

POL 8160: Qualitative Methodologies
Wednesday 1:25-3:20, Social Sciences Room 1383
Fall 2015

Professor: Joe Soss
Office: Humphrey 261
Office Hours: Tues 2-3, Wed 3:30-4:30
Email: jbsoss@umn.edu
Phone: 612-626-9865 (campus), 651-207-5876 (home)

Overview

This seminar explores a variety of research strategies available to students of politics, focusing on those that make use of empirical evidence but do not require quantification of data. In the social sciences today, the term “qualitative” is typically used as a remainder category: It includes a multitude of research strategies deemed to fall outside the dominant category, “quantitative,” regardless of their differences. (In this sense, it functions like the racial term “nonwhite.”) At present, our department does not offer a full sequence of “qualitative” coursework, as it does for “quantitative” training. So, students should take note: This seminar is a survey course, designed to cover the waterfront. It explores a wide range of methodologies – comparing and contrasting their logics, specifying their strengths and weaknesses, and so on – but does not provide intensive training in any single approach.

Learning Goals: My hope is that participants (including me!) will leave the seminar with the following: (1) an expanded sense of the strategies available to us when we pursue empirical and theoretical research, (2) a deeper understanding of how to design and carry out “qualitative” research projects, (3) a stronger grasp of the logics that distinguish methodologies and the creative possibilities for their assembly, (4) a greater appreciation for the interplay of methods and methodologies, and (5) a sharpened capacity to read, understand, and evaluate the diverse forms of scholarship produced across the social sciences.

Three features of the course merit special note. First, we will focus on questions of *practice* and adopt an explicitly comparative approach to questions of design, analysis, data collection, inference, interpretation, critique, and so on. In this manner, we will aim to clarify the assumptions, possibilities, and challenges associated with specific strategies and, thus, their strengths and weaknesses for particular kinds of research projects. Second, we will treat the seminar as an opportunity to discuss general issues related to the logic, conduct, and significance of social science inquiry. Throughout the course, we will tack back and forth between technical matters and more foundational questions regarding epistemology, ontology, ethics, politics, and the societal and global role of the social scientist. The latter topics should concern all of us, regardless of our choices among methods.

Third, it can be comforting to imagine that “proper methods, rightly applied” will eventually lead to good scholarship. I encourage you to resist this temptation. As a site of intellectual labor and practice, social science is far more interesting, creative, and fun than this procedural view admits. I have not organized this seminar as a research practicum or as a step-by-step guide to “correct” practice. Nevertheless, you will find that our readings and discussions include a significant “how to” component. Technique matters, and we will devote considerable attention to the nuts and bolts of research practice that allow scholars to turn good ideas into compelling scholarship.

Class Preparation and Seminar Meetings

The course will be structured as a seminar. I will pose discussion questions and present brief lectures to clarify methodological issues. In the main, though, our meetings will emphasize student participation and dialogue. For this format to work, you will need to read with a critical eye and think about how the readings relate to your subfield. As you prepare for class, try to be proactive in connecting the readings to your specific interests (e.g., your ideas for a dissertation topic). I also invite you to think more broadly about topics for discussion. At root, this course is about the things social scientists do with their professional lives. Any issue related to this topic strikes me as fair game.

At the risk of stating the obvious: We differ considerably in our scholarly interests, methodological commitments, and previous training – not to mention our positions in social, economic, and political life. Please show respect for these differences and try to be constructive in the ways you engage one another. You should also remember, however, that in a graduate seminar we are *supposed* to question one another's ideas and explain our reasons for agreement or disagreement. If you don't speak up when you think I've got it wrong, you deprive the entire group of an opportunity to learn, and you deprive me of an opportunity to address your concern (possibly to your satisfaction).

Response Essays

During weeks 3 through 14, each student will write FOUR brief critical essays in response to the assigned readings. These essays should not be “personal reaction papers,” nor should they simply summarize the readings. Your essays should:

1. *Elucidate* key arguments, insights, distinctions, or concepts in the week's readings
2. *Critically engage* the texts and place methodological writings in dialogue with research examples. (You should also feel free to explore connections to your own subfield or specific research interests.)
3. *Propose* two or more questions for seminar discussion.

You will be responsible for one critical essay, on average, every three weeks and should treat it as a significant course assignment. Your essay should be no more than two pages (single-spaced) and should be sent to the entire class as an email attachment *no later than 24 hours before our class meeting*.

Response group assignments will be handed out in class. The relevant response group is indicated on the heading for each class meeting. You are responsible for keeping up with the dates on which your response essays are due. Your postings will count toward seminar participation. The address for the class email list is qual-meth-8160@googlegroups.com.

Please note: We will begin each class with a brief comment from each essay writer, typically highlighting a single argument or question raised by the essay. Also, I invite students to respond to postings, share links to supplemental readings and news items, or initiate other course-relevant conversations on the list. You should see the listserv as an opportunity for ongoing discussion between seminars. Finally, if you'd like to get feedback on your response essay or discuss the issues you've raised, *please* drop by office hours or set up an appointment. I'm always happy to have one-on-one conversations!

Major Paper

To tailor the course to their own needs and interests, students may select one of three options for their final seminar paper. This assignment will require steady work throughout the semester. It is due on

Friday, December 18, at 4pm.

The Research Proposal. Propose a thorough design for a do-able, dissertation-size research project on an important question in your field. (You might think of this as a “dry run” for a dissertation prospectus.) Over the course of the semester, you should plan to have at least two one-on-one meetings with me: an early one to discuss and refine your preliminary question and research strategies and a second one at mid-semester to discuss your readings of relevant literature and your updated plans for a research design. Your full proposal should be 15-20 pages. It should include a clear statement of your research questions and goals (as well as their significance), a focused *analytic* review of relevant literature, a clear explication of your research design (i.e., methodology and methods), a discussion of feasibility and ethics, and estimates of the project’s timetable and funding needs. A more detailed set of instructions for this assignment will be handed out in class.

The Double Book Review: Choose two published books in your field that share a research focus but employ different “qualitative” approaches. Your assignment is to use these two books as “cases” for a comparative study of methodology in your field. After briefly summarizing the authors’ research questions and key contributions, your essay should draw on relevant course material to compare and contrast (a) the underlying logic of each study and the authors’ key analytic moves, (b) the mode of explanation and/or critique pursued in each study, (c) the strengths and weaknesses of the authors’ approaches to gathering and analyzing empirical materials. In light of our readings and the authors’ questions, how well has each chosen, executed, and presented her/his/their research approach? How do their methodologies shape, limit, and enable their conclusions? In what ways does each study succeed or fail (a) in relation to the other and (b) in relation to the standards you see as most relevant for the methodology in question? Your paper should be no longer than 20 pages.

The Practicum: For a research question of your own choosing, collect and analyze “qualitative” observations drawn from *at least* two different approaches to data gathering. I do not expect you to conduct a full-scale research project. Rather, the goal is to conduct a small amount of research to facilitate a comparison of methods. For example, you might compare the strengths and weaknesses of four interviews vs. two focus groups. Or you might contrast the standpoints offered by archival research into an organization’s documents, interviews with two key personnel, and a small amount of participant observation with staff. As early as possible and *prior* to any observations, you should plan to have a one-on-one meeting with me to discuss your preliminary research question and plan for securing IRB approval. For this meeting, you should bring a printed copy of your question, a strategy for observations, and a preliminary draft of a consent letter soliciting participation. For subsequent meetings (which should occur throughout the semester), you should send me a copy of any relevant materials (e.g., an interview protocol) a few days in advance of our meeting so that I can prepare comments. The final report on your practicum should include (a) a statement of your research question and its significance, (b) a substantive analysis similar to (but briefer than) what you would present in a conference paper, (c) a comparative evaluation of your methods, and (d) a critical reflection of your efforts to employ them. In an appendix, you should provide your consent letter, materials used to conduct your research (e.g., interview protocol), and your IRB approval. Excluding the appendix, your full paper should be no longer than 20 pages.

Unless prior arrangements have been made, late papers will be penalized one unit immediately, and then again for each 48 hours after the due date/time. For example, an “A” paper will be lowered to an “A-” if turned in after the due date/time, and then to a “B+” 48 hours after the due date/time.

Grades

Seminar attendance and participation (20%), response essays (10%), and seminar paper (70%)

Readings

Readings for this course consist mostly of journal articles and book chapters. All readings can be downloaded and printed from the Wilson Library Course Reserves (<https://reserves.lib.umn.edu/>), which you can access directly through our course Moodle site at:

https://ay15.moodle.umn.edu/local/library_reserves/lister.php?course_id=2807

Accommodations

I am eager to hear from anyone who may require accommodations in this class for reasons related to ability, life circumstances, or religion. Please let me know if I can help by modifying seating arrangements, deadlines, or other features of the class so that appropriate arrangements may be made. I also encourage students to ask for reasonable and timely accommodations for religious observances. Please review the syllabus closely to determine if your religion will present scheduling conflicts.

It is University policy to provide, on a flexible and individualized basis, reasonable accommodations and resources for students who have documented disability conditions (e.g., physical, learning, psychiatric, vision, hearing, or systemic). Students with disabilities are encouraged to contact Disability Services and their instructors for a confidential discussion of their individual need for academic accommodations. Disability Services is located in Suite 180 McNamara Alumni Center, 200 Oak Street. Staff can be reached by calling 612-626-1333 voice or TTY.

Equity, Diversity, Equal Opportunity, and Affirmative Action

The University will provide equal access to and opportunity in its programs and facilities, without regard to race, color, creed, religion, national origin, gender, age, marital status, disability, public assistance status, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression. For more information, please consult the Board of Regents Policy:

http://www1.umn.edu/regents/policies/administrative/Equity_Diversity_EO_AA.html

Mental Health and Stress Management

As a student, you may experience a range of stressors and mental health challenges. It is not unusual for graduate students to experience increased anxiety, strained relationships, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down and perpetually tired, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. Mental health challenges and stressful events may diminish academic performance, reduce your ability to participate in daily activities, and pose a significant threat to individual well-being. Please know that University of Minnesota services are available to assist you, and please do not hesitate to speak with me if I can help with accommodations of any sort. You can learn more about the broad range of confidential mental health services available on campus via the Student Mental Health Website:

<http://www.mentalhealth.umn.edu>.

READING SCHEDULE

I. Commonality and Difference in Social Science

Week 1, Sept 9

Social Science in Context and Positivist Uses of Qualitative Research

Analysis and Explanation as Situated Practices

Andrew Abbott. 2004. *Methods of Discovery: Heuristics for the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton. Pp.3-40.

Stephen Jay Gould. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton. pp.19-29, 73-112.

Charli Carpenter. "You Talk Of Terrible Things So Matter-of-Factly in This Language of Science": Constructing Human Rights in the Academy." *Perspectives on Politics*. 10(2): 363-83.

Positivist Qualitative Research

Selections from Henry E. Brady and Davide Collier, eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. (1) D. Collier, H.E. Brady, and J. Seawright. "Introduction to the Second Edition." Pp.1-10. (2) D.A. Freedman. "On Types of Scientific Inquiry." Pp.221-36. (3) H.E. Brady. "Data-Set Observations and Causal-Process Observations: The 2000 U.S. Presidential Election." Pp.237-42.

Morten Jerven. 2012. *Poor Numbers: How We are Misled by African Development Statistics and What to Do about It*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Pp.ix-xiv, 1-7.

Jack A. Goldstone. 2003. "Comparative Historical Analysis and Knowledge Accumulation in the Study of Revolutions." In J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. pp.41-90.

Week 2, Sept 16

Interpretive and Critical Uses of Qualitative Research

Interpretive Qualitative Research

Clifford Geertz. 1973. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture." *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books. Pp.3-32.

Michael Agar. 2007. "Emic/Etic." In George Ritzer, ed. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. Pp. 1371-74.

Peregrine Schwartz-Shea and Dvora Yanow. 2012. "Ways of Knowing: Research Questions and Logics of Inquiry." *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge. pp.24-44.

Adriana Petryna. 2003. *Life Exposed: Biological Citizens after Chernobyl*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp.1-33.

Critical Qualitative Research

Victoria Hattam. 2000. "History, Agency, and Political Change." *Polity*. 32(3): 333-38.

Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward. 1997[1985]. "Women and the State: Ideology, Power, and the Welfare State." *The Breaking of the American Social Compact*. New York, NY: The New Press. pp.213-42.

Heather Love. 2015. "Doing Being Deviant: Deviance Studies, Description, and the Queer Ordinary." *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*. 26(1): 74-95.

Dorinne Kondo. 1995. "Poststructuralist Theory as Political Necessity." *Amerasia Journal*. 21(1-2): 95-100.

Week 3, Sept 23 (Response Group A)

Research Ethics: Moral, Political, and Professional Dimensions

Assignment

Complete the UMN/CITI online IRB Training (CITI Group 2 Behavioral or Humanist Research Investigators and Key Personnel; duration: approx. one hour):

<http://www.irb.umn.edu/training.html#UiZKBj8IKMU>

Brief Discussions of Cases for Consideration

Charlotte Allen. 1997. "Spies Like Us." *Lingua Franca* 10(6): 31-39.

Paul Voosen. 2015. "Damning Revelations Prompt Social Science to Rethink Its Ties to the Military." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. July 15.

Jesse Singal. 2015. "The Case of the Amazing Gay-Marriage Data: How a Graduate Student Reluctantly Uncovered a Huge Scientific Fraud." *New York Magazine*. May 29.

Beth McMurtrie. 2014. "Secrets From Belfast." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. January 26.

Paul Campos. 2015. "Alice Goffman's Implausible Ethnography." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. August 21.

Perspectives on Moral Dilemmas and Ethical Responsibilities

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

Elisabeth Jean Wood. 2006. "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones." *Qualitative Sociology* 29 (June 20): 373-386.

Gunther Eysenbach and James E Till. 2001. "Ethical Issues in Qualitative Research on Internet Communities." *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 323 (7321): 1103-1105.

Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang. 2014. "Unbecoming Claims: Pedagogies of Refusal in Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Inquiry*. 20(7): 1-8.

II. Methodologies: Putting Research Designs to Work

Week 4, Sept 30 (Response Group B)

Case Studies I: Conceptualizing, Theorizing, and Generalizing

Clarifying Case Studies

Adrijana Biba Starman. 2013. "The Case Study as a Type of Qualitative Research." *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*. 1: 28-43.

Mario L. 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.

Conceptualizing and Theorizing

Howard Becker. 1998. "Concepts." *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your Research While Doing It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. 109-45.

Dietrich Reuschmeyer. 2003. "Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?" In J. Mahoney and D. Reuschmeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp.305-36.

Examples

Lisa Wedeen. 2007. "The Politics of Deliberation: *Qāt* Chews as Public Spheres in Yemen."

Herbert Kaufman. 1960. *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. pp.3-22.

Margot Canaday. 2009. *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth Century America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp.1-15, 255-64.

Week 5, Oct 7 (Response Group C)

Case Studies II: Process Tracing and Causal Mechanism Analysis

Causal Mechanisms, Processes Set in Motion

Peter A. Hall. 2003. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research." In J.

- Mahoney and D. Reuschmeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp.373-404.
- Gary Goertz and James Mahoney. 2010. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Causal Mechanisms and Process Tracing." *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research*. 8(2): 24-30.
- Andrew Bennett. 2010. "Process Tracing and Causal Inference." In H.E. Brady and D. Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield. Pp.207-219.

Examples

- Richard Snyder. 1999. "After Neoliberalism: The Politics of Reregulation in Mexico." *World Politics* 51(2): 173-204.
- Joe Soss, Richard C. Fording, and Sanford F. Schram. "Performance, Perversity, and Punishment." *Disciplining the Poor: Neoliberal Paternalism and the Persistent Power of Race*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp.207-32.
- Doug McAdam, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2008. "Methods for Measuring Mechanisms of Contention." *Qualitative Sociology*. 31: 307-31.

Week 6, Oct 14 (Response Group A)

Cases Studies III: Relational and Constitutive Analyses

Different Questions, Different Methodologies

- Alexander Wendt. 1998. "On Constitution and Causation in International Relations." *Review of International Studies*. 24(5): 101-18.
- Mustafa Emirbayer. 1997. "Manifesto for a Relational Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology*. 103(2): 281-317.

From Comparing to Locating in Relations

- Francisco Panizza and Romina Miorelli. 2013. "Taking Discourse Seriously: Discursive Institutionalism and Post-Structuralist Discourse Theory." *Political Studies* 61 (2): 301–18.
- Micol Seigel. 2005. "Beyond Compare: Comparative Method after the Transnational Turn." *Radical History Review*. 91(Winter): 62-90.

Examples

- Thomas Medvetz. 2012. *Think Tanks in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp. 23-46, 84-180.
- Erica Simmons. Forthcoming [2016]. *The Content of Their Claims: Subsistence Threats and Social Protest in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp.1-55.

Week 7, Oct 21 (Response Group B)

Historical Analysis I: Narratives, Paths, Temporalities, and Transformations

Narrative Explanation

- David Carr. 2008. "Narrative Explanation and Its Malcontents." *History and Theory*. 47: 19-30.
- Michael Howlett and Jeremy Raynor. 2006. "Understanding the Historical Turn in the Policy Sciences: A Critique of Stochastic, Narrative, Path Dependency and Process-Sequencing Models of Policy-Making over Time." *Policy Sciences*. 39: 1-18.

Timing, Sequence, and Development

- Paul Pierson. 2000. "Not Just What, but When: Timing and Sequence in Political Processes." *Studies in American Political Development* 14 (Spring): 72-92.
- Hillel David Soifer. 2012. "The Causal Logic of Critical Junctures." *Comparative Political Studies*. 45(12) 1572-1597
- Theda Skocpol et al. 1995. "State Formation and Social Policy in the United States." *Social Policy in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp.11-36.

Temporalities and Transformations

William H. Sewell, Jr. 2005. "Three Temporalities" *Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Pp.81-123.

Anna Grzymala-Busse. 2011. "Time Will Tell? Temporality and the Analysis of Causal Mechanisms and Processes." *Comparative Political Studies*. 44: 1267-97.

Week 8, Oct 28 (Response Group C)

Historical Analysis II: "Critical and Effective" Inquiries

Marxian, Freudian, and Feminist Historical Analyses

Bertell Ollman. 2003. "Putting Dialectics to Work: The Process of Abstraction in Marx's Method." *Dance of the Dialectic: Steps in Marx's Method*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press. pp.59-112.

Michael Rogin. 1987. "Liberal Society and the Indian Question." *Ronald Reagan, the Movie: and Other Episodes in Political Demonology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Pp.134-68.

Joan Wallach Scott. 2004. "Feminism's History." *Journal of Women's History*. 16(2): 10-29.

Archaeologies

Licia Carlson. 2005. "Docile Bodies, Docile Minds: Foucauldian Reflections on Mental Retardation." In S. Tremain, ed. *Foucault and the Government of Disability*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. Pp.133-52.

Julie Novkov. 2011. "Legal Archaeology." *Political Research Quarterly*. 64(2): 348-61.

Jennifer Fredette. 2015. "Becoming a Threat: The *Burqa* and the Contestation over Public Morality Law in France." *Law & Social Inquiry*. doi: 10.1111/lsi.12101

Genealogies

David Garland. 2014. "What Is a 'History of the Present'? On Foucault's Genealogies and their Critical Preconditions." *Punishment & Society*. 16(4): 365-84.

Michel Foucault. 1978. "About the Concept of the 'Dangerous Individual' in 19th Century Legal Psychiatry." *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*. 1: 1-18.

Week 9, Nov 4 (Response Group A)

Comparisons I: Variable-Based Logics of Covariance and Control

Mill's Methods, Counterfactuals, and Causal Inference

John Gerring. 2007. "Internal Validity: An Experimental Template." *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp.151-71.

Adam Przeworski. 2004. "Institutions Matter?" *Government and Opposition*. 40(4): 527-40.

Andrew Bennett. 2004. "Case Study Methods: Design, Use, and Comparative Advantages." In D.F. Sprinz, Y. Wolinsky-Nahmias, eds. *Models, Numbers, and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. Pp.19-55.

Examples

David D. Laitin. 1999. "National Revivals and Violence." In J. Bowen and R. Peterson, eds. *Critical Comparisons in Politics and Culture*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 21-60.

Kevin Narizny. 2003. "Both Guns and Butter, or Neither: Class Interests in the Political Economy of Rearmament." *American Political Science Review*. 97(2): 203-220.

Evgeny Finkel. 2015. "The Phoenix Effect of State Repression: Jewish Resistance during the Holocaust." *American Political Science Review*. 109(2): 339-53.

Week 10, Nov 11 (Response Group B)

Comparisons II: Standpoints, Configurations, Typologies and Logics of Conjunction

Conjunctural Comparisons

Charles Ragin. 2000. *Fuzzy Set Social Science*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Pp.21-42, 64-119.

David J. Harding, Cybelle Fox, and Jal D. Mehta. 2002. "Studying Rare Events through Qualitative Case Studies: Lessons From a Study of Rampage School Shootings." *Sociological Methods & Research*. 31(2): 174-217.

Typological Comparisons

Colin Elman. 2005. "Explanatory Typologies in Qualitative Studies of International Politics." *International Organization* 59: 293-326.

Paul Staniland. 2012. "States, Insurgents, and Wartime Political Orders." *Perspectives on Politics*. 10(2): 243-264.

Comparisons for Interpretive Explanation and Critique

Erica S. Simmons and Nicholas Rush Smith. 2015. "Comparative Ethnography: Possibilities for Political Science." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. San Francisco, CA: September 3-6.

Lynne A. Haney. 2010. *Offending Women: Power, Punishment, and the Regulation of Desire*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Pp.1-56, 115-49, 207-25.

III. Methods: Acquiring and Working with Empirical Materials

Week 11, Nov 18 (Response Group C)

Entering the Field: Access and Selection, Dilemmas and Experiences

Paths into the Field are Personal and Professional

Gideon Kunda. 2013. "Reflections on Becoming an Ethnographer." *Journal of Organizational Ethnography*. 2(1): 4-22.

David D. Laitin. 1986. "Appendix: Research Methodology." *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp.185-205.

Gaining Access and Selecting Research Participants

Kenneth. Goldstein. 2002. "Getting in the Door: Sampling and Completing Elite Interviews." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 35 (4): 669-672.

Janice M. Morse. 1989. "Strategies for Sampling." In J.M. Morse, ed. *Qualitative Nursing Research: A Contemporary Dialogue*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. Pp.127-45.

Relational Identities and Methods in the Field

Jillian Schwedler. 2006. "The Third Gender: Western Female Researchers in the Middle East." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 39(3): 425-428.

Ann Chih Lin. 2000. *Reform in the Making: The Implementation of Social Policy in Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. pp.175-194.

Politics and Reflexivity and in Field Studies

Timothy Pachirat. 2009. "The Political in Political Ethnography: Dispatches from the Kill Floor." In E. Schatz, ed. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp.143-61.

Kathleen M. Blee. 2002. "Crossing a Boundary." *Inside Organized Racism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. pp.1-24.

Week 12, Nov 25 (Response Group A)

Being There: Participant Observation and Ethnography

Varied Approaches

- Lisa Wedeen. 2009. "Ethnography as Interpretive Exercise." In E. Schatz, ed. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp.75-93.
- Paul Lichterman. 2002. "Seeing Structure Happen: Theory-Driven Participant Observation." In B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg, eds. *Methods of Social Movement Research*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. pp.118-45.

Questions of Method

- Laura Adams. 2009. "Techniques for Measuring Identity in Ethnographic Research," in R. Abdelal, Y. Herrera, I. Johnston, and R. McDermott, eds. *Measuring Identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp.316-41
- H. Russell Bernard. 2002. "Field Notes: How to Take Them, Code Them, Manage Them." *Research Methods in Anthropology. Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* 3rd ed. Altamira Press. 365-89.

Examples

- Sarah Parkinson. 2013. "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War" *American Political Science Review*. 107(3): 418-32.
- Michael N. Barnett. 1997. "The UN Security Council, Indifference, and Genocide in Rwanda." *Cultural Anthropology*. 12(4): 551-78.
- Richard F. Fenno, Jr. 1977. "U.S. House Members in their Constituencies." *American Political Science Review*. 71(3): 883-917.

Week 13, Dec 2 (Response Group B)

Say What? Interviews and Focus Groups

In-Depth Interviews

- Joe Soss. 2014. "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered View of Interviewing for Interpretive Research." In D. Yanow and P.Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. 2nd ed. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. Pp.161-82.
- Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin. 2011. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Pp.115-70.

Oral Histories and Testimonies

- Lee Ann Fujii. 2010. "Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence." *Journal of Peace Research*. 47(2): 231 –241.
- Bina D'Costa. 2006. "Marginalized Identity: New Frontiers of Research for IR?" In B. Ackerly, M. Stern, and J. True, eds. *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp.129-52.

Focus Groups

- Morgan, David L. 1996. "Focus Groups." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 22: 129–152.
- Dodson, Lisa, and Leah Schmalzbauer. 2005. "Poor Mothers and Habits of Hiding: Participatory Methods in Poverty Research." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67(4): 949–959.

Examples

- Joe Soss. 2005. "Making Clients and Citizens: Welfare Policy as a Source of Status, Belief, and Action." In Schneider, Anne L, and Helen M Ingram. 2005. *Deserving and Entitled: Social Constructions and Public Policy*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Katherine Cramer Walsh. 2012. "Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective." *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 517-32.

Pamela Johnston Conover, Ivor Crewe, Donald Searing. 1991. "The Nature of Citizenship in the United States and Great Britain: Empirical Comments on Theoretical Themes." *Journal of Politics*. 53(3): 800-832.

Week 14, Dec 9 (Response Group C)

Reading Residues: Archival Research

Leo Szilard. 1948/1961. "Report on 'Grand Central Terminal'." *The Voices of Dolphins and Other Stories*. New York: Simon & Schuster. pp.115-22.

Katherine E. Tirabassi. 2010. "Journeying into the Archives: Exploring the Pragmatics of Archival Research." In A.E. Ramsey, W.B. Sharer, B. L'Eplattenier, and L.S. Masstrangelo, eds. *Working in the Archives: Practical Research Methods for Rhetoric and Composition*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. pp.169-80.

Primary Documents, News Reports, Historiographies

Christian Davenport and Patrick Ball. 2002. "Views to a Kill Exploring the Implications of Source Selection in the Case of Guatemalan State Terror, 1977-1995." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 46(3): 427-450.

Mara Loveman. 2014. "Constructing National Orders." *National Colors: Racial Classification and the State in Latin America*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp.169-206.

Megan Ming Francis. 2014. *Civil Rights and the Making of the Modern American State*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp.1-58, 185-9.

Beyond Written Documents: Visual Materials, Built Spaces...

Wendy S. Hesford. 2011. *Spectacular Rhetorics: Human Rights Visions, Recognitions, Feminisms*. Duke University Press. pp.1-60.

Dvora Yanow. 2014. "How Built Spaces Mean: A Semiotics of Space." In D. Yanow and P.Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*. 2nd ed. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe. Pp.368-86.

Week 15, Dec 16

Making Sense of Field Notes, Transcripts, and other Evidence: In the Field and Beyond

Matthew B. Miles, A. Michael Huberman, and Johnny Saldaña. 2013. "Making Good Sense: Drawing and Verifying Conclusions." *Qualitative Data Analysis*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Pp.275-322.

Margaret D. LeCompte and Jean J. Schensul. 2012. *Analysis and Interpretation of Ethnographic Data: A Mixed Methods Approach*. 2nd ed. AltaMira Press. Pp.27-110.

Cynthia Hardy, Bill Harley, and Nelson Phillips; Neta Crawford; Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes; Ted Hopf; and Kimberly A. Neuendorf. 2004. "Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis" *Qualitative Methods: QMMR Newsletter*. 2(1): 19-24, 28-35.

Martha S. Feldman and Julka Almquist. 2012. "Analyzing the Implicit in Stories." In J.A. Holstein and J.F. Gubrium, eds. *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp.207-28.

Francesca Poletta. 2012. "Analyzing Popular Beliefs about Storytelling." In J.A. Holstein and J.F. Gubrium, eds. *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp.229-50.