

## Seminar: Introduction to Qualitative Methods

*Note – This seminar is for SPS researchers only.*

**1st Term, Academic Year 2022-2023**

**Mondays, 9.00-11.00 (Refettorio, Seminar Room 2, Sala del Capitolo, Teatro)**

**First Seminar Session: 03.10.22**

**Last Seminar Session: 12.12.22**

Instructor: [Jeffrey T. Checkel](#)

Office: Villa Sanfelice, SF-02

E-Mail: [jeffrey.checkel@eui.eu](mailto:jeffrey.checkel@eui.eu)

Office Hours: Mondays, 12:00-14:00

Contact: Pia Dittmar ([pia.dittmar@eui.eu](mailto:pia.dittmar@eui.eu))

### Description

This is a course about how to evaluate and conduct rigorous, epistemologically plural qualitative research. It will both introduce you to key concepts and methods – cause and case studies, positionality and ethnography, say – and show how they work in practice. Seminar sessions will be divided in two – a conceptual introduction and overview that is then followed by examples drawn from key topics and sub-fields within SPS. The goal is not for you to become methodologists, but to be smart consumers and users of qualitative methods in your own studies and reading.

The course has three parts. We begin with two sessions on foundational issues: philosophy, theory, causation and ethics. Methods can flow from various philosophical starting points; process tracing and ethnography – for example – are distinct techniques for gathering and evaluating data that draw upon different epistemologies. The chosen epistemology, in turn, attunes the scholar to certain research questions and not others; to seeing theory's role in different ways; to differing understandings of cause; and to contrasting appreciations of ethics. Why do proponents of case studies champion their causal power while saying little about the ethics in play, while – for the ethnographer – ethics stand front and center, but causality – if even discussed – is contextualized and local?

The bulk of the course then provides an introduction to a number of qualitative methods. Each seminar session introduces a particular technique, provides a critical net assessment, and explores how the method works in practice. The latter is accomplished by drawing upon empirical research in the social and political sciences. Finally – in the last two sessions – we look to the future, exploring the cutting-edge for students of qualitative research: research transparency and mixed methods.

The seminar is worth 20 credits.

### Learning Outcomes

- An understanding of the varying links among philosophy, theory, cause, ethics and your choice of and assessment of a particular qualitative method.

- For the six core qualitative methods – case studies; comparative historical analysis; process/practice tracing; textual/discourse analysis; fieldwork/ethnography; interviewing – an appreciation of the method’s content, its strengths and weaknesses, and an ability to assess applications.
- An understanding of the central – and growing – importance of transparency in qualitative methods, and the trade-offs necessary to attain this goal.
- An appreciation of the role(s) played by qualitative methods in mixed-method designs, and the challenges involved in executing such designs.

SPS’s third-term course offerings build on these learning outcomes by providing detailed operationalizations and hands-on training in particular qualitative methods. (In the 2021-2022 year, for example, qualitative third-term workshops included philosophy of social science, ethics, process tracing, computational text analysis, discourse methods, interviews, and archives/historical-data.)

### Format

During the September Programme, SPS offered a ‘[Preparatory Workshop: Introduction to Qualitative Methods](#).’ In structuring this seminar, we assume you have the background knowledge provided in that workshop – on philosophy, ethics, interviews and ethnography – either because you participated in it or have had graduate coursework on the topics it covered.

For all ten weeks, the group - as a whole - meets during the first hour, when Checkel will lead the discussion. For these sessions, Checkel will distribute lecture notes. However, he will not lecture for the entire first hour; rather, he will also lead a debate structured around the ‘discussion questions’ for that particular session.

The seminar’s second hour is then devoted to researcher-led discussion and debate, with the class split in two. SPS Part-Time Professor [Daniëlle Flonk](#) will lead one of the groups, and Checkel the other.

### Seminar Readings

Books to be read – mostly key sections - include the following.

- Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editors, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)
- della Porta, Donatella and Michael Keating, Editors, *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008)
- Fujii, Lee Ann, *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach* (London: Routledge, 2017)
- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005)
- Gerring, John, *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices, Second Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017)
- Hopf, Ted and Bentley Allan, Editors, *Making Identity Count: Building a National Identity Database* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)
- Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren MacLean and Benjamin Read, *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)

- Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen, Editors, *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015)
- Mosley, Layna, Editor, *Interview Research in Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013)

One note on the readings: In several cases, articles/chapters have the phrases ‘international relations,’ ‘IR theory,’ or ‘international studies’ in their titles. Relax! I have not made this an IR theory seminar (☺). When selecting a reading from IR, I have made sure that its argument and logic apply across the various subfields in political science and sociology.

Seminar readings are accessible in a variety of ways.

- Books & Chapters in Books: Most books are available electronically from the EUI Library. In the reading list below, these are indicated by (**E-Book**). (The direct hyperlink to the book is provided whenever possible.)
- Difficult-to-Access Materials: This includes articles from newsletters and books/chapters only available in paper format. Nearly all of these will be uploaded to the seminar [Brightspace](#) page.
- Journal Articles: These are easily obtained electronically through the EUI Library.

If you encounter any problems accessing seminar readings, please contact Pia Dittmar.

## Requirements

There are three requirements; to receive credit for the seminar, you need a passing mark in all three.

- 1) Seminar Discussions: Active participation in them.
  - ➔ For the discussion part of the seminar – the second hour - the class will be divided in two. Your participation in these discussions on a regular basis is required.
- 2) Group Preparation of Discussion Memo: Once over the course of the term.
  - ➔ **Group Composition**: There will likely be 34-36 researchers taking the seminar. For the discussion hour, we will divide the group in two, with Checkel taking 17-18 researchers (Cluster #1) and Flonk the other 17-18 (Cluster #2). Within each cluster, researchers should form as many groups as possible with two members each, and, if necessary, one group with 3 members. In both Cluster #1 and #2, each group signs up as discussion leader for one of the 9 available course weeks (Sessions 2-10).
  - ➔ **Group Assignment**: In both Cluster #1 and #2, if your group is responsible for a particular session, then you will take the lead in our discussions during it. For this to work, please - *by 12.00/noon the Friday before our Monday seminar* - upload to Brightspace a 5-7 page (double-spaced) memo.

In these memos, you should *focus on applications and ‘what’s in it for me’ / ‘how do I use it.’* Let me give a few examples. Say you are responsible for session #9 on qualitative transparency. Your memo might address how you understand transparency, its pluses and minuses, its use in practice (the application readings), and how you would operationalize transparency in a hypothetical qualitative research design. Or, say you have the session on process/practice tracing (session #5). Here, your memo could assess

the two application readings for that week – why are they good, or bad uses of the method – and work through how you would set up and operationalize process/practice tracing in a hypothetical study. With these hypothetical studies/designs, it is of course all for the better if they are drawn from your own projects.

The memos' purpose is to move our discussions from the conceptual and theoretical (what is ethnography and how do positivists and interpretivists use it differently) to the applied and operational (is this a good application of ethnography and, if so, why; how do we operationalize access and ethics in different ethnographic field settings).

### 3) Writing Exercise: Due on 05.12.22 (Week 9).

➔ It should be 10 pages in length (double-spaced). There are two possible formats for your paper.

**Format A:** Choose any topic or method covered in the syllabus and critically assess the current state of debate over, applications of, or the strengths and weaknesses of it. In the jargon, you are writing a 'critical review.'

With Format A, be strategic. If you are a qualitative researcher, pick a method or topic (ethics, say) that will likely play a key role in your dissertation. If you are a quantitative researcher, choose one of the more frequently used qualitative methods in your area of research, so you can better evaluate work done in that tradition. Example: You are a quantitative researcher planning to study civil wars with advanced statistical methods. For your critical review, it would then make sense to consider fieldwork and case-study methods, as a growing number of scholars are studying civil conflicts with them.

**Format B:** Start with the central research question of your thesis and your tentative theoretical argument for answering it. What qualitative methods will you need to answer that question and test/probe your theory? Here, the bulk of the review will be spent operationalizing your methods. How, exactly, will they be used? Are their particular data challenges to consider? How will you ensure the methods are used ethically?

For either format, you are required to read deeper into the relevant literature. It is not sufficient to summarize what we already have read and discussed in class!

A final comment: Papers in either format – and especially format B – will be very helpful in fleshing out key parts of your thesis prospectus, which is due on 03.04.23.

## Schedule

- Session 1 (3 October) – Doing Qualitative Methods I: Context; Philosophy & Theory
- Session 2 (10 October) – Doing Qualitative Methods II: Cause & Research Ethics
- Session 3 (17 October) – Case Studies
- Session 4 (24 October) – Comparative Historical Analysis

**\*\*\* 31 October – No Class (EUI holiday) \*\*\***

- Session 5 (7 November) – Process Analytics: Process Tracing & Practice Tracing
- Session 6 (14 November) – Textual & Discourse Analysis
- Session 7 (21 November) – Fieldwork & Ethnography
- Session 8 (28 November) – Interviewing
- Session 9 (5 December) – The Cutting Edge I: Transparency & Qualitative Methods

- Session 10 (12 December) – The Cutting Edge II: Qualitative Methods & Mixed-Method Designs

## Seminar Topics & Readings

### Session 1 – Doing Qualitative Methods I: Context; Philosophy & Theory

#### *Context: Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences*

Emmons, Cassandra and Andrew Moravcsik, “Graduate Qualitative Methods Training in Political Science: A Disciplinary Crisis,” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53/2 (April 2020): 258-264.

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

#### *Philosophy of Social Science and Theory*

##### *Nuts and Bolts*

della Porta, Donatella and Michael Keating, Editors, *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) – Chapters 1-2. ([E-Book](#))

Van Evera, Stephen, “Hypotheses, Laws, and Theories: A User’s Guide,” in *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997) – Chapter 1. ([E-Book](#))

Bauböck, Rainer, “Normative Political Theory and Empirical Research,” in Donatella della Porta and Michael Keating, Editors, *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) – Chapter 3. ([E-Book](#))

##### *Applications*

Johnson, James, “Consequences of Positivism: A Pragmatist Assessment,” *Comparative Political Studies* 39/2 (2006): 224-52.

Hall, Peter, “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics,” in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Editors, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) – Chapter 11. ([E-Book](#))

### Discussion Questions

- What is philosophy of social science and why does it matter?
- What is positivism? What is interpretism? How do they differ? Which is a better?
- How do philosophical starting points influence our thinking about cause, theory, data, ethics and methods?
- What are the roles of deduction and induction in theory development?
- What are the differences among normative, problem-solving theory and critical theory?
- What is the relation between theory and method?

### Session 2 – Doing Qualitative Methods II: Cause & Research Ethics

##### *Nuts and Bolts*

“Controversy over Causes in the Social Sciences,” in Milja Kurki, *Causation in International Relations: Reclaiming Causal Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) – Chapters 1-2. ([E-Book](#))

Hedstroem, Peter and Petri Ylikoski, “Causal Mechanisms in the Social Sciences,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 36 (2010): 49–67.

European Commission, DG Research and Innovation, “[Ethics in Social Science and Humanities](#)” (Brussels: European Commission, October 2018).

American Political Science Association, “[Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research](#)” (Washington, DC: Spring APSA Council Meeting, 4 April 2020).

### ***Applications***

Wood, Elisabeth Jean, “The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones,” *Qualitative Sociology* 29/3 (2006): 373-86.

Hoover Green, Amelia and Dara Kay Cohen, “[Centering Human Subjects: The Ethics of ‘Desk Research’ on Political Violence](#),” *Journal of Global Security Studies* 6/2 (2021).

Darnton, Christopher, “The Provenance Problem: Research Methods and Ethics in the Age of WikiLeaks,” *American Political Science Review* 116/3 (2022): 1110–1125.

### **Discussion Questions**

- What is cause? (There’s a simple question - ☺.)
- Situated understanding, causal mechanisms, cause-effect, and correlation are all equally valuable ways to help us explain and understand the social world. Discuss.
- What is the relation between epistemology and ethics?
- How do ethics play out in differing research contexts? Consider three: elite interviews of Commission bureaucrats in Brussels; a field experiment in Sierra Leone; fieldwork among Roma in Hungary.
- Are the ethical aspects of your thesis finished or just beginning when the EUI Ethics Committee approves your ethical framework?
- Ethics do not matter for quantitative researchers. Discuss.

### **Session 3 - Case Studies**

#### ***Nuts and Bolts***

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005) – Chapters 1, 4-5.

Gerring, John, *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices, Second Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017) – Chapters 1-3, 5, 7-8, 11.

#### ***Applications***

Blattman, Christopher, “Children and War: How ‘Soft’ Research Can Answer the Hard Questions in Political Science,” *Perspectives on Politics* 10/2 (2012): 403-413.

Bakke, Kristin, “Copying and Learning from Outsiders? Assessing Diffusion from Transnational Insurgents in the Chechen Wars,” in Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editor, *Transnational Dynamics of Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013) - Chapter 2. ([E-Book](#))

## **Discussion Questions**

- What is a case study? What kinds of questions and puzzles is it especially helpful in answering?
- Case studies are always built on a processual, mechanism-based understanding of cause. Discuss.
- What does it mean to speak of validity and transparency in case study research?
- What are the narrative, methodological and data attributes of a rigorously executed case study?
- Are quantitative techniques incompatible with case studies?

## **Session 4 - Comparative Historical Analysis**

### *Nuts and Bolts*

Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen, Editors, *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapters 1, 6, 8, 9. ([E-Book](#))

### *Applications*

Gibson, Christopher, *Movement-driven Development: The Politics of Health and Democracy in Brazil* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2019) – Chapters 1, 4. ([E-Book](#))<sup>1</sup>

## **Discussion Questions**

- Comparative historical analysis (CHA) is a method (or should that be design?!) uniquely well placed to capture temporal dynamics. Discuss.
- If case studies play key roles in CHA, what are the typical within-case methods employed by these scholars?
- What role do path dependence and critical junctures play in CHA?
- How would you recognize a critical juncture if it were to walk through the door?

## **Session 5 - Process Analytics: Process Tracing & Practice Tracing**

### *Nuts and Bolts - Positivist*

Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editors, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapters 1, 10, Appendix. ([E-Book](#))

Zaks, Sherry, “Updating Bayesian(s): A Critical Evaluation of Bayesian Process Tracing,” *Political Analysis* 29/1 (2021): 58-74.

### *Nuts and Bolts - Interpretive*

Pouliot, Vincent, “Practice Tracing,” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editors, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapter 9. ([E-Book](#))

Checkel, Jeffrey T., “[Process Tracing – Towards a New Research Agenda](#),” Paper presented at the American Political Science Association Annual Convention (September-October 2021).

---

<sup>1</sup> The EUI Library does have Gibson as an e-book. If the link provided here does not work, just access it through the Library Catalogue.

### *Applications*

Schwartz, Rachel and Scott Straus, “What Drives Violence against Civilians in Civil War? Evidence from Guatemala’s Conflict Archives,” *Journal of Peace Research* 55/2 (2018): 222–235.

Pouliot, Vincent, *International Pecking Orders: The Politics and Practice of Multilateral Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016) – Appendix. ([E-Book](#))

### **Discussion Questions**

- What is process tracing and how does it differ from historical chronologies?
- What role do causal mechanisms and social practices play in process tracing / practice tracing?
- How would you know a rigorous application of process tracing / practice tracing if it were to walk through the door?
- How visible and explicit should the process/practice tracing method be in the write up of your results?
- For many, formalization (Bayesianism, set theory, directed acyclic graphs) is the cutting edge in process tracing. What are the pluses and minuses of such efforts?

### **Session 6 - Textual & Discourse Analysis**

#### *Nuts and Bolts*

Milliken, Jennifer, “The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods,” *European Journal of International Relations* 5/2 (1999): 225-54.

Neumann, Iver, “Discourse Analysis,” in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, Editors, *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) – Chapter 5. ([E-Book](#))

Hopf, Ted, “Constructivism at Home,” in *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002) – Chapter 1. ([E-Book](#))

#### *Applications*

Price, Richard, “A Genealogy of the Chemical Weapons Taboo,” *International Organization* 49/1 (1995): 73-103.

Allan, Bentley, “Recovering Discourses of National Identity,” in Ted Hopf and Bentley Allan, Editors, *Making Identity Count: Building a National Identity Database* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) – Chapter 2. ([E-Book](#))

### **Discussion Questions**

- What is discourse as a method and what types of research questions can it best answer?
- What role do social power and productive power play in discourse analysis?
- How would you recognize a good, systematic application of discourse if it were to walk through the door?
- Can one combine discourse analysis with quantitative methods?
- Discourse analysis has an agency problem. Discuss.

## Session 7 - Fieldwork & Ethnography

### *Nuts and Bolts*

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren MacLean and Benjamin Read, *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapters 1, 3, 4, 7. ([E-Book](#))

Geertz, Clifford, “*Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture*,” in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (NY: Basic Books, 1973) – Chapter 1. ([E-Book](#))

Schatz, Edward, “Introduction: Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics,” in Edward Schatz, Editor, *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009) – Introduction. ([E-Book](#)) ([One-User License](#))

Delamont, Sara and Paul Atkinson, “The Ethics of Ethnography,” in Ron Iphofen and Martin Tolich, Editors, *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Ethics* (London: Sage Publications, 2018) – Chapter 7. ([E-Book](#))

### *Applications*

Gusterson, Hugh, “Ethnographic Research,” in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, Editors, *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) – Chapter 7. ([E-Book](#))

Wood, Elisabeth Jean, “Ethnographic Research in the Shadow of Civil War,” in *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003) – Chapter 2. ([E-Book](#))

Fujii, Lee Ann, “Five Stories of Accidental Ethnography: Turning Unplanned Moments in the Field into Data,” *Qualitative Research* 15/4 (2015): 525–39.

### Discussion Questions

- What is ethnography and how does it differ from conducting a case study?
- What is the difference between cultural ethnography and political ethnography?
- When can you ‘stop’ your ethnographic research?
- What matters more to an ethnographer: Interviews or participant observation?
- How does a researcher decide what is ethical when she is in the field?
- Access and positionality play key – and very differing – roles in ethnography. Discuss.

## Session 8 - Interviewing

### *Nuts and Bolts - Positivist*

Mosley, Layna, Editor, *Interview Research in Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013) – Introduction, Chapters 1, 3, 9. ([E-Book](#))

### *Nuts and Bolts – Interpretive*

Fujii, Lee Ann, *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach* (London: Routledge, 2018). ([E-Book](#))

### *Applications*

Leech, Beth, Frank R. Baumgartner, Jeffrey M. Berry, Marie Hojnacki and David C. Kimball, "Lessons from the 'Lobbying and Policy Change' Project," in Layna Mosley, Editor, *Interview Research in Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013) - Chapter 11. ([E-Book](#))

Fujii, Lee Ann, "Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence," *Journal of Peace Research* 47/2 (2010): 231–241.

### **Discussion Questions**

- Political scientists and sociologists, on the one hand, and ethnographers, on the other, conduct interviews in fundamentally different ways. Do you agree or not? Why?
- How would you conduct an interview ethically?
- How does one deal with lies, dissimulation and (faulty?) memory when interviewing?
- How do your gender, nationality, status, and interview questions affect the interview process? (And why do we have two different names for these dynamics: interviewer effects and positionality?)

### **Session 9 – The Cutting Edge I: Transparency & Qualitative Methods**

#### ***Nuts and Bolts***

Symposium, "[Data Access and Research Transparency \(DA-RT\)](#)," *Comparative Politics Newsletter: The Organized Section in Comparative Politics of the American Political Science Association* 26/1 (Spring 2016): 10-64.

Jacobs, Alan and Tim Buthe, "The Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: Insights and Implications," *Perspectives on Politics* 19/1 (2021): 171 – 208.

Rinke, Eike Mark and Alexander Wuttke, "Open Minds, Open Methods: Transparency and Inclusion in Pursuit of Better Scholarship," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 54/2 (2021): 281-84.

Kapiszewski, Diana and Elisabeth Wood, "Ethics, Epistemology, and Openness in Research with Human Participants," *Perspectives on Politics* (FirstView, 15.03.21: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720004703>).

#### ***Applications***

Moravcsik, Andrew, "Trust, but Verify: The Transparency Revolution and Qualitative International Relations," *Security Studies* 23/4 (2014): 663–688.

Symposium, "[Varieties of Transparency in Qualitative Research](#)," *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 19/1 (Spring 2021): 6-32.

### **Discussion Questions**

- What are the epistemological foundations of the debate over research transparency?
- What are the pluses and minuses of using Active Citation / Annotation for Transparent Inquiry (ATI) and constructing a transparency index?
- Qualitative transparency and quantitative replication are essentially the same. Or fundamentally different? Or ...?

- There is no such thing as a free lunch in social science research: More effort devoted to research transparency means less time for theory development, ethics and the like. Discuss.

## **Session 10 – The Cutting Edge II: Qualitative Methods & Mixed-Method Designs**

### ***Nuts and Bolts***

Lieberman, Evan, “Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research,” *American Political Science Review* 99/3 (2005): 435-452.

Ahmed, Amel and Rudra Sil, “When Multi-Method Research Subverts Methodological Pluralism - Or, Why We Still Need Single-Method Research,” *Perspectives on Politics* 10/4 (2012): 935-53.

### ***Applications***

Dunning, Thad, “Improving Process Tracing: The Case of Multi-Method Research,” in Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel, Editors, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) – Chapter 8. ([E-Book](#))

Hopf, Ted, “Making Identity Count: Constructivism, Identity, and IR Theory,” in Ted Hopf and Bentley Allan, Editors, *Making Identity Count: Building a National Identity Database* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) – Chapter 1. ([E-Book](#))

### **Discussion Questions**

- Mixed methods are all the rage, but they are not easy to execute. Discuss.
- When is it appropriate to use a mixed-method design? When is it not?
- Do experimental designs of necessity require the use of qualitative methods?
- Can one mix methods across epistemological boundaries – combining discourse analysis with, say, a process-tracing case study?