

First Term, Academic Year 2025-2026

Seminar: Introduction to Qualitative Methods

Time and Place: Monday 11:00-13:00, Seminar Room 2

First Session: 29.09; Last Session: 01.12

Given by: Professor Tasha Fairfield and Dr. Natasja Rupesinghe

Administrative Contact: SOFIA.ALTESINI@eui.eu

Professor Tasha Fairfield

Tasha.Fairfield@eui.eu

Office: Villa Sanfelice, SF028

Office Hours: By appointment

Dr Natasja Rupesinghe

natasja.rupesinghe@eui.eu

Office: Badia Fiesolana, BF429

Office Hours: By appointment

Seminar [Brightspace Page](#)

Seminar Description and Objectives

This course introduces graduate students to core elements of qualitative research methods and practice. The goal is not to provide a comprehensive survey of qualitative methods—the terrain is vast and diverse—but rather to expose students to some commonly used approaches and techniques that they might choose to pursue further in the context of their own research or encounter in relevant literature. The first part of the course will cover conceptualization and description; crafting theory and hypotheses with an emphasis on explanation; and approaches to inference including process tracing, comparative case studies, and qualitative Bayesian analysis. The second part of the course will cover field research and ethics, participant observation, interview techniques, qualitative coding and analytical approaches that emphasize ethnographic perspectives.

The course will be highly interactive, with the goal of equipping students to critically consume and effectively conduct qualitative research, whether as part of a stand-alone project or in the context of multi-method designs—after all, nearly all research is informed to some extent by qualitative information. Seminar meetings will often include structured discussions and group exercises, drawing on published empirical research from a range of fields in the social and political sciences.

During the second part of the course, students will develop and conduct either an individual or a group project. Students can choose from a list of suggestions (to be posted on Brightspace) or

consult with the instructors on alternative ideas for their project. Where feasible, we encourage students to craft projects that will contribute in some manner to the development of their dissertation prospectus, but students may of course work on unrelated projects that capture their interest. The goal is to gain practical skills and analytical skills, but also to have fun with qualitative research.

Learning Outcomes

- Familiarity with a variety of qualitative data collection techniques and analytical methodologies;
- Skills for more effectively consuming and scrutinizing published qualitative research;
- Appreciation of the contributions qualitative information can make to social science, whether in the context of mixed-method research or purely qualitative research designs;
- Insights for fruitfully incorporating qualitative components into dissertation research;
- Foundational skills for conducting qualitative research.

Requirements

This course requires regular attendance (80% minimum), active participation in discussions and group exercises, and completion of a final project. Researchers are expected to do the readings that are listed as required ahead of each meeting and arrive prepared to talk about any specific discussion questions or assignments that are included with the required readings.

Attendance: Officially, the EUI allows you to miss two class meetings and still receive credit for the course, but we urge you to attend all sessions except in cases of illness. If you have caught a contagious illness but do not want to miss a session, ask the instructors about participating via zoom.

Research project: Projects will require work outside of class time. Depending on your topic and interests, your research may involve gathering original data through interviews, participant observation, etc. Individually authored projects should not exceed 2,500 words. The maximum length is 4,300 words for three-person collaborations, and 5,000 words for four-person collaborations. In addition to the written report, students will present preliminary findings during seminar in Week 10. This will be an opportunity to highlight challenges and receive feedback which can be incorporated into the final report. For more information on project requirements and timeline, please see the document “Introduction to Qualitative Research: Project Topics and Guidelines.”

Recommended readings: Readings that are listed as recommended (rather than required) are meant as additional resources for you to consult as you find relevant.

Auditors: All of the above requirements also apply for auditors who do not wish to receive credit, with the exception of the research project.

AI policy: No use of AI / large language models is permitted for assignments in this course.

Cell phone policy: No texting, browsing, or phone calls during class.

Schedule

Note: This schedule is tentative and subject to change based on our weekly progress.

- Session 1 (29 September) Course Introduction; Description, Explanation, and Inference
- Session 2 (6 October) Conceptualization and Measurement
- Session 3 (13 October) Explanatory Hypotheses
- Session 4 (20 October) Bayesian Inference
- Session 5 (27 October) Process Tracing and Comparative Case Studies
- Session 6 (3 November) Fieldwork
- Session 7 (10 November) Ethnography and Participant Observation
- Session 8 (17 November) Interviews
- Session 9 (24 November) Qualitative Data Coding
- Session 10 (1 December) Student Research Project Presentations

Readings

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)**; this provides the direct hyperlink to the book. If these are unavailable from the EUI library, the required chapters have been uploaded directly onto [Brightspace](#).
- Journal Articles: These are easily obtained electronically through the EUI Library.

If you encounter any problems accessing seminar readings, please contact Sofia Altesini.

Sessions and Readings

Week 1. Course Introduction; Description, Explanation, and Inference

Instructor: Tasha Fairfield

Please come prepared to briefly introduce yourself, including your field of study and dissertation/research interests, your methods background, something that interests you or puzzles you about qualitative research, and something unique or unusual about yourself.

Please also come prepared to discuss Winters (the required reading below)—focus in particular on the Types of Oligarchies section.

Required Reading

- Jeffrey Winters, 2011, *Oligarchy*, Cambridge University Press. **(E-book)**
Read pp.1-11, 20-26 (Wealth Defense), 32-38 (Types of Oligarchies).

Discussion Questions: What aspects of Winters' exposition do you find most analytically helpful or insightful? Are there aspects that you find confusing or less clear? Where would you place the United States under Trump 2.0 on Figure 1.2? Do you find the typology helpful for understanding other cases that you are familiar with?

Recommended Readings

- Ben Ross Schneider, *Hierarchical Capitalism*, CUP, Chapter 2. [\(E-book\)](#) *Note:* This is another example of excellent conceptual and theoretical work that identifies and describes a new “hierarchical” variety of capitalism in Latin America that is distinct from coordinated and liberal varieties of capitalism discussed in previous literature. See in particular the typology on p. 23 and surrounding discussion.
- David Collier, Jody LaPorte, and Jason Seawright, 2012. “Putting Typologies to Work: Concept Formation, Measurement, and Analytic Rigor,” *Political Research Quarterly*, 65(1):217–232. *Note:* Focus just on Sections 4-8.
- David Collier and Steven Levitsky, 1997, “Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research.” *World Politics* 49:430-51.
- John Gerring, 2012: “Mere Description,” *British Journal of Political Science* 42: 721-4. *Note:* Presents interesting ideas, some more compelling than others, but overall a through-provoking piece.

Week 2. Conceptualization and Measurement

Instructor: Tasha Fairfield

Required Readings

- Nina Tannenwald, 2007, *The Nuclear Taboo* (Cambridge University Press). [\(E-book\)](#) Read pp. 8-17.
Note: pp.8-9 provide context; focus in particular on pp.10-14 on taboo vs. norm, pp. 14-17 on taboo vs. tradition, and why she classifies the nuclear taboo as such rather than a norm of nuclear non-use or a tradition or nuclear non-use.
Discussion Questions: How would you articulate the difference between a *norm*, a *taboo*, and a *tradition* as per Tannenwald’s usage? How do you think these concepts relate to each other? e.g., are taboos and traditions specific types of norms? or is there some other more general concept that encompasses all three? Where does a *prohibition* fit in? Does Tannenwald use these terms consistently? What do you think of her argument in favor of a nuclear taboo rather than Sagan’s tradition of non-use?
- Tasha Fairfield, 2015, “Structural Power in Comparative Political Economy,” *Business and Politics* 17(3). Read pp. 411–419.
- Michael Coppedge and John Gerring, 2011, “Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach,” *Perspectives on Politics* 9(2):247-267.

Recommended Readings—Conceptualization

Theory:

- David Collier and Steven Levitsky, 1997, “Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research.” *World Politics* 49:430-51.

Practice:

- Sebastian Mazzuca, 2010, “Access to Power Versus Exercise of Power,” *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 45:334-357.
 - Taylor Boas and Jordan Gans-Mors, 2009, “Neoliberalism: From New Liberal Philosophy to Anti-Liberal Slogan,” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 44:137-161.
 - Rachel Aviv, July 21, 2025, “Mary Had Schizophrenia Then Suddenly She Didn’t,” *The New Yorker*. <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2025/07/28/mary-had-schizophrenia-then-suddenly-she-didnt>
- Note:* A fascinating read or listen involving concepts, theory, and explanation in psychology and neurology—with life or death stakes.

Recommended Readings—Measurement

Theory:

- Robert Adcock and David Collier, 2001, “Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research,” *American Political Science Review* 95, 3: 529-546.
- Note:* Focus on the first half of the article, up to validation.

Practice:

- Marcus Kurtz and Andrew Schrank, 2007, “Growth and Governance: Models, Measures, and Mechanisms.” *Journal of Politics* 69, 2: 538-554.
- Andrew Little and Anne Meng, 2024, “Measuring Democratic Backsliding,” and the response from Carl Henrik Knutsen et al, 2024, “Conceptual and Measurement Issues in Assessing Democratic Backsliding,” in *PS* 57(2):162-177.
- Lasse Egendal Leipziger, 2023, “Measuring Ethnic Inequality: An Assessment of Extant Cross-National Indices,” *British Journal of Political Science* 53:652–673.
- Special Issue: Structural Power and the Study of Business, *Business and Politics* 2005, 17(3).

Week 3. Explanatory Hypotheses

Instructor: Tasha Fairfield

Required Readings

- Fairfield & Charman, 2022. *Social Inquiry and Bayesian Inference*. Cambridge University Press. [\(E-book\)](#) Read Section 3.3.1 (pp.78-83) and 3.3.3.2 (pp.86-95).
- Note:* You may skip over any parts that involve Bayes rule and/or conditional probabilities, which we will take up next week.
- Nina Tannenwald, 2007. *The Nuclear Taboo*. Cambridge University Press. [\(E-book\)](#) Read the worksheet + Chap. 6 excerpt (*to be distributed*). Please complete Q1 and Q2 on the worksheet before class.
 - Alexander Gazmararian, 2025. “Sources of Partisan Change: Evidence from the Shale Gas Shock in American Coal Country,” *Journal of Politics*. Read pp. 601-606 (stop at Research

Design).

Note: We will do a group exercise in class that experiments with diagramming the author's argument. Please give this a try at home before coming to class, using arrows to represent causal relationships between the relevant variables / steps in the causal process and using whatever conventions you find sensible for a helpful visual representation of the argument.

Recommended Readings

- “Symposium, Causal Mechanisms and Process Tracing,” *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 2016, 14(1).
- “Symposium: Draw Your Argument! Causal Figures in Political Science,” *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 2024, 22(2):6-31.

Note: Among the contributions, I would recommend Goertz's piece. One caveat: at some points he suggests including “alternative explanations” in the figure, but as we will discuss in seminar, alternative explanations should have their own *separate diagrams*.

- John Gerring and Jason Seawright, 2022, “Tools and Tips for Theorizing,” in *Finding your Social Science Project: The Research Sandbox*, Cambridge University Press, pp.218-241. ([E-book](#))

Note: A similar caveat as above: rival theories should have their own *separate diagrams*.

Week 4. Bayesian Inference

Instructor: Tasha Fairfield

Required Readings

- Tasha Fairfield and Andrew Charman, 2022. “Introduction: Bayesian Reasoning for Qualitative Research,” pp. 1-23, 29-30, in *Social Inquiry and Bayesian Inference: Rethinking Qualitative Research*. Cambridge University Press. ([E-book](#))
- Fairfield and Charman. 2022. “Chapter 3: Heuristic Bayesian Reasoning,” pp.73-77, 96-111, in *Social Inquiry and Bayesian Inference*. Cambridge University Press. ([E-book](#))

Recommended Readings

- Fairfield and Charman, 2025. “Bayesian Reasoning for Qualitative Replication Analysis: Examples from Climate Politics,” *Political Science Research and Methods*.
- Fairfield and Charman, 2020. “Reliability of Inference,” pp. 201-33 in C. Elman, J. Gerring, and J. Mahoney, Eds., *The Production of Knowledge*, New York: Cambridge University Press. ([E-book](#))

Week 5. Process Tracing and Comparative Case Studies

Instructor: Tasha Fairfield

Required Readings

Read the following (Kurtz) as well as one item from Set 1 and one item from Set 2 below:

- Marcus Kurtz, 2009. “The Social Foundations of Institutional Order: Reconsidering War and the ‘Resource Curse’ in Third World State Building.” *Politics & Society* 37 (4): 479-520. *Note*: Focus in particular on pp. 490-491.

Set 1—choose one of two:

- Kenneth Schultz, 2001. “Fashoda Revisited,” in *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy*. Cambridge University Press, pp.175-195. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Dan Slater, 2009. “Revolutions, Crackdowns, and Quiescence: Communal Elites and Democratic Mobilization in Southeast Asia.” *American Journal of Sociology* 115 (1): 203-254. *Note*: Pay close attention to pp. 220-239. Be sure to read the Philippines and Vietnam cases, but you can skip the Burma case.

Set 2—choose one of two:

- Jared Finnegan, Phillip Lipsky, Jonas Meckling, Florence Metz, 2025. “The Institutional Sources of Economic Transformation: Explaining Variation in Energy Transitions,” *Journal of Politics*. Read Sections 1-4 in the main text and read the case studies in Appendix 9, pp.19-29.
- Michael Albertus, 2015. *Autocracy and Redistribution: The Politics of Land Reform*, Cambridge University Press. [\(E-book\)](#) Read pp. 16-17 (summary of the argument) in Chapter 1, pp. 267-268, (intro to Chap 8), pp. 282-287 (Egypt case) and pp. 287-292 (Hungary case) in Chapter 8.

Discussion Questions: For each of the required readings you selected from Set 1 and Set 2: Did you find the authors’ argument clear? Did they consider rival hypotheses? Can you think of salient rivals they did not consider? Do the authors provide concrete empirical evidence? Does that evidence include an adequate level of detail? Do the authors seem to implicitly think about whether the evidence would be more expected or less expected under a rival hypothesis? How strongly do you think the evidence discriminates between alternative hypotheses? If the piece includes comparative case studies, do you find one of the cases more compelling than the others, and why? How does the comparative component enhance the analysis?

Recommended Readings—Methodology

- Andrew Bennett & Jeffrey Checkel, 2015. *Process Tracing in the Social Sciences: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*, Cambridge University Press. Read pp. 23-31. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Peter Hall, 2003. “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research.” In J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge University Press, pp.373–404. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Stephen Van Evera, 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Cornell University Press. [\(E-book\)](#)
- “Book Symposium: Debating The Grammar of Time,” *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* 23(1). <https://www.qmmrpublication.com/issues>

Recommended Readings—Practice

- Elisabeth Wood, 2001, “An Insurgent Path to Democracy: Popular Mobilization, Economic Interests, and Regime Transition in South Africa and El Salvador,” *Comparative Political Studies*, 34(8):862-888.

- Marcus Kurtz, 2009, “The Social Foundations of Institutional Order: Reconsidering War and the ‘Resource Curse’ in Third World State Building,” *Politics & Society* 37 (4): 479-520.
- Tasha Fairfield and Candelaria Garay, 2017, “Redistribution Under the Right in Latin America: Electoral Competition and Organized Actors in Policymaking,” *Comparative Political Studies* 50(14):1871-1906.

Week 6. Fieldwork

Instructor: Natasja Rupesinghe

Required Readings

- Kapiszewski D, MacLean LM, Read BL. “Field research in political science: practices and principles”, pp. 1-33, in *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles*. Cambridge University Press, 2015. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Elisabeth Jean Wood. 2006. The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones. *Qualitative Sociology*. 29 (3): 307-41. (Special issue on political ethnography).
- Autesserre, Séverine. *Peaceland: Conflict resolution and the everyday politics of international intervention*. Cambridge University Press, 2014. [\(E-book\)](#) Read “Appendix: An Ethnographic Approach”, pp. 275-288. To familiarise yourself with Autesserre’s core argument, please also skim pp. 35-45 in “Studying the Everyday” and pp. 249-251 in the “Conclusion.”

Discussion Questions: In *Peaceland*, Autesserre conducted extensive fieldwork in the Democratic Republic of Congo, as well as Burundi, Cyprus, South Sudan, Israel and the Palestinian Territories and Timor-Leste. She collected five main sources of evidence, including participant observation and interviews during fieldwork. How did fieldwork enable Autesserre to develop new insights? What could be some of the drawbacks of Autesserre’s approach to immersion in the field? What are the main ethical dilemmas Autesserre would have had to mitigate?

Recommended Readings – Methodology

- Elisabeth Wood. “Field Methods.” In Charles Boix and Susan Stokes (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. 2007
- Krause, Jana. “The ethics of ethnographic methods in conflict zones.” *Journal of Peace Research* 58.3 (2021): 329-341.
- Cronin-Furman, Kate, and Milli Lake. 2018. “Ethics Abroad: Fieldwork in Fragile and Violent Contexts.” *Political Science & Politics* 51(3): 607–14.
- Knott, Eleanor. 2019. “Beyond the Field: Ethics after Fieldwork in Politically Dynamic Contexts.” *Perspectives on Politics* 17(1): 140–53.
- Procter, Caitlin and Branwen Spector, *Inclusive Ethnography: Making Fieldwork Safer, Healthier and More Ethical* (London: Sage, 2024) [\(E-book\)](#)

Recommended Readings – Practice

- Wood, Elisabeth Jean. *Insurgent Collective Action and Civil War in El Salvador*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Arjona A. *Rebelocracy: Social Order in the Colombian Civil War*. Cambridge University Press; 2016. See especially Appendix 1 “Fieldwork and Sources of Empirical Evidence”, pp. 313-329. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Lucht, Hans. *Darkness before Daybreak: African Migrants Living on the Margins in Southern Italy Today*. 1st ed. University of California Press, 2012. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Cabot, Heath. *On the Doorstep of Europe: Asylum and Citizenship in Greece*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014.

Week 7. Ethnography and Participant Observation

Instructor: Natasja Rupesinghe

Required Readings

- Schatz, Edward. 2009. “Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics.” In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. University of Chicago Press. [\(E-book\)](#)
- DeWalt, Kathleen M., and Billie R. DeWalt. 2011. *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Rowman Altamira. (chapter 2, 5)
- Jerolmack, Colin, and Shamus Khan. 2014. ‘Talk Is Cheap Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy’. *Sociological Methods & Research* 43 (2): 178–209.
- Pachirat, Timothy. 2009. ‘The Political in Political Ethnography: Dispatches from the Kill Floor’. In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, 143–64. University of Chicago Press. [\(E-book\)](#) [If you wish to consult Timothy Pachirat’s book, see Timothy Pachirat. 2011. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. See also an interview with Timothy Pachirat: <https://medium.com/learning-for-life/working-undercover-in-a-slaughterhouse-an-interview-with-timothy-pachirat-c6d7f37eef9c>]

Discussion questions: What aspects of Pachirat’s ethnography do you find most compelling and why? What are the limitations of this immersive approach? What does proximity add to his description and analysis of the slaughterhouse? Would you be equally convinced if he had relied only on interviews?

Recommended Readings – Methodology

- Geertz, Clifford, “*Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture*,” in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (NY: Basic Books, 1973) – Chapter 1. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Wedeen, Lisa. “Reflections on ethnographic work in political science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13, no. 1 (2010): 255-272.
- Simmons, Erica S and Nicholas Rush Smith. 2019. “The Case for Comparative Ethnography.” *Comparative Politics* 51(3): 341-359.

- Emerson, R.M., R.I. Fretz, and L.L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes, Second Edition*. Chicago Guides to Writing, Editing, and Publishing. University of Chicago Press. (Chapters 1-3)
- Sluka, Jeffrey A. "Participant Observation in Violent Social Contexts." *Human Organization* 49, no. 2 (1990): 114–26.

Recommended Readings – Practice

- Cramer, Katherine J. 2012. 'Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective'. *American Political Science Review* 106 (3): 517–32. [note: You may also wish to consult the larger project, Cramer, Katherine J. 2016. *The Politics of Resentment: Rural Consciousness in Wisconsin and the Rise of Scott Walker*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Chapter 1 is freely available through the University of Chicago Press [here](#)]
- Borges Martins da Silva M. Weapons of Clients: Why Do Voters Support Bad Patrons? Ethnographic Evidence from Rural Brazil. *Latin American Politics and Society*. 2023;65(1):22-46. doi:10.1017/lap.2022.49
- Parkinson, Sarah Elizabeth. 2013. "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War." *American Political Science Review* 107(3): 418-432.
- Khan, Shamus, and Colin Jerolmack. "Saying Meritocracy and Doing Privilege." *The Sociological Quarterly* 54, no. 1 (2013): 9–19. [note: you may also want to consult the broader project Khan, Shamus Rahman. *Privilege: The Making of an Adolescent Elite at St. Paul's School*. NED-New edition. Princeton University Press, 2021, especially "Methodological and Theoretical Reflections", pp. 201-207. ([E-book](#))
- James Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (Yale U, 1985) ([E-book](#))

Week 8. Interviews

Instructor: Natasja Rupesinghe

Required Readings

- Lee Ann Fujii (2018) *Interviewing in social science research: a relational approach* (Routledge) – Chapter 1 (skim Chapters 3, 4) ([E-book](#))
- Mosley, Layna, Editor, *Interview Research in Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013) – Introduction ([E-book](#))
- Kapiszewski D, MacLean LM, Read BL. "Interviews, Oral Histories, and Focus Groups," pp. 190-229, in *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles*. Cambridge University Press, 2015. ([E-book](#))
- Fujii, Lee Ann. *Killing Neighbors: Webs of Violence in Rwanda*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009, Chapter 1 "Conducting Fieldwork in the Aftermath of War and Genocide", and Chapter 5 "The Power of Local Ties," especially focus on pp. 128 – 131 and 139-147. [note: this is also an excellent example of how to present interview data] ([E-book](#))

Discussion questions: Lee Ann Fujii conducted the bulk of her research with perpetrators of genocide in prisons. What do you find compelling and less compelling about this research

methodology? How does Lee Ann Fujii establish access with her interlocutors? What are the strengths and drawbacks of her approach in accessing participants? How could the research setting influence what people told her? What are the potential limitations in Fujii's reliance on interviews as her main source of evidence? (describe at least three)

Recommended Readings – Methodology

- Fujii, Lee Ann, "Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence," *Journal of Peace Research* 47/2 (2010): 231–241. [note: this article is developed from Chapter 1 of Fujii's book, but takes the theoretical argument further by elaborating the concept of "meta-data" in interviews]
- Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (1995). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. Chapters 4 and 5. ([E-book](#))
- William S. Harvey (2011) "Strategies for Conducting Elite Interviews." *Qualitative Research*. 11 (4): 431–441.
- Pearlman, Wendy, 'Interviewing Vulnerable Populations', in Jennifer Cyr, and Sara Wallace Goodman (eds), *Doing Good Qualitative Research* (New York, 2024; online edn, Oxford Academic, 30 Apr. 2024) ([E-book](#))
- Small, M. L., & Cook, J. M. (2021). Using Interviews to Understand Why: Challenges and Strategies in the Study of Motivated Action. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 52(4), 1591-1631.
- Tavory, I. (2020). Interviews and Inference: Making Sense of Interview Data in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Sociology* 43 (4):449–65.

Recommended Readings – Practice

- Viterna, Jocelyn, *Women in War: The Micro-processes of Mobilization in El Salvador*, Oxford Studies in Culture and Politics (New York, 2013; online edn, Oxford Academic, 23 Jan. 2014), especially "Appendix B: Data and Methods" pp. 233-246. ([E-book](#))
- Pearlman, Wendy. *The Home I Worked to Make: Voices from the New Syrian Diaspora*, Liveright Publishing Corporation, 2024. ([E-book](#))

Week 9. Qualitative Data Coding

Instructor: Natasja Rupesinghe

For this session, we will also cover the basics of organising and coding data in NVIVO. Please ensure to download the free trial of NVIVO beforehand

Required Readings

- Emerson, Robert M., Fretz, Rachel I., and Shaw, Linda L. 2011. Chapter 6. Processing Fieldnotes: Coding and Memoing. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*, 171-199. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Robert Weiss, 1995. Chapter 6. Analyzing Data. *Learning from Strangers*, 151-182. Note: this text is particularly useful for analyzing interview data. ([E-book](#))

- Matthew B. Miles, A. Michael Huberman, and Johnny Saldana. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook. Third Edition*. Sage Publications Ltd (CA). Sage Publications. Chapter 4 “The Fundamentals of Qualitative Data Analysis”

Recommended Readings—Methodology

- Lee Ann, Fujii. “I Have My Data—Now What?” *Interviewing in Social Science Research*. 1st ed. United Kingdom: Routledge, 2018. 73–89. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Rubin, Herbert J., and Irene S. Rubin. Chapter 10, “The First Phase of Analysis: Preparing Transcripts and Coding Data,” pp. 201-223 and Chapter 11, “Analyzing Coded Data,” pp. 224-245 In *Qualitative Interviewing (2nd ed.): The Art of Hearing Data*, 2nd, 201-23. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2005. [\(E-book\)](#)
- Herrera, Y. and B.F. Braumoeller. 2004. “Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis,” *Qualitative Methods*, Spring 2004

Week 10. Student Research Project Presentations