foundations of Political Science Methodology," *Perspectives on Politics* 3(4): pp. 855-866.

*James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin (1996), "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation," *American Political Science Review* 90: pp. 715-735.

Seminar 4. The Interpretivist Tradition

Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shae (2006), "Introduction" in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. xi-xxvii).

Dvora Yanow (2006), "Thinking Interpretively: Philosophical Presuppositions and the Human Sciences" in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. 5-26).

Dvora Yanow (2006), "Neither Rigorous nor Objective? Interrogating Criteria for Knowledge Claims in Interpretive Science" in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. 67-88).

*Clifford Geertz (1973), *Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books. Chapters 1 and 15.

Recommended

Timothy Pachirat (2006), "We Call It a Grain of Sand: The Interpretive Orientation and a Human Social Science" in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. 373-379).

Terrence Ball (1987), "Deadly Hermeneutics; or SINN and the Social Scientist," in Terrence Ball, ed., *Idioms of Inquiry: Critique and Renewal in Political Science*. New York: State University of New York: pp. 95-112.

Jack S. Levy (2007), "Qualitative methods and cross-method dialogue in political science." *Comparative Political Studies* 40 (2): 196-214.

Charles Taylor (1971), "Interpretation and the Sciences of Man," *The Review of Metaphysics* 25(1): pp. 3-51

Herbert M. Kritzer (1996), "The Data Puzzle: The Nature of Interpretation in Quantitative Research," *American Journal of Political Science* 40: pp. 1-32

"Symposium: Interpretivism," *Qualitative Methods Newsletter of APSA* 1:2 (Fall 2003).

Corey Shdaimah, Roland Stahl, Sanford F. Schram (2009), "When You Can See the Sky Through Your Roof: Policy Analysis from the Bottom Up," in *Political Ethnography* (pp. 255-274).

Seminar 5. Case Studies

John Gerring (2004), "What is a Case Study and What is it Good For?" *American Political Science Review* 98(2): pp. 341-354.

Barbara Geddes (1990), "How the Cases you Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics," *Political Analysis* 2: pp. 131-150.

F. Douglas Dion (1998), "Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study," *Comparative Politics* 30(2): pp. 127-146.

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

Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (1994), *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Chapter 4 and pp. 199-207.

Recommended

(2007) "Symposium on John Gerring's Case Study Research: Principles and Practices" *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* 5(2): pp. 2-15.

Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett (2005), *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Science*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Chapters 3-6 (pp. 67-124).

Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman (2007) "Case Study Methods in the International Relations Subfield." *Comparative Political Studies*. 40(2): pp. 170-195.

Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman (2006), "Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods." *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: pp. 455-476.

Mario Small (2009), "How Many Cases do I Need?" *On Science and the Logic of Case Selection in Field Based Research*. *Ethnography* 10(1): 5-38.

Jason Seawright and John Gerring (2008), "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options." *Political Research Quarterly* 61(2): 2pp. 94-308.

Charles C. Ragin and Howard S. Becker eds. (1992), *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Charles Ragin (2008), *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [And alongside it: Michael Smithson (2005), "Linking fuzzy set methods with mainstream techniques." *Sociological Methods & Research* 33(4): pp. 431-461.]

John Gerring (2007), "Is There a (Viable) Crucial-Case Method?" *Comparative Political Studies* 40(3), 2007: 231-253

Alexander George (1979), "Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured Focused Comparison," in Paul Lauren, ed., *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy*. New York: Free Press: pp. 43-68.

Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune (1970), *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley-Interscience, John Wiley & Sons.

David Collier and James Mahoney (1996), "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research," *World Politics* 49: pp. 56-91.

Barbara Geddes (2003), *Paradigms and Sandcastles*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

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

* Robert Putnam (1993), *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

*Tuong Vu (2010), *Paths to Development in Asia: South Korea, Vietnam, China, and Indonesia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Dan Slater (2010), *Ordering Power: Contentious Politics and Authoritarian Leviathans in Southeast Asia*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Seminar 6. Participant Observation and Ethnography

Edward Schatz (2009), "Introduction: Ethnographic immersion and the study of politics" in *Political Ethnography* (pp. 1-22).

Lisa Wedeen (2009), "Ethnography as Interpretive Enterprise" in *Political Ethnography* (pp. 75-93).

*Katherine Cramer Walsh (2012), "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective" *American Political Science Review* 106(3): pp. 517-532.

*Timothy Pachirat (2009), "The political in political ethnography: dispatches from the kill floor" in *Political Ethnography* (pp. 143-161).

*Review the Office of Research Compliance and Integrity's "Human Subject Research" policies and guidelines and the related Institutional Review Board (IRB) process and forms (see: <http://niu.edu/divresearch/compliance/human/index.shtml>).

Recommended

Samer Shehata (2006), "Ethnography, identity and the production of knowledge" in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. 244-263).

Joseph MacKay and Jamie Levin (2015), "Hanging Out in International Politics: Two Kinds of Explanatory Political Ethnography for IR" *International Studies Review* 17(2): pp. 163-188.

Karl G. Heider, "The Rashomon Effect: When Ethnographers Disagree," *American Anthropologist* 90(1), March, 1988: 73-81

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

*Edward Schatz ed. (2009), *Political Ethnography: what immersion contributes to the study of power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (all other chapters)

*Michael N. Barnett (1997) "The UN Security Council, Indifference, and Genocide in Rwanda." *Cultural Anthropology*. 12(4): pp. 551-578.

*Katherine Cramer Walsh (2004), "Talking about politics: informal groups and social identity in American life. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

*James C. Scott (1998), *Weapons of the Weak*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

*Lisa Wedeen (2008), *Peripheral Visions: Publics, power, and performance in Yemen*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

* Sarah Marie Wiebe (2016), *Everyday Exposure: Indigenous Mobilization and Environmental Justice in Canada's Chemical Valley*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Seminar 7. Interviewing

Layna Mosley (2013), "'Just Talk to People'? Interviews in Contemporary Political Science" in Layna Mosley (ed.) *Interview Research in Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: pp. 1-28.

Lee Ann Fujii (2017) *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach*. New York: Routledge (pp. 1-101).

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

Recommended

Frederic Charles Schaffer (2006), "Ordinary Language Interviewing" in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. 150-160)

Brian C. Rathbun (2008), "Interviewing and Qualitative Field Methods: Pragmatism and Practicalities" in Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: pp. 685-701.

John G. Geer (1991), "Do Open-Ended Questions Measure 'Salient' Issues?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 55(3): pp. 360-70.

Joe Soss (2006), "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered Approach to In-Depth Interviews for Interpretive Research." in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. 127-159)

Robert Dingwall (1997), "Accounts, Interviews and Observation," in Gale Miller and Robert Dingwall, eds., *Context and Method in Qualitative Research*. New York: Sage: 51-64

Robert M. Emerson, Rachel I. Fretz and Linda L. Shaw (1995), *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lee Ann Fujii (2012), "Research Ethics 101: Dilemmas and Responsibilities" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45(4): pp. 717-23.

Chandra Lekha Sriram, John C. King, Julie A. Mertus, Olga Martin-Ortega, and Johanna Herman, eds. (2009) *Surviving Field Work: Working in violent and difficult situations*. New York: Routledge.

*Elisabeth Jean Wood (2006), "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones" *Qualitative Sociology* 29(3): pp. 373-386.

*Vincent Pouliot (2010), *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Especially Chapter 2). [See also Ted Hopf (2011) "Review of: International Security in Practice" *Perspectives on Politics* 9(3): pp. 772-773.]

*Joe Soss (2000), *Unwanted Claims: The Politics of Participation in the U.S. Welfare System*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

*Lee Ann Fujii (2011), *Killing Neighbors: Webs of Violence in Rwanda*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

*Frederic Charles Schaffer (1998), *Democracy in Translation: Understanding Politics in an Unfamiliar Culture*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Seminar 8. Archival Research and Historiography

Ian Lustick (1996), "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias," *American Political Science Review* 90: pp. 605-618.

Theda Skocpol and Margaret Sommers (1980), "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22(2): pp. 174-197.

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

Clare Ginger (2006), "Interpretive content analysis: Stories and arguments in analytical documents" in *Interpretation and Method* (pp. 331-348)

*Ted Hopf (2002) *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies: Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Preface and Chapter 1 (*and skim the rest of the book*).

Recommended

Tim Büthe (2002), "Taking Temporality Seriously: Modeling History and the Use of Narratives as Evidence," *American Political Science Review* 96(3): pp. 481-493.

Jack Levy (1997), "Too Important to Leave to the Other," *International Security* 22(1): pp. 22-33

David Hackett Fischer (1970), *Historian's Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*. New York: Harper and Row.

*Yuen Foong Khong (1992), *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

*James G. Blight, Bruce J. Allyn, and David A. Welch (2002), *Cuba on the Brink: Castro, the Missile Crisis, and the Soviet Collapse*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

*Kate Brown (2003), *A Biography of No Place: From Ethnic Borderland to Soviet Heartland*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

*Kristen Weld (2014), *Paper Cadavers: The archives of dictatorship in Guatemala*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Seminar 9. Discourse Analysis

Iver B. Neumann (2008), "Discourse Analysis," in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash eds., *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan: pp. 61-77.

Vivien A. Schmidt (2008), "Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11: pp. 303-326.

Lisa Weeden (2002), "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science" *American Political Science Review* 96(4): pp. 713-728.

*Rodney Bruce Hall (2003), "The Discursive Demolition of the Asian Development Model," *International Studies Quarterly* 47: pp. 71-99.

*Carol Cohn (1987) "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals" *Signs. Within and Without: Women, Gender and Theory* 12(4): pp. 687-718.

Recommended

Jennifer Milliken (1999), "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods," *European Journal of International Relations* 5(2): pp. 225-54

Aletta J. Norval (2000), "The Things We Do with Words: Contemporary Approaches to the Analysis of Ideology," *British Journal of Political Science* 30: pp. 313-346.

Carol Cohn (2006), "Motives and Methods: Using Multi-Sited Ethnography to Study US National Security Discourses," in Brooke A. Ackerly, Maria Stern and Jacqui True eds., *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations* Cambridge University Press: pp. 91-107.

Shaul R. Shenhav (2006), "Political Narratives and Political Reality," *International Political Science Review* 27(3): pp. 245-262

Terrence Ball (2004), "History and the Interpretation of Texts" in Gerald F. Gaus and Chandran Kukathas, eds., *Handbook of Political Theory*, London: Sage: pp. 18-30.

*Iver B. Neumann (2002), "Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy" *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 31(3): pp. 627-651.

*Roxanne Lynne Doty (1996), *Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

*Lene Hansen (2006), *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge.

*Jutta Weldes (1999), *Constructing National Interests: The United States and the Cuban Missile Crisis* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

*Thomas Ricento (2003), "The Discursive Construction of Americanism," *Discourse & Society* 14(5): pp. 611-637.

Seminar 10. Thinking about Time: Critical Junctures, Temporality, and Path Dependence

Paul Pierson (2000), "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics" *American Political Science Review* 94 (2): pp. 251-67.

Orfeo Fioretos (2011), "Historical Institutionalism in International Relations" *International Organization* 65(2): pp. 367-399.

Giovanni Capoccia and R. Daniel Kelemen (2007), "The Study of Critical Junctures: Theory, Narrative, and Counterfactuals in Historical Institutionalism," *World Politics* 59(3): pp. 341-369.

*Vincent Pouliot and Jean-Philippe Thérien (2015), "The Politics of Exclusion: Changing Patterns in the Governance of International Security," *Review of International Studies* 41(2): pp. 211-237.

*John G. Ikenberry (2001), *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 1 (and skim the rest of the book).

Recommended

Kathleen Thelen (1999), "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics" *Annual Review of Political Science* 2(1): pp. 369-404.

Avner Greif, David D. Laitin (2004) "A Theory of Endogenous Institutional Change." *American Political Science Review* 98 (4): pp. 633-652.

Paul Pierson (2015), "Power and Path Dependence" in James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen eds., *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: pp. 123-146.

James Mahoney (2000) "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology" *Theory and Society* 29 (4): pp. 507-548.

Peters, B. Guy, Pierre Jon, and Desmond S. King (2005) “The Politics of Path Dependency: Political Conflict in Historical Institutionalism” *The Journal of Politics* 67 (4): pp. 1275-1300.

Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman (2006), “Complex Causal Relations and Case Study Methods: The Example of Path Dependence,” *Political Analysis* 14(3): pp. 250-267

Adrian Kay (2005), “A Critique of the Use of Path Dependency in Policy Studies,” *Public Administration* 83(3): 553-571.

* Ruth Berins Collier and David Collier (1991) *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

*Theda Skocpol (1979), *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seminar 11. Thinking about Mechanisms: Process Tracing

Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel (2014), “Process tracing: from philosophical roots to best practices” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1-38.

Jeffrey T. Checkel (2014), “Mechanisms, process and the study of international institutions” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: pp. 74-97.

Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel (2014), “Beyond metaphors: standards, theory, and the ‘where next’ for process tracing” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 260-275.

*Matthew Evangelista (2014), “Explaining the Cold War’s end: process tracing all the way down?” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 153-185.

Recommended

Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett (2005), “Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation” in Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press: pp. 205-232.

Andrew Bennett (2010), "Process Tracing and Causal Inference" in *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (pp. 207-219).

Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel eds. (2014), *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (all other chapters)

"Symposium: Causal Mechanisms and Process Tracing" *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research Newsletter of APSA*. Spring/Fall 2016, 14(1/2). Available online: https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/CQRM_Newsletters/Newsletter14.1-2.pdf

Oisín Tansey (2007), "Process tracing and elite interviewing: a case for non-probability sampling" *PS: Political Science and Politics* 40(4): pp. 765-772.

* Kathleen Thelen (2004) *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States, and Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seminar 12. Mixed Methods

Amel Ahmed and Rudra Sil (2008), "Is Multi-Method Research Really 'Better'?" *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research*, 7(2): pp. 2-6.

Sidney Tarrow (2010), "Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide" in *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (pp. 101-110).

Jason Seawright (2016), *Multi-Method Social Science*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter. 1.

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

*Reyko Huang (2016), "Rebel Diplomacy in Civil War" *International Security* 40(4): pp. 89-126.

Recommended

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

James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin (2008), "Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods," in Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: pp. 756-776.

Cathie Jo Martin (2013). "Using Interviews in the Search for Cause and Effect: The Power of Mixed-Methods Research Design" In *Interview Research in Political Science*, edited by Layna Mosley. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: pp. 141-167.

Joseph A. Maxwell (2010), "Using Numbers in Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 16(6): pp. 475-482.

Robert Pahre (2005), "Formal Theory and Case-study Methods in EU Studies." *European Union Politics* 6 (1): pp. 113-145.

Patricia Bazeley (2009), "Integrating Data Analyses in Mixed Methods Research," *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 3 (3): pp. 203-207.

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

*Daniel W. Drezner (1999) *The Sanctions Paradox: Economic Statecraft and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Idean Salehyan (2009), *Rebels Without Borders: Transnational insurgencies in world politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Seminar 13. Student Presentations

Seminar 14. Student Presentations