

**POL S 559 (B)**  
**Qualitative and Mixed Methods**  
Spring 2021  
T 4:30pm-7:20pm  
Offered Via Remote Learning

Professor: Geoffrey Wallace  
Email: [gprwall@uw.edu](mailto:gprwall@uw.edu) (preferred method of contact)  
Office Hours: T 3:30pm-4:30pm, or by appointment  
Course website: On Canvas (<https://canvas.uw.edu>)

“The complexity of our research problems calls for answers beyond simple numbers in a quantitative sense or words in a qualitative sense. A combination of both forms of data can provide the most complete analysis of problems.”  
– Creswell & Plano Clark. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (2017: 23)

### **Overview**

Building on the department’s main methods sequence (POL S 500, 501, and 503), this course delves more deeply into qualitative and mixed methods approaches in political science research. The first part of the course focuses on learning about some of the most commonly used qualitative methodologies, while the second part then expands on mixed methods approaches. Each week combines theoretical treatments with more hands-on instruction on how to execute a specific methodological approach in practice through an examination of applied examples and students’ own work. Applications are drawn from various topics and subfields, and engage a range of specific methods, including case studies, process tracing, comparative historical analysis, archival research, and interviews. Along with an introduction to mixed methods approaches, designs will consider combinations *within* each general category of qualitative and quantitative methods, in addition to those combining *across* qualitative and quantitative methods (which include large-N observational data, surveys, experiments, and formal models). Throughout the course we will consider ethical issues that arise in the social scientific research process in general, and for qualitative and mixed methods in particular.

In a quarter-length course, certain topics, by necessity, cannot be covered. Similarly, many of the week’s topics could constitute entire courses on their own. Nevertheless, the course aims to provide students a firm foundation for further research and instruction using qualitative and mixed methods.

The course should be viewed as complementary to other offerings in the department (e.g., POL S 504 Multi-Method Field Research). For additional course offerings, see UW’s Qualitative Multi-Method Research Program (QUAL) (<https://jsis.washington.edu/programs/qual/>).

Although there are no prerequisites, some experience with general principles of research design and quantitative methods is recommended (e.g., POL S 500 and 501, or equivalents).

### **Learning Objectives**

- 1) Introduce students to qualitative and mixed methods research approaches generally, and how they should be conducted.

- 2) Increase knowledge of philosophical underpinnings of qualitative and mixed methods research.
- 3) Recognize and understand the various mixed methods designs that exist, their key/distinguishing features and characteristics, and the main considerations in using them.
- 4) Gain an understanding of how to execute these methods in practice through analysis of applied examples.
- 5) Assist students in developing their own qualitative or mixed methods proposal using an appropriate research design.

### Course Requirements

- Class Participation: 25%
- Short Assignments: 45% (15% each)
  - Assignment #1: Case Study and Selection (due April 6)
  - Assignment #2: Option A Historical Sources (due April 20) OR Option B Interviews (due May 4)
  - Assignment #3: Peer Design Review (due May 25)
- Research Proposal: 30% (due June 9)
  - Memo on proposed topic (due April 27)

**\*\*Important Note:\*\*** In order to receive a passing grade in this course, all assignments must be completed. Moreover, late assignments will not be accepted unless prior arrangements have been granted beforehand in writing by the professor.

#### *Regular Seminar Participation (25%)*

Although this is a methods course, classes will primarily be run in the style of seminar with limited (ideally, close to no) lecturing by the professor. Rather, this is an opportunity for the class as a whole to engage with various methodologies and their application in existing published work, as well as their implications for students' own research.

For meaningful discussion and a successful overall seminar, everyone must actively participate. This is particularly important given the subject matter of the course, since research on qualitative and mixed methods is vibrant and highly contested with few (if any) settled conclusions. Students are expected to attend class meetings, complete all assigned readings beforehand, and come prepared to discuss the material and raise questions of their own. Thinking about each week's readings in relation to students' own research interests is highly encouraged. The professor is also apt to call on students to answer questions related to the readings and their own work. All students will be expected to contribute to the discussion during class meetings. Quality of comments is valued over quantity with the goal being an open and welcome classroom environment where all students' voices are heard.

#### *Short Assignments (45% – the 15% each)*

A series of short assignments (each averaging around 4-6 pages double-spaced) will be due at various points throughout the quarter – see the summary of course requirements for specific due dates (all short assignments will be due by the start of class for the relevant deadline). Assignments will generally ask students to reflect upon assigned readings engaging particular methods, and then extend and apply them to their own or related research. More detailed instructions will be distributed in the lead-up to each assignment.

### *Research Proposal (30%)*

The final assessment will be a research proposal (15-20 pages double-spaced) on a topic of your choosing. The proposal should be structured as a modified version of a grant or dissertation proposal. It should briefly offer a clear research question, situate it within the existing literature, define key concepts, and put forward a theoretical argument with attention to developing specific hypotheses and identifying likely alternative explanations. The bulk of the proposal should then concentrate on formulating and justifying a qualitative or mixed method research design for testing these hypotheses, specifying the types of data to be used, how they will be analyzed, and assessing possible inferential challenges.

Although ungraded, a 1-page single-spaced memo describing your proposed topic and initial thoughts on research design is due by the start of class on April 27. The final research proposal will be due by 5pm on June 9.

### **Grading Policies & Procedures**

Grading for all assignments and for the course overall takes place on a 4.0 scale set by the UW Graduate School. Please remember that late assignments will not be accepted without prior arrangement with the instructor.

#### *Grade scale:*

3.5-4.0 = A range

2.5-3.4 = B range

1.7-2.4 = C range

Below 1.7 = E

### **Collaborative Work**

Please note that unless specifically granted by the professor, or directly indicated on the assignment, students should only complete assignments individually. All assignments are NOT to be completed in a collaborative effort with other students.

### **Religious Accommodations**

Washington state law requires that UW develop a policy for accommodation of student absences or significant hardship due to reasons of faith or conscience, or for organized religious activities. The UW's policy, including more information about how to request an accommodation, is available at Religious Accommodations Policy (<https://registrar.washington.edu/staffandfaculty/religious-accommodations-policy/>). Accommodations must be requested within the first two weeks of this course using the Religious Accommodations Request form (<https://registrar.washington.edu/students/religious-accommodations-request/>).

### **Accessibility**

If you have already established accommodations with Disability Resources for Students (DRS), please communicate your approved accommodations to the instructor as soon as possible so we can discuss your needs in this course. If you have not yet established services through DRS, but have a temporary health condition or permanent disability that requires accommodations (conditions include but not limited to: mental health, attention-related, learning, vision, hearing, physical or health impacts), you are welcome to contact DRS at 206-543-8924, email [uwdrs@uw.edu](mailto:uwdrs@uw.edu), or online at <http://disability.uw.edu>. DRS offers resources and coordinates reasonable accommodations for

students with disabilities and/or temporary health conditions. Reasonable accommodations are established through an interactive process between you, your instructor, and DRS. It is the policy and practice of the University of Washington to create inclusive and accessible learning environments consistent with federal and state law.

### **Academic Misconduct**

Academic misconduct is a serious offense at The University of Washington. All cases of suspected academic misconduct will be referred to the Arts and Sciences Committee on Academic Conduct, and may result in a grade of 0.0 for the assignment in question.

University policies and guidelines regarding cheating and plagiarism can be found at <https://depts.washington.edu/grading/pdf/AcademicResponsibility.pdf>.

What constitutes academic misconduct? The University of Washington Student Conduct Code defines it as the following (WAC 478-120-024).

**Academic misconduct** includes:

- (a) **“Cheating,”** which includes, but is not limited to:
  - (i) The use of unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations; or
  - (ii) The acquisition, use, or distribution of unpublished materials created by another student without the express permission of the original author(s).
- (b) **“Falsification,”** which is the intentional use or submission of falsified data, records, or other information including, but not limited to, records of internship or practicum experiences or attendance at any required event(s). Falsification also includes falsifying scientific and/or scholarly research.
- (c) **“Plagiarism,”** which is the submission or presentation of someone else’s words, composition, research, or expressed ideas, whether published or unpublished, without attribution. Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to:
  - (i) The use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgment; or
  - (ii) The unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or acquired from an entity engaging in the selling of term papers or other academic materials.
- (d) **Prohibited collaboration.**
- (e) Engaging in behavior specifically prohibited by an instructor in the course of class instruction or in a course syllabus.
- (f) **Multiple submissions** of the same work in separate courses without the express permission of the instructor(s).
- (g) Taking deliberate action to destroy or damage another’s academic work in order to gain an advantage for oneself or another.
- (h) The recording of instructional content without the express permission of the instructor(s), and/or the dissemination or use of such unauthorized records.

If you are uncertain what constitutes plagiarism, please ask the instructor. The Political Science/JSIS/LSJ/CHID Writing Center also offers guidance on plagiarism, general advice on writing, and related issues of academic integrity:

<http://depts.washington.edu/pswrite/forstudents.html>.

## Classroom Expectations & Communication

Even in a methods course, some of the material covered may be controversial. While debate is expected and in fact encouraged, students are required to conduct themselves in a professional manner at all times during the course. Students are expected to arrive on time and ready to start class. We have a very short period of time for each class, and it is disrespectful to the instructor and your fellow classmates to show up late. If you miss a class you are still responsible for the information covered, and the instructor will not provide you with notes. All disruptive behavior is not permitted during class, including but by no means limited to sleeping, talking outside of regular discussion, using cell phones, and insulting classmates and/or the instructor. Laptops are permitted, but should be used solely for course work (e.g., taking notes, accessing course readings, etc.). Eating is permitted as long as it does not disrupt others.

Email is the preferred method of contact for most logistical questions. For more in-depth issues, please arrange to talk with the instructor during office hours or by appointment. All e-mail related to the course should begin with the subject heading “POL S 559:...”. Assignments should be submitted by e-mail attachment with the subject heading “POL S 559: <Your Name> - <Assignment Name>”.

## Readings

All readings are available in electronic format and will be posted on the Canvas course website. The reading load for this course is quite heavy (often several hundred pages per week) – plan and prepare accordingly.

Although there are no required books for purchase, the following are a selection of reference books that delve more deeply into qualitative and mixed methods in general, as well as certain techniques in particular (excerpts from some of which are assigned).

- Bennett, Andrew, and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. 2015. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Brady, Henry E., and David Collier, eds. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Creswell, John W., and Vicki L. Plano Clark. 2017. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage Publications.
- Dunning, Thad. 2012. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2018. *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach*. New York, N.Y.: Routledge.
- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Science*. Cambridge, M.A.: MIT Press.
- Gerring, John. 2011. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Mosley, Layna. 2013. *Interview Research in Political Science*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Plano Clark, Vicki L., and Nataliya V. Ivankova. 2016. *Mixed Methods Research: A Guide to the Field*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage Publications.

- Ragin, Charles C. 2014. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press.
- Seawright, Jason. 2016. *Multi-Method Social Science: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Tools*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Tashakkori, Abbas M., Robert Burke Johnson, and Charles B. Teddlie. 2020. *Foundations of Mixed Methods Research: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage Publications.
- Weller, Nicholas, and Jeb Barnes. 2014. *Finding Pathways: Mixed Method Research for Studying Causal Mechanisms*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Other more specific treatments of particular approaches and questions of mixed methods research can be found in the *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*. The APSA section on Qualitative and Multi-Method Research also publishes semi-annually *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research*. A host of resources are available from the Center for Qualitative and Multi-Method Inquiry at Syracuse University ([https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/CQMI\\_at\\_Syracuse/](https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/CQMI_at_Syracuse/)). Empirical Implications of Theoretical Models (EITM) provides opportunities for learning more about integrating formal modeling with empirical evidence (<https://eitminstitute.org/>).

### A Few Notes on Note-Taking

You should take an organized and long-term approach to your notes. You will likely need to refer back to your notes from this course many times in the future – making connections to other courses, preparing for comprehensive exams, researching a paper, etc. This applies to an equal, if not greater, extent with methods readings. In fact, I still regularly consult my own notes when I took courses like the following many years ago!

Here are two general recommendations on note-taking:

1. Your notes should be a combination of a) specifics to the particular reading and b) big picture thinking. Having detailed notes on each reading is important, but getting bogged down in the minutiae can conceal the bigger picture and how a reading fits within the broader field. Along with reading-specific notes, you should also include (often at the beginning) a brief paragraph or set of points where you take a step back and situate the reading in the relevant literature. In general, keep the following questions in mind when reading each piece (not necessarily in this order):
  - a. What is the research question?
  - b. What literature/work is this work contributing to?
  - c. What is the theory and hypotheses?
  - d. What is the methodological approach and research design?
  - e. What are the findings?
  - f. What is the central contribution of the work and implications?
2. You should also experiment with some electronic system for managing your notes. Reference management systems (e.g. Bookends, Mendeley, Zotero, BibTeX, etc.) can be extremely flexible and efficient for organizing your materials, citing works, and updating your notes with new thoughts and connections.

### Self-Care

Graduate studies are hard enough in normal times, but these are unfortunately not normal times. We are currently living through a global pandemic, heightened economic uncertainty, a period of

renewed attention domestically and internationally to racial injustice, and an intensely polarized political environment.

The Counseling Center and Hall Health are excellent resources on campus that many UW students utilize. Students may get help with study skills, career decisions, substance abuse, relationship difficulties, anxiety, depression, or other concerns.

- Counseling Center – <https://www.washington.edu/counseling/>
- Hall Health – <https://wellbeing.uw.edu/unit/hall-health/>

## Course Schedule

The following is a preliminary schedule of topics and readings for the course. The schedule is subject to change based on the pace of the class. The instructor will clearly announce changes to the course schedule should any occur. Please be mindful that some of the readings for a particular week may be split across separate pages in the syllabus.

### Week 1 (March 30): A Quantitative vs. Qualitative Divide?

- Collier, David, and Colin Elman. 2008. “Qualitative and Multimethod Research: Organizations, Publications, and Reflections on Integration.” In *The Oxford Handbook on Political Methodology*. Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, eds. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press. (779-795).
- Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research.” *Political Analysis* 14 (3): 227-249.
- Hall, Peter A. 2003. “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research.” In *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press. (373-404).
- Bracanti, Dawn. 2018. *Social Scientific Research*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: SAGE Publications. Ch.2 “Research Ethics” (15-29).
- International History and Politics Section. 2016. “Roundtable: Discussion on the DA-RT.” *International History and Politics Newsletter* 1 (2): 2-18.
  - This newsletter contains various contributions to a vibrant debate that has developed in recent years around initiatives related to Data Access and Research Transparency (DA-RT), and in particular the implications for qualitative research. Skim the roundtable entries to get a flavor of some of the considerations, but really fully the following two “Friendly Fire” pieces.
    - Moravcsik, Andrew. “Qualitative Transparency: Pluralistic, Humanistic and Policy-Relevant.” (17-23).
    - Isaac, Jeffrey C. “In Praise of Transparency, But Not of DA-RT.” (24-29).

### Week 2 (April 6): Case Studies and Case Selection

#### \*\*\*Short Assignment #1 Due\*\*\*

- Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press. Ch.2 “What is a Case Study? The Problem of Definition” (17-36).
- Seawright, Jason, and John Gerring. 2008. “Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research.” *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (2): 294-308.

- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." *Political Analysis* 2 (1): 131-150.
- Collier, David, and James Mahoney. 1996. "Insight and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 49 (1): 56-91.
- Harding, David J., Cybelle Fox, and Jal D. Mehta. 2002. "Studying Rare Events Through Qualitative Case Studies: Lessons from a Study of Rampage School Shootings." *Sociological Methods and Research* 31 (2): 174-217.
- Zepeda-Millán, Chris. 2017. *Latino Mass Mobilization: Immigration, Racialization, and Activism*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. Ch.2 "Weapons of the Not So Weak" (41-66) and Appendix A "Research Design" (215-229).

### Week 3 (April 13): Process Tracing and Within-Case Analysis

- Bennett, Andrew, and Jeffrey T. Checkel, 2015. "Process Tracing: From Philosophical Roots to Best Practices." In *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. (3-37).
- Waldner, David. 2015. "What Makes Process Tracing Good? Causal Mechanisms, Causal Inference, and the Completeness Standard in Comparative Politics." In *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. (126-152).
- Zaks, Sherry. 2017. "Relationships among Rivals (RAR): A Framework for Analyzing Contending Hypotheses in Process Tracing." *Political Analysis* 25 (3): 344-362.
- Berman, Sheri. 1997. "Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic." *World Politics* 49 (3): 401-429.
- Layne, Christopher. 1994. "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19 (2): 5-49.

### Week 4 (April 20): Archives and Historical Sources

#### \*\*\*Short Assignment #2 (Option A) Due\*\*\*

- Trachtenberg, Marc. 2009. *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. Ch.5 "Working with Documents" (140-168).
- Thies, Cameron G. 2002. "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives* 3 (4): 351-372.
- Davenport, Christian, 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): 427-550.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 1998. *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press. (Excerpts 10-17, 24, 28, 176-197, 473-479).
- Lieshout, Robert H., Mathieu L.L. Segers, and Anna M. van der Vleuten. 2004. "De Gaulle, Moravcsik, and *The Choice for Europe*: Soft Sources, Weak Evidence." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 6 (4): 89-139. (Read main body of article and skim appendices).



**Week 5 (April 27): Approaches to Understanding History – Analytic Narratives, Comparative-Historical Analysis, and Historical Institutionalism**

**\*\*\*Research Design Memo Due\*\*\***

- Bates, Robert, Avner Grief, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry Weingast 1998. *Analytic Narratives*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. Introduction (3-22) and Avner Grief Ch.1 “Self-Enforcing Political Systems and Economic Growth: Late Medieval Genoa” (23-63).
- Carpenter, Daniel. 2000. “Commentary: What is the Marginal Value of Analytic Narratives?” *Social Science History* 24 (4): 653-667.
- Thelen, Kathleen, and James Mahoney. 2015. “Comparative-Historical Analysis in Contemporary Political Science.” In *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. James Mahoney, and Kathleen Thelen, eds. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. (3-36).
- Pierson, Paul, and Theda Skocpol. 2002. “Historical Institutionalism in Contemporary Political Science.” In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*. Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner, eds. New York, N.Y.: W.W. Norton. (693-721).
- Tsai, Kellee S. 2006. “Adaptive Informal Institutions and Endogenous Institutional Change in China.” *World Politics* 59 (1): 116-141.

**Week 6 (May 4): Interviews**

**\*\*\*Short Assignment #2 (Option B) Due\*\*\***

- Mosley, Layna. 2013. “Introduction. ‘Just Talk to People’? Interviews in Contemporary Political Science.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*. Layna Mosley, ed. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press. (1-28).
- Martin, Cathie Joe. 2013. “Crafting Interviews to Capture Cause and Effect.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*. Layna Mosley, ed. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press. (109-124).
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2010. “Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence.” *Journal of Peace Research* 47 (2): 231-241.
- England, Kim V.L. 1994. “Getting Personal: Reflexivity, Positionality, and Feminist Research.” *Professional Geographer* 46 (1): 80-89.
- Hochschild, Jennifer. 1981. *What’s Fair: American Beliefs About Distributive Justice*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press. Ch.1 “Why There Is No Socialism in the United States” (1-26), Ch.9 “Political Orientations: Why the Dog Doesn’t Bark” (260-285), and Appendix A “Demographic Characteristics of Respondents” (288-291) and Appendix B “Interview Questions” (292-308).
- Brooks, Sarah M. 2013. “The Ethical Treatment of Human Subjects and the Institutional Review Board Process.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*. Layna Mosley, ed. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press. (45-66).

**Week 7 (May 11): A Third Way, a Middle Way, or No Way? Perspectives on Mixed Methods**

- Tashakkori, Abbas M., Robert Burke Johnson, and Charles B. Teddlie. 2020. *Foundations of Mixed Methods Research: Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage Publications. Ch.1 “Mixed Methods as the Third Research Community” (3-40).

- Small, Mario Luis. 2011. "How to Conduct a Mixed Methods Study: Recent Trends in a Rapidly Growing Literature." *Annual Review of Sociology* 37: 57-86.
- Coppedge, Michael. 1999. "Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories: Combining Large N and Small in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Politics* 31(4): 465-476.
- Yeasmin, Sabina, and Khan Ferdousour Rahman. 2012. "'Triangulation' Research Method as the Tool of Social Science Research." *BUP Journal* 1 (1): 154-163.
- Ahmed, Amel, and Rudra Sil. 2012. "When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism – or, Why We Still Need Single-Method Research." *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (4): 935-953.

### **Week 8 (May 18): Using Qualitative Evidence to Inform Quantitative Design and Analysis**

- Lieberman, Evan S. 2010. "Bridging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide: Best Practices in the Development of Historically Oriented Replication Databases." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13: 37-59.
- Cohen, Dara Kay. 2016. *Rape during Civil War*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press. Ch.2 "Research Strategy, Cross-National Evidence (1980–2009), and Statistical Tests" (Excerpt 56-84) and Appendix "Notes on Data Collection on Wartime Rape" (201-208).
- Seawright, Jason. 2016. *Multi-Method Social Science: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Tools*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. Ch.3 "Using Case Studies to Test and Refine Regressions" (45-74).
- Weller, Nicholas, and Jeb Barnes. 2014. *Finding Pathways: Mixed Method Research for Studying Causal Mechanisms*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. Ch.7 "Using Large-N Methods to Gain Perspective on Prior Case Studies" (104-116).
- Kreuzer, Marcus. 2010. "Historical Knowledge and Quantitative Analysis: The Case of the Origins of Proportional Representation." *American Political Science Review* 104 (2): 369-392.

### **Week 9 (May 25): And Using Quantitative Evidence to Inform Qualitative Design and Analysis**

#### **\*\*\*Short Assignment #3 (Peer Design Review) Due\*\*\***

- Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99 (3): 435-452.
- Rohlfing, Ingo. 2007. "What You See and What You Get: Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research." *Comparative Political Studies* 4 (11): 1492-1514.
- Howard, Marc Morjé and Philip G. Roessler. 2006. "Liberalizing Electoral Outcomes in Competitive Authoritarian Regimes." *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (2): 365-381.
- Coppedge, Michael. 2005. "Explaining Democratic Deterioration in Venezuela Through Nested Inference," In *The Third Wave of Democratization in Latin America: Advances and Setbacks*. Frances Hagopian and Scott Mainwaring, eds. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. (289-318).
- Luetgert, Brooke, and Tanja Dannwolf. 2009. "Mixing Methods: A Nested Analysis of EU Member State Transposition Patterns." *European Union Politics* 10 (3): 307-334.

**Week 10 (June 1): Qualitative Methods, Experiments, and Causal Inference**

- Dunning, Thad. 2012. *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. Ch.7 “The Central Role of Qualitative Evidence” (208-231).
- Paluck, Elizabeth L. 2010. “The Promising Integration of Qualitative Methods and Field Experiments.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 628: 59-71.
- Kocher, Matthew A., and Nuno P. Monteiro. 2016. “Lines of Demarcation: Causation, Design-Based Inference, and Historical Research.” *Perspectives on Politics* 14 (4): 952-975.
- Hyde, Susan D. 2007. “The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” *World Politics* 60 (1): 37-63.
- Phillips, Trisha. 2021. “Ethics of Field Experiments.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 24: 1-24.

**\*\*\*Research Design due by 5pm on June 9\*\*\***