

CPO 6096
Fall 2022
Room: 216 Anderson
Time: F 8:30-11:30

Michael Bernhard
Office: 202A Anderson
Office Hours: F 1:00-2:30
bernhard at UFL dot edu

Seminar: Comparative Qualitative and Mixed Methods

AUDIENCE: Open to all graduate students. No prerequisites.

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This course has been designed to help students refine their research design skills and to think about how combining more than one form of inference can lead to greater confidence in one's research findings. Class time will be devoted to discussing causal and probabilistic forms of inference, concept formation and measurement, small-n comparison, the use of in-depth case studies, nested analysis using large and small-n components, and a range of alternative methods which lend themselves to combined strategies of investigation (QCA, ethnography).

WHY SHOULD YOU TAKE THIS COURSE? Within the discipline, qualitative and mixed methods are important tools of research. Within the American Political Science Association, the launching of a Qualitative and Mixed Methods section has been seen as an important step in integrating quantitative and qualitative modes of investigation. Many political scientists are committed to this ecumenical view of methods and for this reason the section is one of the largest in the association. With the increased prominence of normal science models and the regression model to provide inference in the social sciences, qualitative methods have experienced a revival as well. The nature of this is two-fold. First, there are recognized limitations to what quantitative social science using the regression model can study. Many interesting and worthwhile questions demand the use of alternative strategies of research or the combination of more than one method. Second, the expansion of large-n studies using the regression model in the last twenty years has made the issue of how to generate legitimate inference and the explicit study of method a central concern of the discipline. This trend has led to a renaissance of explicit methodological thinking on the part of qualitative social scientists. Many qualitative social scientists have begun to consider how their styles of work generate valid inferences about the social world, and how their logic of inference departs from that of other modes of inquiry. The centrality of these questions across many schools of social science has been fruitful in thinking about how multiple forms of inquiry complement each other and allow us to make stronger logical inferences about the social world.

REQUIREMENTS: There is substantial reading each week (several articles or a book, or some combination thereof). Careful reading and preparation for active and cogent participation in class discussions is essential. Students will prepare a research design paper.

Research paper: I am looking for three types of research design papers in this course. You should consider these as strictures unless you discuss an alternative way of meeting the paper requirement with me. The first kind of paper that I would like to see would be explicitly methodological. That is, it would address one of the methodological controversies that are raised in the literature. The second kind of paper I would like to see would consciously use one of the research methods discussed in the course

and apply it to a research question (e.g. case study, QCA, process tracing, ethnographic, small-n comparison, nested regression, etc.). Such a paper would need to be methodologically explicit in the framing of its design and execute the test/validation of a hypotheses/proposition using the method selected. The third kind of paper that is appropriate to this course is the execution of a research design for a larger project. Here I would expect the framing of a very defined research question, and falsifiable hypotheses/propositions about it that grow out of a survey of the relevant theoretical literature. I would also expect a detailed discussion of the kind of inferential strategy or strategies that would be used to provide verification of your hypothesis/proposition, and a discussion of the data or sources that would be used. Students should take this as an invitation to do a trial run of dissertation or funding proposals they will be floating in the near future.

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION: Course requirements will be weighted in the following manner. Paper - 60%, research meetings -- 5% (10% total), research presentation -- 5% (failure to make the first draft submission deadline – minus 2%), participation -- 15%, discussant assignments 10%.

<u>Grading Scale</u>	(Grade Point Equivalent)
A = 93 or above	4.00
A- = 90-92	3.67
B+ = 87-89	3.33
B = 83-86	3.00
B- = 80-82	2.67
C+ = 77-79	2.33
C = 73-76	2.00
C- = 70-72	1.67
D+ = 67-69	1.33
D = 63-66	1.00
D- = 60-62	0.67
E = 59 or below	0.00

POLICY ON PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES: Students requesting classroom accommodation must first register with the Dean of Students Office. It will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the instructor when requesting accommodation. Anyone with a disability should feel free to see me during office hours to make the necessary arrangements.

POLICY ON CHEATING AND PLAGIARISM: All students should observe the University of Florida's standards of academic honesty. In the event that a student is found cheating or plagiarizing, he/she will automatically fail the course and will be reported to Student Judicial Affairs and to the Department Chair and Graduate Coordinator for possible dismissal from the program. Acts of Plagiarism include:

- Turning in a paper or another assignment that was written by someone else (i.e., by another student, by a research service, or downloaded off the Internet);
- Copying, verbatim, a sentence or paragraph of text from the work of another author without properly acknowledging the source through a commonly accepted citation style and using quotation marks;

- Paraphrasing (i.e., restating in your own words) text written by someone else without citing that author;
- Using a unique idea or concept, which you discovered in a specific reading, without citing that work.

POLICY ON LATE ASSIGNMENTS: Vagaries of life and scheduling sometimes make the handing in of assignments on time difficult. If students approach the instructor ahead of time and provide a good reason, accommodations may be possible. Such requests should be made prior to the deadline on the assignment. Retroactive accommodation will only be granted in the rarest and direst of cases.

BOOKS AVAILABLE FOR PURCHASE

Required (you will read most of these):

Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton, Princeton University Press: 41-86.

Recommended (you will read less of these, but they are good books that are worth having in your personal library):

Schatz, Ed. 2009. *Political Ethnography*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Kapiszewski, Diana et al. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

COURSE OUTLINE

August 25: Course Overview

September 2: Logics of Inference

Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, University of California Press: 1-84.

Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton, Princeton University Press: 41-86.

Hall, Peter A. 2003. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics." In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschmeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press: 373-406.

September 9: Concepts and Measurement

Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *APSR* 64(4): 1033-1053. (read mainly 1033-1046).

Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton, Princeton University Press: 127-176.

Coppedge, Michael. 2012. *Democratization and Research Methods*. New York, Cambridge University Press: 1-48.

September 16: Consultations on paper.

Individual Meetings to discuss research topics.

September 23: Millian Methods.

Mill, John Stuart. *A System and Logic, Ratiocinative, and Inductive*. Chapter VII. Of the Four Methods of Experimental Inquiry: 418-441. (pdf version. <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/26495>)

Collier, David. 1993. "The Comparative Method." In Finifter, Ada, ed. *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*. Washington, DC., American Political Science Association: 105-119.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1991. "Comparing and Miscomparing." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 3(3): 243-257.

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MIT Press: 57-63. Chapter 3 -- "The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison."

James Mahoney. 1999. "Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis," *American Journal of Sociology* 104(4): 1154-96.

September 30: Case Selection Design.

Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York, Wiley-Interscience: 31-46, Chapter 2: Research Designs.

Geddes, Barbara. 2003. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get." *Paradigms and Sandcastles*. University of Michigan Press: 89-130.

Collier, David and James Mahoney. 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research". *World Politics* 49(1): 56-91.

October 7: Homecoming

No Class. Nice opportunity to get a jump on your research design.

October 14: Process Tracing

Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney. 2012. *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*. Princeton, Princeton University Press: 87-126.

Büthe, Tim. 2002, "Taking Temporality Seriously: Modeling History and the Use of Narratives as Evidence." *American Political Science Review* 96 (3): 481-493.

Collier, David. 2011. "Understanding Process Tracing." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 44 (4): 823-830.

Zaks, Sherry. 2017. "Relationships Among Rivals (RAR): A Framework for Analyzing Contending Hypotheses in Process Tracing." *Political Analysis* 25(3): 344-362.

October 21: Nested Analysis, Mixing Casework and Statistical Analyses

Tarrow, Sidney. 2019. "Comparison, Triangulation, and Embedding Research in History: A Methodological Self-Analysis," *Bulletin of Sociological Methodology/Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique* 141(1):7-29.

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

Laitin, David and James Fearon. 2008. "Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods." *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 756-776.

Rohlfing Ingo. 2007. "What You See and What You Get: Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research," *Comparative Political Studies* 41: 1492-1514.

October 28: Ethnography and Field Research

Schatz, Edward. 2009. *Political Ethnography. What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. USA: University of Chicago Press: 25-94, 165-182.

Kapiszewski, Diana et al. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press: Chapters 2, 3 and 10.

November 4: Causal Complexity and QCA

Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, University of California Press: 85-163.

Goertz, Gary (2006). "Assessing the Trivialness, Relevance, and Relative Importance of Necessary or Sufficient Conditions in Social Science," *Studies in Comparative International Development* 41(2): 88-109.

November 11: No Class

Research Time, opportunity for consultation.

November 18: Research Presentations

November 25: Thanksgiving

December 2: Research Presentations