**POL686 Qualitative and Mixed-Methods Research**

Social Sciences 311, Wednesdays, 5:30-8 pm

Jennifer Cyr

Social Sciences 328A2

[jmcyr@email.arizona.edu](mailto:jmcyr@email.arizona.edu)

520.621.1346

Office hours, Tuesdays, 11 am-1 pm, or by appointment

This seminar has two principal aims. First, it introduces graduate students to the systematic conduct of research based on the study of a relatively small number of cases. It exposes them to multiple qualitative data collection methods and analytical techniques. Second, it provides students with the tools to fruitfully integrate multiple methods into their research. Although mixed methods research can theoretically include the combination of multiple qualitative or multiple quantitative methods, this course will focus on the integration of qualitative with quantitative methods.

One practical goal of this course is to enable students to create and critique research designs in the social sciences. The course focuses on recent methodological writings, substantive examples from various subfields of political science, and classical pieces. The course also includes readings from the broader social sciences in addition to political science. The course assumes no background in qualitative methodology.

The seminar will begin with a focus on concept formation and causal inference. The seminar will then delve into the central issues of qualitative research design, such as case studies, cross-case comparison, typological theory, case selection, and process tracing. It ends with an overview of mixed-methods research, focusing both on earlier works and more recent texts.

By the end of the semester, the student will be able to: 1) Understand when and how to use qualitative methods; 2) Understand when and how to use mixed methods; 3) Create a qualitative or mixed-methods research design; and 4) Evaluate qualitative and mixed-methods research.

**Course Format**

The seminar is meant to be a survey of qualitative and mixed methods research. This means we will address multiple topics across the course of the semester. For this to be feasible, students are expected to *carefully read* all assigned readings and come ready to discuss their content. Students are expected to participate throughout the seminar. My role as the instructor will be to facilitate these conversations and, where necessary, provide additional information or explanations on specific topics or concerns. Note that this will not be a more conventional methodological course, wherein the professor lectures on and teaches students above different methodologies. The nature of qualitative and mixed-methods research lends itself to critical discussion, and so that is what we will do here.

**Required Texts**

Gary Goertz, *Social Science Concepts: A User’s Guide.* Princeton University Press, 2005

Charles Ragin, *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond.* University of Chicago Press, 2008

Derek Beach and Rasmus Pedersen, *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines*. University of Michigan Press, 2013

**Recommended texts:**

We will only read two chapters from the books below and those chapters will be disseminated, so it is not necessary to purchase them. However, these are important books in the field of qualitative methods, and it is **strongly recommended** that you add them to your library at some point.

Henry Brady and David Collier eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards,* second edition. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2010

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

Alexander George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences.* MIT Press, 2005

**Required/Recommended Knowledge**

The School of Government and Public Policy requires that all graduate students take a two-course methods sequence that exposes students to the logic of quantitative analysis. While not required for this course, having an understanding of quantitative methods and analysis will serve as an important counterpoint to what we discuss in this seminar.

**Assignments:** *Specific information on each assignment will be distributed at least two weeks before the assignment is due.*

1. **Seminar Discussion (40%):** Students are expected to read the assigned chapters and articles and come prepared to discuss them. Each student will come prepared with (at least) one question or comment to foment discussion. We will use these to orient our conversation. Additionally, twice in the semester, students will write two, 4-5 pages response papers to the selected readings. Each of these responses will count as 15% of your final grade and should serve as discussion points for seminar that week.
2. **Concept Paper (15%):** An essay of 6-8 pages in which students analyze a concept of their choice. Ideally, this concept should be a dependent variable of interest; this variable may (should) be used in subsequent assignments. This essay will be due in class on February 8.
3. **Causal Assessment Paper (20%):** An essay of 8-10 pages in which students discuss the qualitative methods used by other scholars to assess hypotheses concerning their chosen dependent variable. This essay should be critical, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of this literature. This essay will be due in class March 22.
4. **Research Design (25%):** An essay of 20-25 pages (including references) in which students develop a research design for carrying out a project using qualitative methods and/or mixed methods. This research design can form the basis for a project that is pursued at a later date. Students will present their research design to the class on April 26 and May 3. The final research design is due on May 10.

**Grading Policy**

A: 100-89.5

B: 89.4-79.5

C: 79.4-69.5

D: 69.4-59.5   
E: 59.4 and below

Requests for incompletes (I) and withdrawal (W) must be made in accordance with university policies which are available at <http://catalog.arizona.edu/2016-17/policies/grade.htm#I> and <http://catalog.arizona.edu/2016-17/policies/grade.htm#W> respectively.

**Late Work Policy**

As a rule, work will not be accepted late except in case of documented emergency or illness. You may petition me in writing for an exception if you feel you have a compelling reason for turning work in late.

**Attendance Policy**Should you need to miss the class for any reason, please let me know as soon as possible and prior to the day of class. The UA’s policy concerning Class Attendance and Administrative Drops is available at: <http://catalog.arizona.edu/2016-17/policies/classatten.htm>.

The UA policy regarding absences on and accommodation of religious holidays is available athttp://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/policies-and-codes/accommodation-religious-observance-and-practice.  
  
Absences pre-approved by the UA Dean of Students (or Dean designee) will be honored. See: http://uhap.web.arizona.edu/chapter\_7#7.04.02

**Classroom Behavior**

To foster a positive learning environment, students may not text, chat, make phone calls, play games, read the newspaper or surf the web during lecture and discussion. Students are asked to refrain from disruptive conversations with people sitting around them during lecture. Students observed engaging in disruptive activity will be asked to cease this behavior. Students who continue to disrupt the class will be asked to leave lecture or discussion and may be reported to the Dean of Students.

Some learning styles are best served by using personal electronics, such as laptops and iPads. These devices can be distracting to some learners. Therefore, people who prefer to use electronic devices for note-taking during lecture should use one side of the classroom.

The Arizona Board of Regents’ Student Code of Conduct, ABOR Policy 5-308, prohibits threats of physical harm to any member of the University community, including to one’s self. See: <http://policy.arizona.edu/threatening-behavior-students>.

**Accessibility and Accommodations**

**It is the University’s goal that learning experiences be as accessible as possible.  If you anticipate or experience physical or academic barriers based on disability, please let me know immediately so that we can discuss options. You are also welcome to contact Disability Resources (520-621-3268) to establish reasonable accommodations. For additional information on Disability Resources and reasonable accommodations, please visit** <http://drc.arizona.edu/>**.**

If you have reasonable accommodations, please plan to meet with me by appointment or during office hours to discuss accommodations and how my course requirements and activities may impact your ability to fully participate.

**Please be aware that the accessible table and chairs in this room should remain available for students who find that standard classroom seating is not usable.**

**Student Code of Academic Integrity**  
Students are encouraged to share intellectual views and discuss freely the principles and applications of course materials. However, graded work/exercises must be the product of independent effort unless otherwise instructed. Students are expected to adhere to the UA Code of Academic Integrity as described in the UA General Catalog. See: <http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/codeofacademicintegrity> [http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/academic-integrity/students/academic-integrity](http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/academic-integrity/students/academic-integrity" \t "_blank).

The University Libraries have some excellent tips for avoiding plagiarism available at: [http://www.library.arizona.edu/help/tutorials/plagiarism/index.html](http://www.library.arizona.edu/help/tutorials/plagiarism/index.html" \t "_blank).

*Selling class notes and/or other course materials to other students or to a third party for resale is not permitted without the instructor’s express written consent*. Violations to this and other course rules are subject to the Code of Academic Integrity and may result in course sanctions. Additionally, students who use D2L or UA email to sell or buy these copyrighted materials are subject to Code of Conduct Violations for misuse of student email addresses. This conduct may also constitute copyright infringement.

**Additional Resources for Students (recommended links)**

UA Non-discrimination and Anti-harassment policy: <http://policy.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/Nondiscrimination.pdf>

UA Academic policies and procedures are available at:  
<http://catalog.arizona.edu/2016-17/policies/aaindex.html>

Student Assistance and Advocacy information is available at:

<http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/student-assistance/students/student-assistance>

**Subject to Change Statement**

Information contained in the course syllabus, other than the grade and absence policy, may be subject to change with advance notice, as deemed appropriate by the instructor.

**Reading Schedule (*subject to change, as the semester unfolds*):**

**January 11, Week 1—Introduction**

**Substantive Examples of Qualitative Work**

Fenno, Richard, “Observation, Context and Sequence in the Study of Politics,” *American Political Science Review,* 80 (1986), pp. 3-15

“Ballot Pox.” Lee Drutman. The Chronicle of Higher Education. <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Ballot-Pox/238131>

*To skim (with intention), focusing on the methodological discussion/justification:*

Tannenwald, Nina, “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use,” *International Organization* 53:3 (Summer 1999), pp. 433-68

Wickham-Crowley, Timothy P. “A Qualitative Comparative Approach to Latin American Revolutions,” *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 32 (1991), pp. 82-109

Wedeen, Lisa, “Acting “As if”: Symbolic Politics and Social Control in Syria,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 40:3 (July 1998) pp. 503-523

**January 18, Week 2**

**Overview of the Field of Qualitative Methods**

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba (hereafter **KKV**), “The *Science* in Social Science,” in King, Keohane and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) pp. 3-34

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

Brady, Henry, David Collier, and Jason Seawright, “Introduction to the Second Edition: A Sea Change in Political Methodology” and “Refocusing the Discussion of Methodology,” in Brady and Collier eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards,* second edition(hereafter **RSI**) (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2010) pp. 1-32

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett, “Case Studies and Theory Development,” in George and Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Science* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005) pp. 3-36

Hall, Peter “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research,” in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) pp. 376-401

*Recommended (further) reading*:

Collier, David, “The Comparative Method,” in Ada W. Finifter, ed. *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II* (Washington, DC: American Political Science Association, 1993) pp. 105-119

Eckstein, Harry “Case Studies and Theory in Political Science,” in Greenstein and Polsby, eds. *Handbook of Political Science* (Addison-Wesley, 1975) pp. 79-138

**January 25, Week 3**

**Concepts and Measurement**

Goertz, Gary, *Social Science Concepts: A User’s Guide* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), pp. 1-94

Adcock, Robert N. and David Collier, “Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research,” *American Political Science Review* 95:3 (September 2001) pp. 529-546

Collier, David and James Mahon, “Conceptual “Stretching” Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis,” *APSR* 87:4 (December 1993) pp. 845-855

Ahram, Ariel, “Concepts and Measurement in Multi-method Research,” *Political Research Quarterly* 66 (June 2013) pp. 280-291

Bevir, Mark and Asaf Kedar, “Concept Formation in Political Science: An Anti-naturalist Critique of Qualitative Methodology,” *Perspectives on Politics,* Issue 3 (September 2008) pp. 503-517

**February 1, Week 4**

**Examples from Work on Democracy**

Munck, Gerardo and Jay Verkuilen, “Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices,” *Comparative Political Studies* 35:1 (February 2002) pp. 5-34

Collier, David and Steven Levitsky, “Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research,” *World Politics* 49:3 (April 1997), pp. 430-451

Paxton, Pamela, “Women’s Suffrage in the Measurement of Democracy: Problems of Operationalization,” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35:3 (September 2000) pp. 92-111

Bowman, Kirk, Fabrice LeHoucq and James Mahoney, “Measuring Political Democracy: Case Expertise, Data Adequacy, and Central America,” *Comparative Political Studies* 38:8 (October 2005) pp. 939-970

**February 8, Week 5**

**Causality and Causal Inference**

**\*\*CONCEPT PAPER DUE\*\***

KKV, “Causality and Causal Inference,” pp. 75-114

RSI, “Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology,” pp. 161-199

Bennett, Andrew, “The Mother of all Isms: Causal Mechanisms and Structured Pluralism in International Relations Theory,” *European Journal of International Relations* 19:3 (2013) pp. 459-481

Goertz and Mahoney, “Causes of Effects vs. Effects of Causes,” and “Hume’s Two Definitions of Cause,” in *A Tale of Two Cultures*, pp. 41-50 and 75-86

Schaffer, Frederic Charles, “Questions About Causes,” *Qualitative and Multi-method Newsletter*, Fall 2013 pp. 23-27

Brady, Henry. “Causation and Explanation in Social Science,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* eds. Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Henry Brady and David Collier, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010 pp. 217-246 (e-book online at UA Library)

**February 15, Week 6**

**Case Selection**

Geddes, Barbara, “How the Cases you Choose Affect the Answers you Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics,” *Political Analysis* 2 (1990)

Gerring, John and Jason Seawright, “Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options,” *Political Research Quarterly* 61: 2 (June 2008) pp. 294-308

Goertz and Mahoney, “Negative Case Selection: The Possibility Principle,” in Chapter 7 of Goertz, *Social Science Concepts*

Seawright, Jason. 2016. "The Case for Selecting Cases That Are Deviant or Extreme on the Independent Variable." *Sociological Methods & Research,* Vol 45, Issue 3, pp. 493 – 525.

Edelstein, David, “Occupational Hazards: Why Military Operations Succeed or Fail,” *International Security* 29:1 (Summer 2004) pp. 49-56, 80-91

*For further reading*:

Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (as an example of selection bias)

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

**February 22, Week 7**

**Cross-Case Analysis**

Mahoney, James, “Strategies of Causal Inference in Small-N Analysis,” *Sociological Methods and Research* 28:4 (May 2000) pp. 387-409 ONLY

George and Bennett, “The Congruence Method,” pp. 181-204

Locke, Richard and Kathleen Thelen, “Apples and Oranges Revisited: Contextualized Comparisons and the Study of Labor Politics,” *Politics and Society* 23(3): 337-67.

Anria, Santiago and Jennifer Cyr (2016). “Inside Revolutionary Parties,” *Comparative Political Studies.* http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0010414016666860

*For further reading*:

Barrington Moore, *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*

Morris Fiorina, *Congress, Keystone of the Washington Establishment*

Thomas Ertman, *Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*

**March 1, Week 8**

**Within-Case Analysis: Process Tracing**

Derek Beach and Rasmus Pedersen, *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines*. University of Michigan Press, 2013, pp. 1-143

For further reading:

James Mahoney, *The Legacies of Liberalism: Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America*

Paul Pierson, *Dismantling the Welfare State?: Reagan, Thatcher, and the Politics of Retrenchment*

**March 8, Week 9**

**Macro-Historical Comparison, Critical Junctures and Path Dependency**

Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, “Comparative-Historical Analysis: Achievements and Agendas,” in their *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 2003) pp. 3-38

Pierson, Paul, “Not Just What, But When: Timing and Sequence in Political Processes,” *Studies in American Political Development* 14:1 (2000) pp. 72-92

Thelen, Kathleen, “The Political Economy of Skills in Comparative Historical Analysis,” in *How Institutions Evolve: The Political Economy of Skills in Germany, Britain, the United States and Japan* (Cambridge University Press), 2004 pp. 1-38

Collier, Ruth and David Collier, *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Junctures, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 27-39

Mahoney, James, “Path Dependence in Historical Sociology,” *Theory and Society* 29 (2000) pp. 507-548

*For further reading*:

Eric Schickler, *Disjointed Pluralism: Institutional Innovation and the Development of the US Congress.*

Frank Dobbin, *Forging Industrial Policy: The United States, Britain and France in the Railway Age.*

**March 15, Week 10**

**NO CLASS, SPRING BREAK**

**March 22, Week 11**

**Qualitative Comparative Analysis**

**\*\*CAUSAL ASSESSMENT PAPER DUE\*\***

Ragin, Charles, *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), pp. 1-84, 109-123 (e-book available online at UA Library)

Mahoney, James, Erin Kimball and Kendra Koivu, “The Logic of Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences” *Comparative Political Studies* 42:1 (January 2009) pp. 114-146

For further reading:

Goertz and Mahoney, “A Mathematical Prelude” in *A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research Designs*

Hicks, Alexander, Joya Misra, and Tang Nah Ng, “The Programmatic Emergence of the Social Security State,” *American Sociological Review*, 60:3 (June 1995) pp. 329-349

Carsten Schneider and Claudius Wagemann, *Set Theoretic Methods for the Social Sciences: A Guide to Qualitative Comparative Analysis*

**March 29, Week 12**

**Introduction to Mixed Methods I: Early Works on Mixed Methods Research**

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

Rohlfing, Ingo, “What You See and What You Get: Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research,” *Comparative Political Studies* 41:11 (2008) pp. 1492-1514

Tarrow, Sidney. 2004. “Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide.” En Brady y Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry,* pp*.* 171-181.

Gerring, John y Rose McDermott. 2007. “An Experimental Template for Case Study Research.” *American Journal of Political Science* 51(3): 688-701.

*For further reading:*

Coppedge, Michael. 1999. “Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories: Combining Large-N and Small in Comparative Politics.” *Comparative Politics* 31(4): 465-476.

David Laitin y James Fearon. 2008. “Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods.”

En Box‐Steffensemeir, Brady y Collier, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology,* pp. 756-776.

**April 5, Week 13**

**Introduction to Mixed Methods II: Recent Texts**

Chatterjee, Abhishek, “Ontology, Epistemology, and Multimethod Research in Political Science,” *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 43:1 (2013) pp. 73-99

Paluck Levy, Elizabeth. 2010. “The Promising Integration of Qualitative Methods and Field Experiments.” *Annals of the American Academy of Politics and Social Sciences* 628 (1): 59‐71.

Humphreys, Macartan, and Alan M. Jacobs. "Mixing Methods: A Bayesian Approach."

*American Political Science Review* 109.04 (2015): 653-673.

Ahmed, Amel and Rudra Sil, “When Multi-method Work Subverts Methodological Pluralism- or, Why We Still Need Single-method Research,” *Perspectives on Politics* 10:4 (2012).

*Recommended reading:*

Gerber, Alan S., Donald P. Green y Christopher W. Larimer. 2008. “Social Pressure and Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Large-Scale Field Experiment.” *American Political Science Review* 102 (1): 33-48.

Mutz, Diana C. 2007. “Effects of ‘In-Your-Face’ Television Discourse on Perceptions of a Legitimate Opposition.”*American Political Science Review* 101 : 621-635

**April 12, Week 14**

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

**April 19, Week 15**

Cyr, Jennifer. Book manuscript on *Focus Groups and Social Science Research*.

**April 26 & May 3, Weeks 16 & 17**

Student Presentations, Research Design

***Topics that we are NOT covering but may nonetheless be of interest:***

**Debate around Set Theory:**

Mahoney, James, and Rachel Sweet Vanderpoel. “Set Diagrams and Qualitative Research.” *Comparative Political Studies* 48.1 (2015): 65-100.

Schenider, Carsten Q. and Ingo Rohlfing, “Combining QCA and Process Tracing in Set-Theoretical Multi-method Research,” *Sociological Methods and Research* 42:4 (2013).

*Comparative Political Studies* Special Issue: Debating Set Theoretic Comparative Methods, May 2016, Vol 49.6.

**Natural Experiments**

Dunning, Thad *Natural Experiments: A Design-Based Approach*, pp. read 1-102, skim 102-207, read 208-231

*For further reading:*

Sekhon, Jasjeet and Rocio Titiunik, “When Natural Experiments Are Neither Natural nor Experiments,” *APSR* 106:1 (2012) pp. 35-57

John Snow, *On the Mode of Communication of Cholera* (this is considered a classic example of both natural experiments and process-tracing.)

Daniel Posner. “The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi” *American Political Science Review* 98:4 (2004).

**Interpretivism and Constructivism**

Klotz, Audie and Cecilia Lynch, “Constructivism” in *Strategies for Research in International Relations* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2007), pp. 3-23

Wendt, Alexander “Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics” *International Organization* 46:2 (March 1992), pp. 391-425

Yanow, Dvora, “Thinking Interpretively: Philosophical Presuppositions and the Human Sciences,” in Yanow and Schwartz-Shea *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn* (Armonk, NY: M.E Sharpe, 2006) pp. 5-26

Weldes, Jutta, “Constructing National Interests,” *European Journal of International Relations* 2:3 (September 1996), pp. 275-318

*For further reading:*

Lisa Wedeen, *Peripheral Visions: Public Power and Performance in Yemen*

**Field Research**

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. *Field research in political science: practices and principles*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Katherine Dettwyler, *Dancing Skeletons: Life and Death in West Africa*

Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, “Encountering your IRB: What Political Scientists Need to Know.” *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research Newsletter* 12:2 (Fall 2014) pp. 34-40

*For further reading:*William Reno, *Warlord Politics and African States*

Elizabeth Jean Wood, *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador*

**Additional Odds and Ends:**

Fujii, Lee Ann. "Five stories of accidental ethnography: turning unplanned moments in the field into data." *Qualitative Research* (2014): 1468794114548945.

Gelman, Andrew, and Thomas Basbøll. "When do stories work? Evidence and illustration in the social sciences." *Sociological Methods & Research*(2014): 0049124114526377.