

Political Science 816
Empirical Methods of Political Inquiry: Qualitative

Professor: Joe Soss
Office: North Hall, Room 407
Office Hours: Mon 3:30-4:30pm,
Tues 9:30-10:30 am, and by appointment
Email: jbsoss@wisc.edu
Phone: 3-2035 (campus), 608/233-9404 (home)

PS 816
Fall 2005

Monday
1:20-3:15pm
422 North Hall

Overview

This seminar explores a variety of research strategies available to students of politics, focusing on those that make use of empirical evidence but do not require quantification of data. The seminar is designed as a survey course. It exposes students to a wide range of methodologies but does not provide intensive training in any single approach. My hope is that participants (myself included) will leave the seminar with an expanded sense of the research strategies available to them, a deeper understanding of how to design and carry out qualitative research, a stronger grasp of the logics and priorities that distinguish alternative methodologies, and a sharpened capacity to read and evaluate the diverse scholarship produced in our discipline.

The readings and assignments for this course emphasize three goals. First, students should leave the course with a working knowledge of alternative strategies for qualitative research design, data collection, and data analysis. By comparing these approaches to one another, as well as to relevant quantitative methodologies, we will try to clarify the specific possibilities and problems that each may hold for particular types of projects. Second, this seminar offers an opportunity to discuss general issues related to the meaning, logic, and conduct of social science inquiry. Throughout the course, we will look beyond technical questions of method to underlying questions of methodology – questions related to epistemology, ontology, rhetoric, standpoint, interpretation, ethics, politics, concept and theory development, validity, inference, and so on. My own view is that these topics should concern researchers regardless of their choices among methods. Third, this course includes a significant “how to” component. No seminar discussion or practice exercise can fully prepare dissertators for their research experiences – or relieve them of their anxieties over what to do first (or next). But to put the matter bluntly, technique matters. I hope graduates of this class will enter their dissertations not only able to understand the logic of their chosen methodology, but also able to pursue the concrete steps needed to execute their methodology well. Toward this end, we will devote considerable time to the mundane but pivotal activities that researchers pursue as they put their research plans into practice.

Class Meetings

The course will be structured as a seminar. We will begin each session with open-ended discussion. Afterward, I will present some lecture material and pose some targeted questions for further discussion. For this format to work, you will need to read with a critical eye and think about how the readings relate to your substantive interests. Also, I invite you to think broadly about suitable topics for discussion. At root, this course is about the things social scientists do with their professional lives. Any issue related to this topic strikes me as fair game, and I hope we’ll spend some time addressing questions of professional development, ethics, grant seeking, public presentation, and so on. Finally, I want to stress the need for *respectful but critical* engagement with one another during seminar discussion. Each of us knows a different substantive area of research, and each of us is at a different point in our efforts to understand methodology. There is nothing wrong with asking simple questions or saying, “I don’t get it.” And it is

important for people to feel that they can take some risks in their seminar comments without risking personal humiliation in front of their classmates. Please do what you can to respond to one another in a constructive way that encourages future participation. On the other hand, please bear in mind that graduate seminars are places where you are *expected* to question one another's ideas, state reasons for agreement or disagreement, and help one another learn. Some of my nicest colleagues are my toughest critics, and I am grateful for the kindness and respect they show as they challenge me, disagree with me, and teach me new tricks. Please be kind, but please don't hesitate to disagree with one another.

Response Postings

During weeks 3 through 11, students in this course will write three brief response papers on assigned readings. You will be assigned to one of three groups, marked A, B, and C on the syllabus. For each of the relevant class meetings, students from one group will be responsible for writing essays and posting them to the class email list. When it is your group's turn, you will need to post your essay to the list **no later than 6pm the day before class**. (Group assignments will be handed out in class. The relevant response group is indicated on the heading for each class meeting. You are responsible for keeping up with the dates on which your response essays are due.) Your postings will count toward seminar participation. Response postings should be approximately one page, single-spaced, and should offer critical engagement with the readings. I especially encourage postings that draw methodological readings into dialogue with substantive examples from the weekly reading or from your own subfield of study. The address for the class email list is polisci816-1-f05@lists.wisc.edu.

A few final notes on posting. First, please paste your essay into your email message rather than sending it as an attachment. Second, please bear in mind that the email list is a public academic forum. When posting messages, you should follow the same writing standards that you would expect to encounter in other academic settings. Third, I invite students to respond to postings and/or initiate other course-relevant conversations on the list. If we want, the listserv can function as a site for ongoing discussion between seminars. Finally, if you'd like to get feedback on your posting or discuss the issues you've raised, just drop by during office hours. I'm always happy to have one-on-one conversations.

Written Work

Students in this seminar are responsible for two major writing assignments.

The Midterm: The midterm will be a take-home essay exam. I will distribute it in class on Monday, October 24, and it will be due on Wednesday, November 2, at 4pm. One part of the exam will require you to work with a research question you develop in your own field. A second part will require you to evaluate a piece of empirical research that employs a research design covered in the first eight weeks of the course and that bases its primary conclusions on non-quantitative evidence. I recommend that you think about your research question and look around for a suitable article or book *prior* to the midterm, and I will be happy to assist you in any way I can. (Also, please note that your research question for the midterm must differ from the one we discuss for your "make your own project" project. See below.) The exam will be graded according to fairly conventional criteria, including the quality of the student's arguments, ideas, writing, and comprehension of course material. But I want to underscore that this is a course exam. You should explicitly engage relevant readings, provide appropriate citations, explain how your approach draws on particular course materials, and clearly state your agreements and disagreements with the authors. Unless prior arrangements have been made, late papers will be penalized one grade level immediately, and then again for each 48 hours after the due date. For example, an "A" paper will be lowered to an "A/B" if turned in after 4:00pm on Wednesday, and then to a "B" after 4:00pm on Friday.

The "Make Your Own Project" Project: This assignment will require steady work throughout the semester. It is due on Thursday, December 8, at 4pm. You may choose one of two options.

The Research Design. Propose a thorough design for a do-able, dissertation-size research project on an important question in your field. Over the course of the semester, you should plan to have at least two one-on-one meetings with me. An early one to discuss your preliminary research question and explain its analytic and political significance, and a second one at mid-semester to discuss your review of relevant literature and your plans for a research design. Your full proposal (15 pages) should include a clear statement of your research question and its significance, a tightly focused review of relevant literature, a detailed description of your research strategy, a discussion of feasibility and ethics, and estimates of the project’s timetable and funding needs. A detailed set of instructions for this assignment will be handed out in class.

The Practicum: For a research question of your own choosing, collect and analyze four relevant “qualitative” observations. Your observations must include *at least* two different types of data, and at least one of your observations must be based on an in-depth interview or focus group. *Prior* to any observations, you should plan to have a one-on-one meeting with me to discuss your preliminary research question. For this meeting, you should bring a printed copy of your question, a plan for your four observations, and a preliminary draft of a consent letter soliciting participation. At mid-semester, we should meet again to go over your draft protocol for an interview or focus group. You should give me a copy of your protocol a few days in advance of our meeting so that I can prepare comments. The final report on your practicum should include (a) a statement of your research question and its significance, (b) a substantive analysis of what you’ve found, (c) a comparative evaluation of your methods, and (d) a critical evaluation of your efforts to employ them. In an appendix, you should provide your consent letter, your interview or focus-group protocol, and any transcripts, fieldnotes, or document summary sheets used in your analysis.

Grades

Response Papers	Counted toward participation
Project Meetings	Counted toward participation
Seminar Participation	10%
Midterm Exam	40%
“Make Your Own Project” Project	50%

Readings

This course has a heavy reading load, so it’s important that you read in a purposive manner. All packet readings are available in the Joel Dean Reading Room; many can be obtained from the UW Library’s electronic databases. The following required books are available for purchase at Underground Textbooks.

- Howard S. Becker. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. ISBN 0226041085
- Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. ISBN 074251126X
- Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. ISBN 0262572222
- James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. 2003. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0521016452
- Anne Norton. 2004. *95 Theses on Politics, Culture, and Method*. New Haven: Yale University Press. ISBN 0300100116
- Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin. 2005. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. ISBN 0803950969

I. Commonality and Difference in Social Science

Week 1, Sept. 12

Social Science, Qualitative Research, and Statistical Templates

What Is “Social Science”? How Does One Make a “Scholarly Contribution”?

Stephen Jay Gould. 1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton. Pp.19-29.

Theodore J. Lowi. 2004. “Response to APSA Task Force on Mentoring.” *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 37(2): 325-6; Elizabeth Sanders, “The Contributions of Theodore Lowi to Political Analysis and Democratic Theory,” and Helen Ingram, “How Book Reviewers Can Recognize a Classic When They See One.” 1990. *PS: Political Science & Politics*.23(4): 574-9.

What Makes Qualitative Research “Scientific”: Views from the Top

National Science Foundation. 2004. *Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. Pp.9-19.

Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Pp. 3-49.

The Diversity of Positivist Perspectives on Qualitative Research

Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. pp.3-20 (Brady, Collier, and Seawright), pp.69-74 (Bartels), and pp.139-67 (McKeown).

Jack A. Goldstone. 2003. “Comparative Historical Analysis and Knowledge Accumulation in the Study of Revolutions.” In J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. pp.41-90.

Week 2, Sept. 19

Interpretive and Critical Approaches

Interpretive Research

Clifford Geertz. 1973. “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture.” *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books. Pp.3-32.

Howard S. Becker. Forthcoming. “The Epistemology of Qualitative Research.” In R. Jessor, A. Colby, and R. Schweder, eds. *Essays on Ethnography and Human Development*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. 14 pages.

Dvora Yanow. 2000. *Conducting Interpretive Policy Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. pp.1-26.

Critical Research

Dennis K. Mumby. 2004. “Discourse, Power, and Ideology: Unpacking the Critical Approach.” In D. Grant et al., eds. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Pp.237-58.

Frances Fox Piven. Forthcoming. “From Public Sociology to Politicized Sociologists.”

Examples: Read Piven & Cloward plus Barnett OR Wedeen

Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People’s Movements*. New York, NY: Vintage. Pp.xix-xxiv, 1-40.

Michael Barnett. 2002. *Eyewitness to a Genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. pp.1-21.

Lisa Wedeen. 1998. “Acting ‘As If’: Symbolic Politics and Social Control in Syria.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 40(3): 503-23

II. Research Designs as Analytic Frameworks

Week 3, Sept. 26: Group A

Cases as a Basis for Concept, Model, and Theory Development

- David A. Snow. 2004. "Thoughts on Alternative Pathways to Theoretical Development: Theory Generation, Extension, and Refinement." *Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. Pp.133-36.
- Dietrich Reuschmeyer. 2003. "Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains?" In J. Mahoney and D. Reuschmeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp.305-36.
- Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp.3-36, 67-88, 109-24.

Examples: Read Two, Skim One

- Herbert Kaufman. 1960. *The Forest Ranger: A Study in Administrative Behavior*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. read pp.3-22, skim pp.161-200.
- Graham T. Allison. 1969. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis." *American Political Science Review*. 63(3): 689-718.
- Cathy J. Cohen. 1999. *The Boundaries of Blackness: AIDS and the Breakdown of Black Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp.1-32, 339-47.

Week 4, Oct. 3: Group B

Cases as a Basis for Analyzing Causal Mechanisms and Constitutive Relations

Causal Processes and Mechanisms

- Peter A. Hall. 2003. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research" In J. Mahoney and D. Reuschmeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp.373-404.
- Ann Chih Lin. 1998. "Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches to Qualitative Methods." *Policy Studies Journal* 26(1): 162-80.

Constitutive and Relational Analyses

- Alexander Wendt. 1998. "On Constitution and Causation in International Relations." *Review of International Studies*. 24(5): 101-18.
- Mustafa Emirbayer. 1997. "Manifesto for a Relational Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology*. 103(2): 281-317.

Examples

- Joe Soss. 1999. "Lessons of Welfare: Policy Design, Political Learning, and Political Action." *American Political Science Review*. 93(2): 363-80.
- Joan Emerson. 1975. "Behavior in Private Places: Sustaining Definitions of Reality in Gynecological Examinations." In D. Brissett and C. Edgley, eds. *Life as Theater*. Chicago, IL: Aldine. Pp.329-43.

Week 5, Oct. 10: Group C

Historical Analysis: Timing & Sequence, Process & Narrative, Critique & Praxis

Timing, Sequence, and Causal Inference

- Paul Pierson. 2004. "Timing and Sequence." *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. pp.54-78.
- Theda Skocpol et al. 1995. "State Formation and Social Policy in the United States." *Social Policy in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp.11-36.

Narrative and Process Tracing

- Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp.205-32.

Jared Diamond. 1999. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton. Pp.67-92, 354-75.

Histories of the Present: Critique and Praxis

Victoria Hattam. 2000. "History, Agency, and Political Change." *Polity*. 32(3): 333-38.

Nancy Fraser and Linda Gordon. 1994. "A Genealogy of *Dependency*: Tracing a Keyword of the U.S. Welfare State." *Signs*. 19: 309-36.

Week 6, Oct. 17: Group A

Comparing Cases I: Variables, Correlations, and Logics of Control

Adam Przeworski. 2005. "Institutions Matter?" *Government and Opposition*. 40(4): 527-40.

Donatella della Porta. 2002. "Comparative Politics and Social Movements." In B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg, eds. *Methods of Social Movement Research*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. pp.286-313.

Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp.151-79.

Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Read pp.85-102 (Collier, Mahoney, and Seawright) ***refer back to pp.21-50 as needed.

Examples: Read Two, Skim One

Ashutosh Varshney. 1997. "Postmodernism, Civic Engagement, and Ethnic Conflict: A Passage to India." *Comparative Politics*.30(1): 1-20.

David D. Laitin. 1999. "National Revivals and Violence." In J. Bowen and R. Peterson, eds. *Critical Comparisons in Politics and Culture*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 21-60.

Kevin Narizny. 2003. "Both Guns and Butter, or Neither: Class Interests in the Political Economy of Rearmament," *American Political Science Review*. 97(2): 203-220.

Week 7, Oct. 24: Group B

Comparing Cases II: Configurations, Typologies, and Logics of Conjunction

Charles Ragin. 2004. "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research." In H.E. Brady and D. Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. Pp.123-38.

James Mahoney. 2004. "Comparative Historical Methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 30: pp.81-101 *****Read pages 81-88 only.**

Charles Ragin. 2000. "Causal Complexity." *Fuzzy Set Social Science*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp.88-119.

Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp.233-62.

Examples

David J. Harding, Cybelle Fox, and Jal D. Mehta. 2002. "Studying Rare Events through Qualitative Case Studies: Lessons From a Study of Rampage School Shootings." *Sociological Methods & Research*. 31(2): 174-217.

Alexander Hicks, Joya Misra, and Tang Nah Ng. 1995. "The Programmatic Emergence of the Social Security State." *American Sociological Review*. 60(3): 329-49.

Week 8, Oct. 31: Group C

Comparing Cases III: Time, Space, and Narrative in Comparative Historical Analysis

Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers. 1994[1980]. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry." *Social Revolutions in the Modern World*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp.72-95.

- George M. Fredrickson. 1997. *The Comparative Imagination: On the History of Racism, Nationalism, and Social Movements*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. pp.1-19.
- James Mahoney. 2003. "Strategies of Causal Assessment in Comparative Historical Analysis." In J. Mahoney and D. Reuschmeyer, eds. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. pp337-72.
- Alternative Approaches to Comparing Historical Narratives
- Margaret R. Somers and Fred Block. 2005. "From Poverty to Perversity: Ideas, Markets, and Institutions over 200 Years of Welfare Debate." *American Sociological Review*. 70(2): 260-87.
- Clifford Geertz. 1968. *Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Pp.1-22.
- Jacob Hacker. 1998. "The Historical Logic of National Health Insurance: Structure and Sequence in the Development of British, Canadian, and U.S. Medical Policy," *Studies in American Political Development*. 12(1): 57-130.

III. Varieties of Qualitative Evidence, Processes of Acquiring Them

Week 9, Nov. 7: Group A

Entering the Field: Purposes, Identities, Experiences, and Ethics

- Ann Chih Lin. 2000. *Reform in the Making: The Implementation of Social Policy in Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. pp.175-194.
- David D. Laitin. 1986. "Appendix: Research Methodology." *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp.185-205.
- Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin. 1994. "Grounded Theory: Methodology." In Denzin and Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications. Pp.273-85.
- Research Ethics (and Politics)
- Jim Thomas et al. 1996. Symposium on Ethics and Research in Cyberspace (selected articles). *The Information Society*.12: 107-17 (Thomas); 119-27 (King); 129-39 (Waskul and Douglass); 175-87 (Allen).
- Bruce Wallace. 2005. "Participatory Action Research Can Be Complicated." *Perspectives*. 27(3): 16-17.
- Kathleen M. Blee. 2002. *Inside Organized Racism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. pp.12-21.
- Complete the University's online Human Subjects Training Module (requires approx. 1 hour)
<http://info.gradsch.wisc.edu/research/compliance/humansubjects/tutorial/>

Week 10, Nov. 14: Group B

Being There: Participant Observation

- Danny L. Jorgensen. 1989. *Participant Observation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. pp.12-25, 53-68.
- Lorraine Bayard de Volvo and Edward Schatz. 2004. "From the Inside Out: Ethnographic Methods in Political Research." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 37(2): 267-271.
- Paul Lichterman. 2002. "Seeing Structure Happen: Theory-Driven Participant Observation." In B. Klandermans and S. Staggenborg, eds. *Methods of Social Movement Research*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press. pp.118-45.

Examples: Read Two, Skim One

- Janet Gilboy. 1992. "Penetrability of Administrative Systems: Political 'Casework' and Immigration Inspections." *Law & Society Review*. 26: 273-314.
- Katherine Cramer Walsh. 2004. *Talking about Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. pp.82-146.
- Michael N. Barnett. 1997. "The UN Security Council, Indifference, and Genocide in Rwanda." *Cultural Anthropology*. 12(4): 551-78.

Week 11, Nov. 21: Group C

Say What? Interviews & Focus Groups

In-Depth Interviews.

Joe Soss. Forthcoming. "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered Approach to In-Depth Interviews for Interpretive Research." In D. Yanow and P. Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin. 2005. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Pp.64-107, 129-72.

Focus Groups

David Morgan. 1997. *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. 2nd ed. Newbury Park: Sage Publications. pp.7-30.

Richard A. Kreuger. 1994. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. pp.53-73, 100-25.

Examples: **Read Two, Skim One**

Pamela Johnston Conover, Ivor Crewe, Donald Searing. 1991. "The Nature of Citizenship in the United States and Great Britain: Empirical Comments on Theoretical Themes." *Journal of Politics*. 53(3): 800-832.

Robert E. Lane. 1962. *Political Ideology: Why the American Common Man Believes What He Does*. New York, NY: The Free Press. pp.57-81.

Mary Hawkesworth. 2003. "Congressional Enactments of Race-Gender: Toward a Theory of Raced-Gendered Institutions." *American Political Science Review*. 97(4): 529-550.

Week 12, Nov. 28

Reading Residues: Documents and Other Social Artifacts

Leo Szilard. 1948/1961. "Report on 'Grand Central Terminal'." *The Voices of Dolphins and Other Stories*. New York: Simon & Schuster. pp.115-22.

Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp.89-108.

Cameron G. Thies. 2002. "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives*. 3: 351-72.

Examples

R. Charli Carpenter. 2003. "'Women and Children First': Gender, Norms, and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991-95." *International Organization* 57: 661-694.

Barry Schwartz. 1987. *George Washington: The Making of an American Symbol*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. pp.1-39 and illustrations.

James Scott. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*. New Have, CT: Yale University Press. Pp.136-82.

IV. Data Analysis, Writing, and the Big Picture

Week 13, Dec. 5

Data Analysis

Analyzing Patterns, Categories, and Meanings

Matthew Miles and Michael Huberman. 1994. "Making Good Sense: Drawing and Verifying Conclusions." *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. pp245-87.

Herbert J. Rubin and Irene S. Rubin. 2005. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Pp.201-45.

Analyzing Narratives: Rhetorical and Causal Approaches

Martha S. Feldman and Kaj Skoldberg and Ruth Nicole Brown and Debra Horner. 2004. "Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14(2): 147-172.

Larry J. Griffin. 1993. "Narrative, Event-Structure Analysis, and Causal Interpretation in Historical Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology*. 98(5): 1094-1133.

Analyzing Discourses

Cynthia Hardy. 2001. "Researching Organizational Discourse." *International Studies of Management & Organization*. 31(3): 25-47.

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

Week 14, Dec. 12

Analysis More Broadly Conceived: What are You Really Trying to Do with Your Research?

C. Wright Mills. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp.3-75.

Anne Norton. 2004. *95 Theses on Politics, Culture, and Method*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Week 15, TBA

Writing and Doing Social Science in the Dissertation and Beyond

C. Wright Mills. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press. Pp.195-226

Howard S. Becker. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book, or Article*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Entire.