

INTL 8500: Qualitative Research Methods

University of Georgia – Fall 2019

Gilbert Hall 309, Thursday 15:30-18:15

Prof. Gregory M. Thaler (he/him)

202 Herty Drive, Room 328

gthaler@uga.edu

Office Hours: Tuesday 15:00-17:00 and by appointment

Sign up for scheduled office hours at <https://calendly.com/gregorythaler>

Course Description:

This seminar introduces graduate students to the theory and practice of qualitative methods in the social sciences. We focus in particular on the use of qualitative methods for the study of politics, drawing on scholarship from political science, sociology, and anthropology. Among other topics, we will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of qualitative research for understanding social phenomena, disciplinary debates about qualitative methods in the social sciences, and practical and ethical considerations in the application of qualitative methods. A substantial portion of the course is devoted to the development of student research projects that will involve experimentation with different approaches to research design, data collection, and data analysis.

Methodological issues in qualitative social science research are manifold, and this course should not be considered comprehensive. The aim is rather to provide a foundation of methodological theory and practical experience that will enable students to better design, conduct, analyze, present, and evaluate qualitative research.

Course Structure, Requirements, and Evaluation:

This seminar focuses on reading, practice, and discussion.

You should complete the **assigned readings** prior to class each week and come prepared to engage in active **discussion**. Our classroom should be an environment for respectful, substantive discussions in which everyone feels comfortable participating. If for any reason you do not feel comfortable speaking during our discussions, please advise me so we can make appropriate adjustments. I recognize that people contribute to discussions in different manners, and I also value as participation conversations during office hours or over email.

A **field research project** will be a major component of the course. You will choose a research topic to pursue over the course of the semester in Athens or the surrounding region. Ideally, this topic should be related in some way to your academic or professional interests. For example, if your interests concern NGOs, you might conduct research on an NGO in Athens. You can also choose a project that helps you develop particular skills, such as practicing a language. You will be asked to investigate your topic through a variety of different qualitative methods. If you wish to use your research in this class for a larger formal project or publication, you must go through UGA's Institutional Review Board (IRB) process. Otherwise, all research related to your project for this course may only be used for class purposes, as explained in the IRB Guidance on Class

Projects: <https://research.uga.edu/docs/policies/compliance/hso/Guidance-Class-Projects.pdf>. I will review and monitor your proposed projects to ensure compliance with ethical guidelines.

You are expected to act respectfully and ethically at all times, especially when carrying out your research activities. When engaging with human subjects for activities related to this course, you will identify yourself as a UGA student and make the disclosures described in the IRB guidelines. Should a serious problem or ethical concern arise during your field activities, please contact me or another faculty member immediately for advice.

You will complete **weekly written assignments** related to your field research project. In Week 2, you will be divided into **research support groups** of 3-4 students. Beginning in Week 3, you must email your written assignments to me and your research support group by 5pm on Wednesday evening. You should read the written assignments of your fellow group members and email constructive comments to at least two of them for each assignment. You should send your comments prior to the subsequent Thursday class. Alternatively, your group may choose to meet on a weekly basis to discuss your research activities and assignments.

Your **final paper** may consist of either a) a research proposal that builds on your work this semester, or b) a paper that analyzes and evaluates your findings and methods from your research project. If you choose option a, the research proposal should be formatted as though it were to be submitted to a funding agency (e.g., SSRC, NSF, Fulbright, Wenner-Gren). In either case, the paper must discuss your topic and methods, present and analyze data from your field research assignments, and draw preliminary conclusions with reference to our assigned readings and our general focus on the connections between research theory, methodologies, and practice. Standard components of a research proposal (option a) include a statement of the motivating puzzle, literature review, discussion of preliminary research, hypotheses, research design and methods, logistical considerations, and expected conclusions and implications. If you choose to write a research proposal for your final paper, you should consult:

- Przeworski, Adam, and Frank Salomon. 1995 [1988]. "The Art of Writing Proposals." Brooklyn, NY: Social Science Research Council. [Available online]

The final paper should be 15-20 pages in length and must be posted to eLC in .doc or .docx format by **3:30pm on Thursday, December 5th**.

During our final meeting on November 21st, you will give a 12 to 15-minute **research presentation** that previews your final paper. This presentation should approximate either a project pitch (for option a) or a conference presentation (for option b). Depending on class size, our final meeting may be extended or a supplemental session may be added to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to receive thorough feedback.

Book to Purchase: Most of the required readings in this course are available for free in electronic format through the UGA Library or elsewhere on the internet. There is one book that you are required to purchase, as we will be using multiple chapters and the UGA Library does not have an electronic version:

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

This book is on order with the UGA Bookstore. You may instead purchase the 1995 First Edition if you wish, but note that the chapter assignments are different, as marked in the syllabus.

Grading: Your grade in this course will be composed as follows:

Participation	20%
Weekly assignments	35%
Research presentation	15%
Final paper	30%

Letter grades will be assigned according to the following scale:

A	94-100	C	74-76
A-	90-93	C-	70-73
B+	87-89	D+	67-69
B	84-86	D	64-67
B-	80-83	D-	60-63
C+	77-79	F	59 and below

General Considerations:

Cell Phones: Cell phone use is always prohibited during class time. Cell phones must be silenced and out of sight during class.

Eating: Please refrain from eating during class.

File Formats: Please share files in either .doc, .docx, or .pdf formats exclusively. Your final papers must be submitted in .doc or .docx format.

Academic Honesty: As a University of Georgia student, you have agreed to abide by the University's academic honesty policy, "A Culture of Honesty," and the Student Honor Code. All academic work must meet the standards described in "A Culture of Honesty" found at: <http://www.uga.edu/honesty>. Instances of cheating or plagiarism will be reported in accordance with university policy, and lack of knowledge of the academic honesty policy is not a reasonable explanation for a violation. Please review the definition of plagiarism in the Academic Honesty Policy: https://honesty.uga.edu/Academic-Honesty-Policy/Prohibited_Conduct/. Questions related to course assignments and the academic honesty policy should be directed to the instructor.

Students with Disabilities: UGA is committed to providing full participation and access for students with disabilities. If you plan to request accommodations for a disability, please register with the Disability Resource Center. They can be reached by visiting Clark Howell Hall, calling 706-542-8719 (voice) or 706-542-8778 (TTY), or by visiting <http://drc.uga.edu>.

SCHEDULE: READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS***Week 1 | 15 August: The Importance and Fallibility of Methods**

- Burnett, Dean. 2017. “How Internet Porn Caused the Rise of Donald Trump.” *The Guardian*, February 27. <https://www.theguardian.com/science/brain-flapping/2017/feb/27/how-internet-porn-caused-the-rise-of-donald-trump>.
 - Blachowicz, James. 2016. “There Is No Scientific Method.” *The New York Times*, July 4. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/04/opinion/there-is-no-scientific-method.html>.
 - Gibler, Douglas M., Steven V. Miller, and Erin K. Little. 2016. “An Analysis of the Militarized Interstate Dispute (MID) Dataset, 1816-2001.” *International Studies Quarterly* 60: 719–30. [abstract and introduction only]
 - Nijhuis, Michelle. 2017. “How to Call B.S. on Big Data: A Practical Guide.” *The New Yorker*, June. <http://www.newyorker.com/tech/elements/how-to-call-bullshit-on-big-data-a-practical-guide>.
 - Check out the “Big Data Batman” Twitter feed: <https://twitter.com/BigDataBatman>.
 - Lewis-Kraus, Gideon. 2016. “The Trials of Alice Goffman.” *The New York Times*, January 12. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/17/magazine/the-trials-of-alice-goffman.html>.
 - University of Georgia - Institutional Review Board. 2017. “Guidance on Class Projects.” Available: <https://research.uga.edu/docs/policies/compliance/hso/Guidance-Class-Projects.pdf>.
- Complete **UGA’s Human Subjects Training (CITI)**: <https://research.uga.edu/hrpp/citi-training/>
- **Assignment 1:** Choose a field research site or topic in Athens or the surrounding region that you will investigate over the course of the semester. Write a 2-3 page proposal for your field research project that includes your motivation for choosing your topic, a description of the field site or potential field sites, an exemplary list of five potential informants (these can be examples of ‘ideal’ informants and do not have to be actual people), logistical considerations for accessing your sites and informants, and the identification of challenges or obstacles you foresee for conducting this project. **Email your assignment to me by 5pm on 21 August and be prepared to discuss in class the next day.**

Supplementary Readings

- Cartwright, Nancy. 2007. “Are RCTs the Gold Standard?” *Biosocieties* 2: 11–20.

* Please note that the course syllabus is a general plan for the course; deviations announced to the class by the instructor may be necessary.

Week 2 | 22 August: Disciplinary Debates and Standards for Qualitative Research

- Swedberg, Richard. 1990. “The New ‘Battle of Methods.’” *Challenge* 33 (1): 33–38.
- Monroe, Kristin Renwick, and Rogers Smith. 2007. “Symposium: The Perestroika Movement.” *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods* 5 (1): 2-9.
- King, Gary, Robert Keohane, and Sydney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [UGA electronic access] **Chapter 1: The Science in Social Science [skim]**
- Brady, Henry, and David Collier, eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. 2nd ed. New York: Rowman & Littlefield. [UGA electronic access] **Introduction to the Second Edition: A Sea Change in Political Methodology**
- Mahoney, James. 2010. “After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research.” *World Politics* 62 (1): 120–47.
- Hale, Charles R. 2006. “Activist Research v. Cultural Critique: Indigenous Land Rights and the Contradictions of Politically Engaged Anthropology.” *Cultural Anthropology* 21 (1): 96–120.

Data Access & Research Transparency (DA-RT) Debates

- “The Journal Editors’ Transparency Statement” (JETS). October 2014. Available: <https://www.dartstatement.org/2014-journal-editors-statement-jets>.
- “Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: About.” <https://www.qualtd.net/page/about>.
- “Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: Final Reports.” 2019. APSA Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research. <https://bit.ly/2IpEBQd>. Read the following:
 - **I.1. Epistemological and Ontological Priors**
 - **Subgroup 1: Varieties of Explicitness and Research Integrity** (Markus Kreuzer and Craig Parsons), **Summary:** https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3332876
 - **Subgroup 2: Explicating the Perils of Transparency** (Timothy Luke, Antonio Y. Vázquez-Arroyo, Mary Hawkesworth), **Summary:** https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3332878
 - **II.2 Evidence from Research with Human Participants** (Anastasia Shesterinina, Mark A. Pollack, Leonardo R. Arriola), **Summary:** https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3333399
- **Assignment 2:** Make initial contacts and obtain any necessary permissions for accessing your research site(s). Spend at least 2 hours at your site. Introduce yourself to people. Get a feel for the place. Jot notes to yourself. Imagine a specific research puzzle or question related to your topic that could be explored with qualitative data from your research sites. In 2-3 pages, describe one main and one plausible alternative explanation or answer for your puzzle. You may develop these hypotheses intuitively based on your knowledge and first impressions or you may reference existing literature. State whether these hypotheses rely on ‘descriptive’ or ‘causal’ inferences. Identify the key variables (independent and dependent, if applicable) supporting these inferences, and briefly

describe the mechanisms or relations connecting your variables and how these variables could be operationalized in a research project or test of your hypotheses. **Email your assignment to me [and your research support group by 5pm on 28 August.](#)**

Supplementary Readings

Disciplinary Debates and Standards

- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, and Dvora Yanow. 2002. “‘Reading’ ‘Methods’ ‘Texts’: How Research Methods Texts Construct Political Science.” *Political Research Quarterly* 55 (2): 457–86.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2004. “A Perestroikan Straw Man Answers Back: David Laitin and Phronetic Political Science.” *Politics & Society* 32 (3): 389–416.
- Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research.” *Political Analysis* 14 (3): 227–49.
- Bennett, Andrew, and Jeffrey Checkel, eds. 2015. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lamont, Michele, and Patricia White. 2005. “Workshop on Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research.” National Science Foundation. Available: http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/ses/soc/ISSQR_workshop_rpt.pdf.

Philosophy of Science and Social Science Theory

- Mackie, J. 1965. “Causes and Conditions.” *American Philosophical Quarterly* 2 (4): 245–64.
- Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. 1994. “Grounded Theory Methodology: An Overview.” In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln, 273–85. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1998. “The Extended Case Method.” *Sociological Theory* 16 (1): 4–33.
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. “Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective.” *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–99.
- Fletcher, Amber J. 2017. “Applying Critical Realism in Qualitative Research: Methodology Meets Method.” *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 20 (2): 181–94.

Week 3 | 29 August: Ethics and Positionality

- Robbins, Paul. 2006. “Research Is Theft: Environmental Inquiry in a Postcolonial World.” In *Approaches to Human Geography*, edited by Stuart Aitken and Gill Valentine, 311–24. London: Sage Publications.
- Lake, Milli, and Sarah Parkinson. 2017. “The Ethics of Fieldwork Preparedness.” *Political Violence at a Glance*, June 5. <http://politicalviolenceataglance.org/2017/06/05/the-ethics-of-fieldwork-preparedness/>.

- Wood, Elisabeth. 2006. “The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones.” *Qualitative Sociology* 29 (3): 373–86.
 - Beech, Hannah. 2018. “The Rohingya Suffer Real Horrors. So Why Are Some of Their Stories Untrue?” *The New York Times*, February 1.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/01/world/asia/rohingya-myanmar-camps.html>.
 - Ortobals, Candice D., and Meg E. Rincker. 2009. “Fieldwork, Identities, and Intersectionality: Negotiating Gender, Race, Class, Religion, Nationality, and Age in the Research Field Abroad: Editors’ Introduction.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 287–90.
 - Hanson, Rebecca, and Patricia Richards. 2017. “Sexual Harassment and the Construction of Ethnographic Knowledge.” *Sociological Forum* 32 (3): 587–609.
 - Knott, Eleanor. 2019. “Beyond the Field: Ethics after Fieldwork in Politically Dynamic Contexts.” *Perspectives on Politics* 17 (1): 140–53.
 - “American Anthropological Association’s Executive Board Statement on the Human Terrain System Project.” 2007. American Anthropological Association.
https://s3.amazonaws.com/rdcms-aaa/files/production/public/FileDownloads/pdfs/pdf/EB_Resolution_110807.pdf.
- **Assignment 3:** First, consider the ethical issues that are implicit in your field project or that may arise over the course of your research. Imagine that your research is going to be published, and consider the additional ethical issues that publication would create. What negative effects might your project have on your subjects? What steps could you take to mitigate negative impacts? Second, consider your positionality in relation to your research topic and research subjects. What intersections of power and identity are most salient, and how do they affect your research practice, the data you collect, and your analytical predilections? What negative impacts could this project have for you and how can those potential impacts be mitigated? **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 04 September.**

Supplementary Readings

- The National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. 1979. “The Belmont Report.” Available:
<https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/belmont-report/index.html>.
- Daley, Patricia. 2015. “Researching Sexual Violence in the Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo: Methodologies, Ethics, and the Production of Knowledge in an African Warscape.” In *The Routledge Handbook of Gender and Development*, edited by Anne Coles, Leslie Gray, and Janet Momsen, 429–40. New York: Routledge.
- Kovats-Bernat, J. Christopher. 2002. “Negotiating Dangerous Fields: Pragmatic Strategies for Fieldwork Amid Violence and Terror.” *American Anthropologist* 104 (1): 208–22.
- Calvey, David. 2008. “The Art and Politics of Covert Research: Doing ‘Situated Ethics’ in the Field.” *Sociology* 42 (5): 905–18.
- Spicker, Paul. 2011. “Ethical Covert Research.” *Sociology* 45 (1): 118–33.

- Clarke, Kamari M. 2010. “Toward a Critically Engaged Ethnographic Practice.” *Current Anthropology* 51 (S2): S301–12.
- Faria, Caroline, and Sharlene Mollett. 2016. “Critical Feminist Reflexivity and the Politics of Whiteness in the ‘Field.’” *Gender, Place and Culture* 23 (1). Routledge: 79–93.
- Caretta, Martina Angela, and Johanna Carolina Jokinen. 2017. “Conflating Privilege and Vulnerability: A Reflexive Analysis of Emotions and Positionality in Postgraduate Fieldwork.” *The Professional Geographer* 69 (2): 275–83.

Week 4 | 05 September: Fieldnotes

- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. **Chapters 1-3 (or Chapters 1-4 in the First Edition)**
 - Wolfinger, Nicholas. 2002. “On Writing Fieldnotes: Collection Strategies and Background Expectancies.” *Qualitative Research* 2 (1): 85–93.
- **Assignment 4:** Spend 2-3 hours in your field site. Observe and make jottings. Just observe and describe this week, do not analyze. You are practicing observation and recording with an ethnographic sensibility. Type up a narrative version of your fieldnotes (i.e., a full, legible transcription and translation of your notes, and not just a verbatim transcription of your jottings). Include a brief introductory paragraph reflecting on your experience observing, jotting, and transcribing fieldnotes. **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 11 September.**

Supplementary Readings

- Sanjek, Roger, ed. 1990. *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Sanjek, Roger, and Susan Tratner, eds. 2016. *eFieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology in the Digital World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Neimark, Benjamin D. 2012. “Finding That ‘Eureka’ Moment: The Importance of Keeping Detailed Field Notes.” *African Geographical Review* 31 (1): 76–79.

Week 5 | 12 September: Ethnography and Participant Observation I – Anthropology & Sociology

- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books. **Chapter 1 “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture” and Chapter 15 “Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight”**
- Briggs, Jean. 1970. “Kapluna Daughter: Living with Eskimos.” *Trans-Action* 7 (8): 12–24.
- Bernard, H.R. 2006. “Participant Observation.” In *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 4th ed., 342–86. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

- Gille, Zsuzsa, and Seán Ó Riain. 2002. “Global Ethnography.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 28 (1): 271–95.

Savage Controversy: Napoleon Chagnon and Ethnographic Methodology

- Sahlins, Marshall. 2000. “Jungle Fever.” *The Washington Post*, December 10. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/entertainment/books/2000/12/10/jungle-fever/e8b757ae-b365-4632-8f04-3d9e61371ed7/?utm_term=.e9aac69d49ea.
- Newcomb, Rachel. 2013. “Noble Savages: My Life among Two Dangerous Tribes - the Yanomamo and the Anthropologists’ by Napoleon A. Chagnon.” *The Washington Post*, February 22. https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/noble-savages-my-life-among-two-dangerous-tribes-the-yanomamo-and-the-anthropologists-by-napoleon-a-chagnon/2013/02/22/09093d8e-5b6f-11e2-88d0-c4cf65c3ad15_story.html.
- Corry, Stephen. 2013. “The Emperor’s New Suit in the Garden of Eden, and Other Wild Guesses: Why Can’t Napoleon Chagnon Prove Anything?” *Survival International*. Available: <http://assets.survivalinternational.org/documents/1080/corry-on-chagnon.pdf>.

Supplementary Reading on the Chagnon Controversy

- Marks, Jonathan. 2013. “Meet Joe Science.” *Anthropomies Blog*, February 19. <https://anthropomies.blogspot.com/2013/02/meet-joe-science.html>.
 - Survival International. 2017. “The Myth of the ‘Brutal Savage’: How Some Writers Are Pushing the View That Tribal Peoples Are Particularly Violent.” Available: <http://www.survivalinternational.org/articles/3289-brutal-savages>.
- **Assignment 5:** Spend at least 2 hours at your field site, and later type up your fieldnotes. You may begin to include analysis in your notes along with your observations. Next, write a 1-2 page reflection on the ‘culture’ that you are investigating. What aspects of that culture are you hoping to interpret and understand? What sorts of insights can ethnography produce for your project? How can you ensure the validity of conclusions drawn from participant observation? Lastly, imagine that you were to develop your project into a multi-sited or global ethnography: what other sites would you include and why? **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 18 September.**

Supplementary Readings

- Clifford, James. 1983. “On Ethnographic Authority.” *Representations* 2: 118–46.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clifford, James. 1988. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marcus, George E. 1995. “Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography.” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 95–117.

Week 6 | 19 September: Ethnography and Participant Observation II – Political Science

- Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. “Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13 (1): 255–72.
 - Simmons, Erica S., and Nicholas Rush Smith. 2017. “Comparison with an Ethnographic Sensibility.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (1): 126–30.
 - Munck, Gerardo, and Richard Snyder. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. **Chapter 11 “James C. Scott: Peasants, Power, and the Art of Resistance”**
 - Simmons, Erica S. 2016. “Corn, Markets, and Mobilization in Mexico.” *Comparative Politics* 48 (3): 413–31.
- **Assignment 6:** Spend at least 2 hours at your field site, and later type up your fieldnotes. Is there a place for ethnography in contemporary political science research? Should there be? What does the status of ethnography in political science reveal about the sociology of disciplinarity in the social sciences? Write a 1-2 page response to these questions. **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 25 September.**

Supplementary Readings

- Schatz, Edward, ed. 2013. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine, and Samantha Majic. 2017. “Ethnography and Participant Observation: Political Science Research in this ‘Late Methodological Moment.’” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (1): 97–102.
- Vrasti, Wanda. 2008. “The Strange Case of Ethnography and International Relations.” *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 37 (2): 279–301.
- Lie, Jon H. S. 2012. “Challenging Anthropology: Anthropological Reflections on the Ethnographic Turn in International Relations.” *Millennium - Journal of International Studies* 41 (2): 201–20.
- Montsion, Jean Michel. 2018. “Ethnography and International Relations: Situating Recent Trends, Debates and Limitations from an Interdisciplinary Perspective.” *The Journal of Chinese Sociology* 5 (9).
- Simmons, Erica S., and Nicholas Rush Smith. 2019. “The Case for Comparative Ethnography.” *Comparative Politics* 51 (3): 341–59.

Week 7 | 26 September: Interviews I

- Bernard, H.R. 2006. “Interviewing: Unstructured and Semistructured.” In *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 4th ed., 210–50. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.
- Leech, Beth. 2002. “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35 (4): 665–68.

- Mosley, Layna. 2013. “‘Just Talk to People’? Interviews in Contemporary Political Science.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*, edited by Layna Mosley, 1–28. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- **Assignment 7:** Prepare an informed consent template for interviews for your research project. This may be oral consent. You do not have to obtain written consent unless you wish to do so. Refer to the sample materials listed in the supplementary readings (Mosley 2013) for this week, as well as the UGA IRB guidance on class projects. You do not need to send me your informed consent template.

Between Assignments 7 and 8, you must conduct at least 3 semistructured interviews and at least 1 interview must be audio or video recorded for transcription. You may elect to substitute one of the semistructured interviews with a focus group interview in Week 8. For Assignment 7, therefore, you should conduct 1 or 2 interviews. Use the following procedure:

- Determine whom you would like to interview for your project
- Make contact and schedule the interviews
- Prepare an interview guide including primary and follow-up questions (your guide may vary across interviews depending on the subjects)
 - You do not need to send me the interview guide. As these interviews are semi-structured, you may vary from the guide during the interview as you see fit.
- Choose a recording medium (at least 1 interview must be audio or video recorded, for the other 2 you may record via handwritten notes if you prefer)
- Conduct interviews using your informed consent template and interview guide
- Transcribe the audio or video recording (1 interview or focus group only)
 - Note: you need only transcribe the first 30 minutes of the recording.
- Write up and analyze your interviews

Email the write up and analysis of 1 interview to me and your research support group by 5pm on 02 October. Either Assignment 7 or 8 must include submission of a transcription of the first 30 minutes of an audio or video recorded interview or focus group.

Supplementary Readings

- Mosley, Layna, ed. 2013. “Appendix: Sample Materials for Interview Research.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rubin, Herbert, and Irene Rubin. 2004. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- McLellan, Eleanor, Kathleen MacQueen, and Judith Neidig. 2003. “Beyond the Qualitative Interview: Data Preparation and Transcription.” *Field Methods* 15 (1): 63–84.

- Brounéus, Karen. 2011. “In-Depth Interviewing: The Process, Skill and Ethics of Interviews in Peace Research.” In *Understanding Peace Research: Methods and Challenges*, edited by Kristine Höglund and Magnus Öberg, 130–45. New York: Routledge.
 - Vansina, Jan. 1985. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press. [UGA electronic access] **Chapter 1: Oral Tradition as Process**
 - Morgan, David. 1996. “Focus Groups.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 129–52.
 - Bleich, Erik, and Robert Pekkanen. 2013. “How to Report Interview Data.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*, edited by Layna Mosley, 84–105. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- **Assignment 8:** Conduct 1 or 2 semistructured interviews, for a total of at least 3 interviews between Assignments 7 and 8. Follow the procedure outlined in Assignment 7. You may choose to substitute a focus group for one of the semistructured interviews. Focus group interviews must be audio or video recorded. **Email the write up and analysis of your focus group or of 1 interview to me and your research support group by 5pm on 09 October. Either Assignment 7 or 8 must include submission of a transcription of the first 30 minutes of an audio or video recorded interview or focus group.**

Supplementary Readings

- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2010. “Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence.” *Journal of Peace Research* 47 (2): 231–41.
- Ingersoll, Fern, and Jasper Ingersoll. 1987. “Both A Borrower and A Lender Be: Ethnography, Oral History, and Grounded Theory.” *The Oral History Review* 15 (1): 81–102.

Week 9 | 10 October: History and Archives

- Skocpol, Theda, and Margaret Somers. 1980. “The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (2): 174–97.
- Lustick, Ian. 1996. “History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias.” *American Political Science Review* 90 (3): 605–18.
- Slater, Dan, and Erica Simmons. 2010. “Informative Regress: Critical Antecedents in Comparative Politics.” *Comparative Political Studies* 43 (7): 886–917.
- Crawford, Neta C. 1994. “A Security Regime among Democracies: Cooperation among Iroquois Nations.” *International Organization* 48 (3): 345–85. **[read pp. 345-362]**
- Wagstaff, Stillman, and Jesse Gant. “Learning to Do Historical Research: A Primer - What Are the Documents?” *Learning Historical Research*. Available: <http://www.williamcronon.net/researching/documents.htm>.
- Heck, Barbara, Elizabeth Preston, and Bill Svec. 2004. “A Survival Guide to Archival Research.” *Perspectives on History*, December. <https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/december-2004/a-survival-guide-to-archival-research>.

- **Assignment 9:** Think about the long-term history of the places and processes involved in your research project. In what ways might historical research contribute to your understanding of contemporary dynamics? Identify potential archives or primary sources of historical data about your topic. Find at least two primary source documents that deepen the historical scope of your research. Photocopy, photograph, or otherwise record the content of your primary sources. Write a 2-3 page memo describing your two primary source documents, how and where you located them, and what they contribute to your understanding of your topic. **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 16 October.**

Supplementary Readings

- Eco, Umberto. 2015. *How to Write a Thesis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dunn, Kevin. 2008. “Historical Representations.” In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide*, edited by Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, 78–92. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Munck, Gerardo, and Richard Snyder. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Chapter 17 “Theda Skocpol: States, Revolutions, and the Comparative Historical Imagination”

Week 10 | 17 October: Processing Fieldnotes Lab

- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. **Chapter 6 “Processing Fieldnotes: Coding and Memoing”**
- Padgett, Deborah. 2012. *Qualitative and Mixed Methods in Public Health*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications. **Chapter 8 “Data Analysis and Interpretation”**
- Atlas.ti “Quick Tour” Available: <https://atlasti.com/manuals-docs/> [skim]
- View “Atlas.ti Tutorial: Coding Basics – Creating and assigning codes” (4 minutes) at <https://youtu.be/TUZpXEySp1U>
- **Assignment 10:** At this point, you have fieldnotes from over six hours of participant observation, write-ups from three interviews, and two primary source historical documents. Your assignment is to begin coding this data. You may use word-processing software (e.g., Microsoft Word) or qualitative data analysis (QDA) software such as Atlas.ti or NVivo. You must code at least one week of participant observation fieldnotes, one interview, and one primary source document. Write a one-page reflection on key challenges or decisions you encountered in coding and any unexpected insights. **Email this reflection and 1 coded interview to me and your research support group by 5pm on 23 October.**

Supplementary Readings

- Ryan, Gery, and H.R. Bernard. 2000. “Data Management and Analysis Methods.” In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln, 2nd ed., 769–802. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Week 11 | 24 October: Qualitative Dimensions of Survey Research

- Gallagher, Mary. 2013. “Capturing Meaning and Confronting Measurement.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*, edited by Layna Mosley. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
 - Fowler, Floyd. 2009. *Survey Research Methods*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications. **Read Chapters 6-7 and skim Chapter 8**
 - Schaffer, Frederic Charles. 2014. “Thin Descriptions: The Limits of Survey Research on the Meaning of Democracy.” *Polity* 46 (3): 303–30.
- **Assignment 11:** Create a short, self-administered survey for your research project, pretest it with your research support group, and give each other critical feedback. Refine the survey and administer the revised version to at least three people at your research site. You may administer the survey remotely (e.g., via email or phone) or in person. Write a short summary of your results and submit this summary along with your revised survey. Since it can take a substantial amount of time to develop, pretest, and administer a survey, the deadline for this assignment is extended. **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 06 November.**

Supplementary Readings

- Sudman, Seymour, and Norman Bradburn. 1982. *Asking Questions: A Practical Guide to Questionnaire Design*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lee, Jerry W., Patricia S. Jones, Yoshimitsu Mineyama, and Xinwei Esther Zhang. 2002. “Cultural Differences in Responses to a Likert Scale.” *Research in Nursing and Health* 25 (4): 295–306.
- Zimbalist, Zack. 2018. “‘Fear-of-the-State Bias’ in Survey Data.” *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 30 (4): 631–51.
- Question Understanding Aid (QUAID) tool from the University of Memphis: <http://quaid.cohmetrix.com/>

Week 12 | 31 October: Mixing Methods

- Sieber, Sam. 1973. “The Integration of Fieldwork and Survey Methods.” *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (6): 1335–59.
- Lieberman, Evan. 2005. “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research.” *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 435–452.
- Rohlfing, Ingo. 2008. “What You See and What You Get.” *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (11): 1492–1514.
- Rocheleau, Dianne. 1995. “Maps, Numbers, Text, and Context: Mixing Methods in Feminist Political Ecology.” *Professional Geographer* 47 (4): 458–66.

- Nightingale, Andrea. 2003. “A Feminist in the Forest: Situated Knowledges and Mixing Methods in Natural Resource Management.” *Acme* 2 (1): 77–90.
- **Assignment 12:** What are the relative strengths and weaknesses of your participant observation, interviews, historical research, and survey for analyzing and understanding your research topic? If you were to pursue this project further, what combination of qualitative (and possibly quantitative) methods would you employ, why would you select these methods, and how would you combine them practically and analytically? Respond in 2-3 pages. **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 06 November.**
- If you wish to propose an article to be discussed during our session in Week 14, please do so when you submit Assignment 12, and we will make a final determination on readings in Week 13.

Supplementary Readings

- Sil, Rudra, and Peter J. Katzenstein. 2010. “Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics: Reconfiguring Problems and Mechanisms across Research Traditions.” *Perspectives on Politics* 8 (2): 411–31.
- Doolittle, Amity. 2010. “Stories and Maps, Images and Archives: Multimethod Approach to the Political Ecology of Native Property Rights and Natural Resource Management in Sabah, Malaysia.” *Environmental Management* 45: 67–81.
- Thaler, Kai M. 2017. “Mixed Methods Research in the Study of Political and Social Violence and Conflict.” *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 11 (1): 59–76.
- “Symposium: Multi-Method Work, Dispatches from the Front Lines.” 2007. *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods* 5 (1): 9–28.

Week 13 | 07 November: Case Studies and Comparison

- Przeworski, Adam, and Henry Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley-Interscience. **Chapter 2 “Research Designs”**
- Seawright, Jason, and John Gerring. 2008. “Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options.” *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (2): 294–308.
- McMichael, Philip. 1990. “Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method.” *American Sociological Review* 55 (3): 385–97.
- Thaler, Gregory M. “False Equivalencies of the Smallholder Slot: Cash Crop Development in the Brazilian Amazon and Indonesian Borneo.” Working Paper.
- **Assignment 13:** Devise a comparative research design that would allow you to further develop or validate the conclusions of your research project. In 1-2 pages, explain your comparative design, inferential goals, and case selection logic. Be clear on how you conceive of a ‘case’ and whether you are operating in a positivist or

reflexive/interpretive mode. **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 13 November.**

- I recommend you begin to think about Assignment 14 this week as well, since it requires engagement with your field site.

Supplementary Readings

- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2004. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics.” *Political Analysis* 2: 131–50.
- Gerring, John. 2008. “Case Selection for Case-Study Analysis: Qualitative and Quantitative Techniques.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, edited by Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, 645–84. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Slater, Dan, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2013. “The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Comparison.” *Comparative Political Studies* 46 (10): 1301–27.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1998. “The Extended Case Method.” *Sociological Theory* 16 (1): 4–33.
- van der Veer, Peter. 2014. “The Value of Comparison: Transcript of the Lewis Henry Morgan Lecture given on November 13, 2013.” *HAU-Morgan Lectures Initiative*.
- Small, Mario Luis. 2009. “‘How Many Cases Do I Need?’: On Science and the Logic of Case Selection in Field-Based Research.” *Ethnography* 10 (1): 5–38.
- Munck, Gerardo, and Richard Snyder. 2007. *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Chapter 12 “Alfred Stepan: Democratic Governance and the Craft of Case-Based Research”

Week 14 | 14 November: Evaluating Methods in Published Work

We will choose three articles to read for this week, and we will use part of our class time to discuss these articles and their use of qualitative methods. In reading the articles, you should ask yourself the following questions:

- What is the puzzle?
- What is the epistemology?
- What is the theoretical framework?
- What is the research design/case selection?
- What are the methods?
- What are the data?
- How are the data analyzed?
- How are the data presented?
- How are data from different methods combined?
- What inferences or conclusions are drawn?

Possible articles include but are not limited to:

- Tannenwald, Nina. 1999. “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use.” *International Organization* 53 (3): 433–468.
 - Honig, Lauren. 2017. “Selecting the State or Choosing the Chief? The Political Determinants of Smallholder Land Titling.” *World Development* 100: 94–107.
 - Shitrit, Lihi Ben. 2013. “Women, Freedom, and Agency in Religious Political Movements: Reflections from Women Activists in Shas and the Islamic Movement in Israel.” *Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies* 9 (3): 81–107.
 - Paprocki, Kasia. 2016. “‘Selling Our Own Skin:’ Social Dispossession through Microcredit in Rural Bangladesh.” *Geoforum* 74: 29–38.
 - Thaler, Gregory M., and Cut Augusta Mindry Anandi. 2017. “Shifting Cultivation, Contentious Land Change and Forest Governance: The Politics of Swidden in East Kalimantan.” *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 44 (5): 1066–87.
- **Assignment 14:** Research is relational. Over the course of the semester, you have been present in a field site and interacted with human subjects who have shared with you their time and experiences. What you have learned from your project may also be of use or interest to your research participants. Choose a way to report back on the preliminary results and conclusions of your project. Methods of reporting back could include organizing a presentation or discussion with a group of your participants or sharing results with individual participants either in person or in writing. When you have completed this process, write a 1-2 page description of how you reported your results, how the results were received, and any other reflections on this experience. **Email your assignment to me and your research support group by 5pm on 20 November. Send comments to your group members or meet with your group by 26 November (before Thanksgiving Break).**

Week 15 | 21 November: Research Presentations

You will give a 12 to 15-minute research presentation that previews your final paper. This presentation should approximate either a project pitch or a conference presentation.

Final papers must be posted to eLC by **3:30pm on Thursday, December 5th.**