

PS 234A/PubPol 290: Qualitative and Multi-Method Research
Department of Political Science and Goldman School of Public Policy
University of California, Berkeley
DRAFT

Semester: Spring 2019
Time: Wednesdays 10 AM – 12 PM
Location: 791 Barrows Hall
Office Hours (770 Barrows): Tuesday 1 PM – 3 PM

Professor: Jennifer Bussell
Offices: 770 Barrows Hall
and 302 GSPP
Email: jbussell@berkeley.edu

Course Description

This graduate seminar introduces students to the rapidly evolving field of qualitative and multi-method research. The seminar is designed to provide students with an overview of qualitative methods essential to political science research. In addition, we will consider a range of ways in which qualitative methods can be integrated with other research methodologies, such as field and natural experiments, formal models, and statistical modeling. Required readings cover classic texts, recent innovations, and applied examples. Note that this means there is a lot of reading! Students are expected to become familiar with both the methodological ideas and their substantive application.

The ultimate goal of the course is to provide students with the background necessary to pursue qualitative and multimethod methods in their own original research. It will enable students to master core tools, understand basic problems, and explore advanced topics. Students should ultimately be able to apply these methods in writing a dissertation prospectus, grant proposal, or research paper.

Requirements

All readings will be provided in advance on the course bCourses site. Students are expected to be active participants in weekly seminar discussions. This entails completing all required readings listed on the syllabus for a given week prior to the class session for that week. Throughout the syllabus, for reference, primarily substantive examples are marked with an asterisk (*). **Course participation will count for 10% of the final grade.**

Students will be required to address different design and methodological aspects of a single research question throughout the course of the semester. The goal of this strategy is to enable students to develop methodological facility and substantive knowledge in multiple techniques. All assignments should be double-spaced with one-inch margins and in 12-point Times New Roman font. Assignments should be submitted via designated links on bCourses.

Summary of Written Assignments (details below):

- (1) Research Abstract - Due: February 6
- (2) Research Statement - Due: February 20
- (3) Concept Formation - Due: March 6
- (4) Case Selection - Due: March 20
- (5) Three Substantive Methodological Reports – Due: between March 20 and May 1

(1) Research Abstract

Due: February 6

A 250 word statement that outlines the proposed research question. This statement should include the following: (1) a substantively motivated question that lends itself to qualitative research; (2) a brief description of the relevant literature; (3) a description of the qualitative methodology or methodologies that will be employed; and (4) the potential theoretical and/or empirical contribution to be made. **The abstract is worth 5% of the final grade.**

(2) Research Statement

Due: February 20

Two pages: present the following: (1) a description of the substantive importance of the question; (2) a hypothesis or theoretical framework to be tested; (3) a description of the required data to assess the hypothesis; (4) a discussion of one or more methods to gather the required data. **The statement is worth 10% of the final grade.**

(3) Concept Formation

Due: March 6

Three-five pages: present a concept that is central to the research question either as a dependent or independent variable. Specify how you will conceptualize, operationalize, and measure the concept. **This assignment is worth 15% of the final grade.**

(4) Case Selection

Due: March 20

Three-five pages: present a rationale for selecting a particular case or set of cases for empirical study. Discuss how the case selection allows for causal inference. Discuss any specific challenges to inferences. **This assignment is worth 15% of the final grade.**

(5) Choose any three of the following and write three-five pages for each. Due by student choice between March 20 and May 1. I highly recommend not waiting until the end of the semester to complete all of these reports. **Each assignment is worth 15% of the final grade.**

(A) Process Tracing

Identify a process that is of importance to your research question. Describe the practical, operational steps you would need to go through to trace the process. Explain what kinds of tests you would need to employ to corroborate the process. Describe what kind of evidence you would need to corroborate the distinct components or stages of the process. Trace the process to the extent possible with available materials and make an argument based on your findings.

(B) Archival Research

Identify an archive that will allow you to pursue your research question, preferably one that is available locally or online. Define a sample of materials from that archive that you anticipate could shed light on your question and explain why they are relevant to your project. Request and read these documents and do your best to answer the question you set out to answer. Discuss limitations that the archive or your sampling technique imposes on causal or descriptive inference.

(C) Ethnography

Design and undertake a small study involving ethnographic observation. This may involve spending a few hours to a few days observing something that is related in some way to your proposed research topic. What did you see/hear/smell/taste/feel? What did you learn? (How) did your presence affect what you saw or learned? Describe what you learned from this study that other methods would not have yielded, and vice versa.

(D) Shadowing

Identify a type of individual whose professional position is of relevance to your research question. Identify a single individual who holds such a position and spend one day shadowing that individual, using the techniques outlined in Bussell (2018) assigned in week 9. Use strategies from week 10's readings to code your field notes and write a preliminary coding memo to accompany a description of your study design. In your final document, also reflect on your experience shadowing: was the observation straightforward? Were there uncomfortable moments? Did your subject seem able to complete her normal routines and tasks without difficulty while being observed?

(E) Interviewing

Develop a semi-structured interview guide to explore questions related to your proposed research topic. Identify a few individuals of the type that you would need to interview and ask them the questions. Which questions elicited the most useful information? Why? How did you feel while you were asking the questions? How did your respondents seem to feel when they were answering them?

Schedule

Week 1 (01/23): Introduction – Asking and Answering Research Questions

Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Chapter 2 (“Big Questions, Little Answers: How the Questions You Choose Affect the Answers You Get”).

Corti, Louise. 2018. “Show me the data: research reproducibility in qualitative research.” <http://blog.ukdataservice.ac.uk/show-me-the-data/>

Recommended:

Openness in Political Science: Data Access and Research Transparency. Symposium. 2014. PS: Political Science and Politics.

Transparency in Qualitative and Multi Method Research. Symposium. 2015. *Qualitative & Multi Method Research Newsletter* 13(1).

Week 2 (01/30): Inference

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 75-91 (“Causality and Causal Inference”).

Collier, David, Henry E. Brady, and Jason Seawright. 2010. “Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology” in Henry Brady and David Collier, Eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield: 161-204.

Gerring, John. 2012. “Mere Description,” *British Journal of Political Science*, 42(4): 721-746.

Fearon, James D. 1991. Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science. *World Politics* 43(2): 169-195.

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

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

Week 3 (02/06): Concepts and Measurement

Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. “Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics,” *American Political Science Review*. 64(4): 1033–1053.

Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, pp. 132-140.

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

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

Paxton, Pamela. 2000. "Women's suffrage in the measurement of democracy: Problems of Operationalization," *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 35(3): 92-111.

Adcock, Robert and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review*, 95: 529-546.

Bussell, Jennifer. 2015. "Typologies of Corruption: A Pragmatic Approach," in S. Rose-Ackerman and P. Lagunes, Eds., *Greed, Corruption, and the Modern State: Essays in Political Economy*, Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Recommended:

Bevir, Mark, and Asaf Kedar. "Concept Formation in Political Science: An Anti-Naturalist Critique of Qualitative Methodology." *Perspectives on Politics* 6, no. 3 (2008): 503-517.

Coppedge, Michael et al. 2011. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach." *Perspectives on Politics* 9(02): 247-67.

Schaffer, Frederic Charles. 2016. *Elucidating Social Science Concepts: An Interpretivist Guide*. New York: Routledge.

*Boas, Taylor C. and Jordan Gans Morse. 2009. "Neoliberalism: From New Liberal Philosophy to Anti-Liberal Slogan," *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 44(2): 137-161.

Week 4 (02/13): Case Selection

Van Evera, Stephen. 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Chapter 2 ("What Are Case Studies? How Should They be Performed?")

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

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

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

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

Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler, and Nicholas Sambanis. 2005. "The Collier-Hoeffler Model of Civil War Onset and the Case Study Project Research Design," in Paul Collier and Nicholas Sambanis, Eds. *Understanding Civil War: Evidence and Analysis, Volume 1: Africa*. Washington, DC: The World Bank, pp. 1-34.

Slater, Dan and Daniel Ziblatt. 2013. "The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Comparison." *Comparative Political Studies* 46(10): 1301-1327. (Read first 14 pages; skim the rest.)

Recommended:

Beach, Derek and Rasmus Brun Pederson. 2016. *Causal Case Study Methods: Foundations and Guidelines for Comparing, Matching, and Tracing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chapters 1-3 ("Causal Case Studies," "Understanding Causation in Case-Based Methods," and "Types of Causal Explanation in Case-Based Research").

Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 3 ("What is a Case Study Good For?") and 5 ("Techniques for Choosing Cases").

Week 5 (02/20) – No Class

Week 6 (02/27): Process Tracing

Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997, pp. 67-88.

Collier, David. 2011. "Understanding Process Tracing," *PS*, October.

Bennett, Andrew, 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*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 1

Beach, Derek and Rasmus Brun Pederson. 2016. *Causal Case Study Methods: Foundations and Guidelines for Comparing, Matching, and Tracing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chapter 9 ("Process-Tracing Methods").

Zaks, Sherry. 2017. "Relationships Among Rivals (RAR): A Framework for Analyzing Contending Hypotheses in Process Tracing," *Political Analysis*, 25: 344-362.

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. "Time Will Tell? Temporality and the Analysis of Causal Mechanisms and Processes." *Comparative Political Studies* 44(9): 1267–1297.

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2004. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, Chapter 10 (“Process Tracing and Historical Explanation”)

*Brady, Henry E. 2004. “Data-Set Observations versus Causal-Process Observations: The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election,” in Henry E. Brady and David Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 267-271.

*Fairfield, Tasha. 2013. “Going Where the Money Is: Strategies for Taxing Economic Elites in Unequal Democracies,” *World Development*, 47: 42-57.

Recommended:

Pierson, Paul. 2001. “Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics.” *American Political Science Review* 94: 251-267.

Falleti, Tulia G. and James Mahoney. 2015. “The comparative sequential method,” in James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen, Eds., *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

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

*Lawrence, Adria. 2013. *Imperial Rule and the Politics of Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Kalyvas, Stathis. 2006. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapters 7 (“A Theory of Selective Violence”) and 9 (“Empirics II: Microcomparative Evidence”).

Week 7 (03/06): Archival & Historical Research

Trachtenberg, Marc. 2006. *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 51-78, 140-168 & Appendix II
<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/methbk/AppendixII.html>

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

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

Capoccia, Giovanni and R. Daniel Kelemen. 2007. The study of critical junctures: Theory, narrative, and counterfactuals in historical institutionalism. *World Politics*, 59(3): 341-369.

*Saunders, Elizabeth N. 2009. "Transformative Choices: Leaders and the Origins of Intervention Strategy." *International Security* 34 (2): 119–161.

*Suryanarayan, Pavithra. 2018. "When Do the Poor Vote for the Right Wing and Why: Status Hierarchy and Vote Choice in the Indian States," *Comparative Political Studies*, 52(2): 209-245

Recommended:

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

Rao, Vijayendra, Michael Woolcock, and Simon Szreter. "Why and How Does History Matter for Development," *Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (January 2011): 70-96

*Wittenberg, Jason. 2012. *Crucibles of Political Loyalty: Church Institutions and Electoral Continuity in Hungary*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Week 8 (03/13): Ethnography

de Volo, Lorraine Bayard and Edward Schatz. 2004. "From the Inside Out: Ethnographic Methods in Political Research." *PS*, April: 267-271.

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

Pachirat, Timothy. 2018. *Among Wolves: Ethnography and the Immersive Study of Power*. London And New York: Routledge.

Pacheco-Vega and Kate Parizeau. 2018. "Doubly Engaged Ethnography: Opportunities and Challenges When Working with Vulnerable Communities," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 17:1-13.

Fortun, Kim. 2001. *Advocacy After Bhopal: Environmentalism, Disaster, New Global Orders*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Prologue, Introduction.

*Wood, Elisabeth. 2003. *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-3.

Recommended:

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

*Scott, James. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

*Auyero, Javier. 2001. *Poor People's Politics: Peronist Survival Networks and the Legacy of Evita*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Week 9 (03/20): Participant Observation and Shadowing

Bussell, Jennifer. 2018. "Shadowing as a Tool for Studying Political Elites," working paper.

Gill, Rebecca, Joshua Barbour, and Marleah Dean. 2014. "Shadowing in/as work: ten recommendations for shadowing fieldwork practice," *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 9(1): 69-89.

*Gilliat-Ray, Sophie. 2011. "'Being there': the experience of shadowing a British Muslim Hospital Chaplain," *Qualitative Research*, 11(5): 469-486.

*Bussell, Jennifer. A Day in the Life of Indian Legislators. Working paper.

*Fenno, Richard. 1978. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Little, Brown, and Company, Chapters 1-2.

Week 10 (03/27): Spring Break

Week 11 (04/03): In-depth Interviewing

Michael Quinn Patton. 1990. "Qualitative Interviewing," in Michael Quinn Patton, *Qualitative Evaluation & Research Methods* (2nd Edition), Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rubin, Herbert and Irene Rubin. 2012. *Qualitative Interviewing. The Art of Hearing Data*, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, Chapters 4, 6, & 7.

Mosley, Layna, ed. 2013. *Interview Research in Political Science*. Cornell University Press. Introduction (Mosley), Chapters 1 (Lynch), 4 (Bleich and Pekkanen), 11 (Leech et al).

Berry, Jeffrey M. (2002). Validity and reliability issues in elite interviewing. *Political Science & Politics*, 35(4): 679-682.

Leech, Beth L. (2002). Asking questions: techniques for semistructured interviews. *Political Science & Politics*, 35(4): 665-668.

Woliver, Laura R. (2002). Ethical dilemmas in personal interviewing. *Political Science & Politics*, 35(4): 677-678.

*Catherine Weaver, *The Hypocrisy Trap: The World Bank and the Poverty of Reform*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008, pp. 92-139.

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

Recommended:

Fujii, Lee Ann. 2018. *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach*. New York and London: Routledge.

*Fujii, Lee Ann. 2010. Shades of truth and lies: Interpreting testimonies of war and violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(2): 231-241.

Week 12 (04/10) – Coding Qualitative Data and Writing Narratives

Saldaña, Johnny. 2015. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. London: Sage. Chapters 1-3.

Emerson, Robert, Rachel Fretz, and Linda Shaw. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press (1995), Chapter 6.

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2004. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, Chapter 6.

*Posner, Daniel. “The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi.” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 98, (2004): 529-545.

*Bussell, Jennifer. 2012. *Corruption and Reform in India: Public Services in the Digital Age*. New York and New Delhi: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 4 and 6 (skim intros, read Karnataka sections).

Week 13 (04/17) - Multi-method Research – Overview

Laitin, David D. 2003. “The Perestroikan Challenge to Social Science.” *Politics & Society* 31(1): 163–184.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2004. “A Perestroikan Straw Man Answers Back: David Laitin and Phronetic Political Science.” *Politics & Society* 32(3): 389–416.

“Symposium: Multi-Methods Work, Dispatches from the Front Lines,” *Qualitative Methods*, Spring 2007, Vol. 5(1): 9-27.

Coppedge, Michael. 1999. “Thickening thin concepts and theories: combining large n and small in comparative politics,” *Comparative Politics*: 465-476.

Rohlfing, Ingo. “What You See and What You Get Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research.” *Comparative Political Studies* 41, no. 11 (November 1, 2008): 1492–1514.

Ahmed, Amel, and Rudra Sil. 2012. “When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism—or, Why We Still Need Single-Method Research.” *Perspectives on Politics*

10(4): 935–953.

Recommended:

Lieberman, Evan. “Bridging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide: Best Practices in the Development of Historically Oriented Replication Databases.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13 (2010): 3759.

Week 14 (04/24): Qualitative Methods, Field & Natural Experiments, and Statistical Models

Dunning, Thad. 2012. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 7 (“The central role of qualitative evidence”).

Paluck, Elizabeth L. 2010. “The promising integration of qualitative methods and field experiments,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 628(1): 59-71.

*Bussell, Jennifer. 2019. *Clients and Constituents: Political Responsiveness in Patronage Democracies*. New York and New Delhi: Oxford University Press. Chapters 1-3.

*Hyun, Christopher, Alison E. Post, and Isha Ray. 2017. “Frontline worker compliance with transparency reforms: Barriers posed by family and financial barriers,” *Governance*, 31: 65-83.

Recommended:

*Ananthpur, Kripa, Kabir Malik, and Vijayendra Rao. 2014. “Anatomy of Failure: An Ethnography of a Randomized Trial to Deepen Democracy in Rural India.” *World Bank Policy Research* 6958.

*Sanyal, Paromita and Vijayendra Rao. 2018. *Oral Democracy: Deliberation in Indian Village Assemblies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (available Open Access: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/oral-democracy/1389E93F8F69AA1AB07B434124CE7582>)

Week 15 (05/01): Qualitative Methods and Formal Theory

Goemans, Hein and William Spaniel. 2013. Multi-Method Research: The Case for Formal Theory. Working paper (extended version of 2016 *Security Studies* piece).

Lorentzen, Peter, M. Taylor Fravel, and Jack Paine. 2017. “Qualitative investigation of theoretical models: the value of process tracing,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 29(3): 467-491.

- *Carnegie, Allison and Austin Carson. 2018. "The Spotlight's Harsh Glare: Rethinking Publicity and International Order," *International Organization*: 72(3): 627-657.
- *Larson, Jennifer M. 2017. "Why the West Became Wild: Informal Governance with Incomplete Networks," *World Politics*, 69(4): 713-749.
- *Gailmard, Sean. 2017. "Building a New Imperial State: The Strategic Foundations of Separation of Powers in America," *American Political Science Review*, 111(4): 668-685.
- *Dunning, Thad. 2008. *Crude Democracy: Natural Resource Wealth and Political Regimes*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 5.