Institute for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research – June 14-25, 2021
Schedule and Reading List  June 12, 2021

There are two types of institute sessions: (1) Elective modules and; (2) research design discussion groups.

On each of the ten days of the institute participants will select one out of four modules.

All synchronous sessions will take place between 11am and 4pm EDT. Instructors will schedule their sessions, and breaks between them, inside that 5 hour window.

The research design discussion groups will be held for 1 and ½ hours on most mornings and late afternoons of the institute (i.e. before 11am of after 4pm.) A separate schedule will be available.

Choosing Which Modules to Take

Most of the modules are arranged as multi-day sequences indicated by roman numerals (e.g. I, II, III). While several of the 40 modules can be taken as stand-alone units, there are some limitations on selections.

Modules with higher numbered suffixes (e.g. Computer Assisted Text Analysis II and III) can usually only be taken with the first module in the sequence (e.g. Computer Assisted Text Analysis I). [That is, while it is often fine to take I and not II in a sequence, it is usually not possible to take II and not I.]

The exceptions to this rule are module 18 The Logic of Qualitative Research II and Module 30 Designing and Conducting Fieldwork III. It is also possible to take Module 5 (Natural and Randomized Experiments II) without Module 1, but only with permission of the instructors.

The module sequence Modules 4, 8, 12 and 16 (Ethnographic Methods I, II, III and IV) should be considered as a single unit. Accordingly the sequence can only be selected as a whole (i.e. participants cannot take only one or some of those modules).

Apart from these formal limitations, we should also note that there are several modules which follow in a natural sequence and/or lend themselves to being taken as a group. For the avoidance of doubt, we outline these informal sequences simply to help you navigate the table below. Beyond the limitations we mention above, you may take whichever modules you would find most helpful.

Modules 1, 5 and 9 (Natural and Randomized Experiments I, II and III), Modules 13 and 17 (Multimethod Research I and II), and Modules 21, 25, and 29 (Causal Inference from Causal Models I, II and III).
Modules 4, 8, 12, and 16 (Ethnographic Methods I, II, III, and IV), Module 20 (Interpretive Comparative Methods), Modules 24 and 28 (Interpretive Methods I and II), and Modules 36 and 40 (Interpretation and History).

Books to Purchase or Otherwise Obtain

The reading for some unified sessions and modules includes a book or books that must be purchased, or borrowed from your university library. You will also see that there is some overlap: some books are used in more than one module.

Manuscripts in Press or in Progress

To the extent possible, IQMR uses the most up-to-date readings on the methods covered at the institute. One consequence is that we are often using manuscripts that are either in press or in progress. Please note that the authors are allowing us to use these materials as a courtesy. As with all IQMR materials, they are made available for current attendees’ use only.

Prerequisites for Modules

Four of IQMR’s module sequences involve participants using R software. To ensure that the modules focus on methods and techniques, and not basic instruction in how to use the software, we are asking participants who sign up for those modules to commit that by IQMR they will have acquired a basic familiarity with R software.

By familiarity, we mean that you should understand packages and how to install them, functions, arguments, and objects; be able to interpret information contained in the various windows in RStudio; know different ways of getting your data 'into R' and then manipulating it (e.g. adding and dropping columns, changing values in specific cells).

This year, the four module sequences involving R are:

- Modules 3/7/11/15 QCA/fs (Schneider and Oana)
- Modules 21/25/29 Causal Inference from Causal Models (Jacobs and Medina)
- Modules 23/27 Computer Assisted Text Analysis (Lowe)
- Modules 33/37 Social Network Analysis (Larson)

For participants who are planning to take one or more of these sequences and do not yet have such a familiarity (or need a quick refresher), IQMR is strongly recommending the first 2 chapters of Koskue Imai’s *Quantitative Social Science*, a short, self-guided introduction to R. Details will follow in a separate document.

One module sequence, M35/39 Social Media as Social Science (Wilson), requires the use of a different software package, Python. Details on any prerequisites for this module sequence will follow in a separate document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/14</td>
<td>M1 Natural and Randomized Experiments <em>(Carter and Rizzo)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M2 Within-Case and Small-N Analysis <em>(Bennett, Fairfield, and Waldner)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M3 QCA/fs I <em>(Schneider and Oana)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M4 Ethnographic Methods I <em>(Pachirat and Schaffer)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15</td>
<td>M5 Natural and Randomized Experiments II <em>(Carter and Rizzo)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M6 Within-Case and Small-N Analysis <em>(Bennett, Fairfield, and Waldner)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M7 QCA/fs II <em>(Schneider and Oana)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M8 Ethnographic Methods II <em>(Pachirat and Schaffer)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16</td>
<td>M9 Natural and Randomized Experiments III <em>(Carter and Rizzo)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M10 Within-Case and Small-N Analysis <em>(Bennett, Fairfield, and Waldner)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M11 QCA/fs III <em>(Schneider and Oana)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M12 Ethnographic Methods III <em>(Pachirat and Schaffer)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/17</td>
<td>M13 Multi-Method Research <em>(Seawright)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M14 Logic of Qualitative Methods I <em>(Mahoney and Goertz)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M15 QCA/fs IV <em>(Schneider and Oana)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M16 Ethnographic Methods IV <em>(Pachirat and Schaffer)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/18</td>
<td>M17 Multi-Method Research II <em>(Seawright)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M18 Logic of Qualitative Methods II <em>(Mahoney and Goertz)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M19 Strategies for Measurement <em>(Firchow)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M20 Interpretive Comparison <em>(Corbett, Boswell and Rhodes)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21</td>
<td>M21 Causal Inference from Causal Models I <em>(Jacobs and Medina)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M22 Designing and Conducting Fieldwork I <em>(Kapiszewski, MacLean, Cyr and Kim)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M23 Computer Assisted Text Analysis I <em>(Lowe)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M24 Interpretive Methods I: Discourse Analysis and Ideology <em>(Wedeen and Mazzarella)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/22</td>
<td>M25 Causal Inference from Causal Models II <em>(Jacobs and Medina)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M26 Designing and Conducting Fieldwork II <em>(Kapiszewski, MacLean, Cyr and Kim)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M27 Computer Assisted Text Analysis II <em>(Lowe)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M28 Interpretive Methods II: Participant Observation and Interpreting Film and Social Media <em>(Mazzarella and Majumdar)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/23</td>
<td>M29 Causal Inference from Causal Models III <em>(Jacobs and Medina)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M30 Designing and Conducting Fieldwork III <em>(Kapiszewski, MacLean, Cyr and Kim)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M31 Finding Your Social Science Project <em>(Gerring)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M32 Re-thinking Small-N Comparisons <em>(Simmons and Smith)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/24</td>
<td>M33 Social Network Analysis I <em>(Larson)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M34 Comparative Historical Analysis I <em>(Kreuzer)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M35 Social Media as Social Science Data I <em>(Wilson)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M36 Interpretation and History I <em>(Grant and Kim)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/25</td>
<td>M37 Social Network Analysis II <em>(Larson)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M38 Comparative Historical Analysis II <em>(Kreuzer)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M39 Social Media as Social Science Data II <em>(Wilson)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or M40 Interpretation and History II <em>(Grant and Kim)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unified Sessions
Pre-recorded introductory lectures
Andrew Bennett, James Mahoney, Jason Seawright, and Lisa Wedeen

These four pre-recorded lectures will be made available at least two weeks before the start of the institute. Each of the four lectures should be watched after reading the assigned text(s).

The Logic of Qualitative Research
James Mahoney, Northwestern University

Qualitative scholars often realize that their research does not follow the logic of statistical analysis. However, they may lack a vocabulary for describing the inferential methods that they do use in their research. This session begins to develop this vocabulary by rooting qualitative methods in logic and set theory. The session compares and contrasts the assumptions and tools of quantitative and qualitative research, showing why qualitative methods are on an equal footing with statistical methods.


Multi-Method Research
Jason Seawright, Northwestern University

This session (asynchronous) introduces students to debates surrounding multi-method designs. Can there be value added to combining qualitative and quantitative methods within a single research design? If so, how do we design our work in ways that take full advantage of the extra effort involved in carrying out multiple kinds of methods? We will consider multiple possible answers to these questions, building to an argument in favor of a paradigm in which methods are added to designs in order to test the assumptions behind (and generally probe the weak parts in) the method used to make central inferences.


Case Study Methods and Research Design
Andrew Bennett, Georgetown University

- U.3.1 Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, Chapter 1, pp. 3-36, Chapter 4 pp. 73-88

Introduction to Interpretive Methods: Culture and interpretive Methods
Lisa Wedeen, University of Chicago

This session (asynchronous) introduces students to interpretive social science. It identifies what interpretive social science entails and then focuses on interpretivism’s relevance to perennial concerns in political science. In doing so, we shall discuss the problematic treatments of “culture” in the discipline while also devising ways to apply productively a notion of culture as “semiotic practices” to the study of politics.

- U.4.1 Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture" in The Interpretation of Cultures, New York: Basic Books, 1973


Recommended:
Monday, June 14
Module 1 – Natural and Randomized Experiments I
Christopher Carter and Tesalia Rizzo

In this module sequence, we introduce natural and randomized experiments and discuss their strengths and limitations through a survey of recent examples from political science and economics. We introduce a common framework for understanding and assessing natural and randomized experiments based on the credibility of causal and statistical assumptions. We discuss tools for developing and assessing experimental designs, such as instrumental variable analysis, sampling principles, power analysis, data collection do’s and don’ts as well as a variety of robustness tests. We then discuss how to bolster the credibility of natural and randomized experiments in the design-stage. In particular, we will focus on the role of “ex-ante” approaches to improve the quality and transparency of research designs, such as the use of pre-analysis plans. The module incorporates applied research and practical advice especially on how to conduct fieldwork, collect data and the logistics and ethics surrounding experiments. We end the module by evaluating the promise and obstacles to the use of multi-method research in the analysis of natural and randomized experiments. We discuss how qualitative methods can help address some of the criticisms of experiments, as well as how experiments can bolster the inferences drawn from qualitative evidence.


Session 1: Design-based Inference under the Potential Outcomes Framework

In this session, we first provide an overview of the potential outcomes framework and the fundamental problem of causal inference. We then discuss design-based research as a strategy for recovering unbiased estimates of causal effects.

Readings:


Session 2: Introduction to Natural Experiments

What are natural experiments? We review the concept of natural experiments and discuss their strengths and limitations through a survey of recent examples from political science and
economics. We introduce a common formal framework for understanding and assessing natural experiments.

Readings:


Optional:


**Session 3: Natural Experiments: Quantitative Methods**

In this session, we discuss the role of causal and statistical assumptions in the analysis of natural experiments. We focus on instrumental-variables (IV) analysis to illustrate the plausibility of these assumptions in a variety of applications.

Readings:

Monday, June 14
Module 2 – Within-Case and Small-N Analysis I: Philosophy of Science, Causal Mechanisms, and Causal Graphs
David Waldner

The first component of this module (Monday, Waldner) explores the philosophy of science of causal mechanisms and causal explanation and its relationship to process tracing and to constructing causal graphs. On Tuesday (Bennett, Fairfield) we will look at traditional process tracing and introduce Bayesian process tracing. On Wednesday (Fairfield, Bennett) we will continue our discussion of Bayesian process tracing. Participants will be asked to complete a few key readings and view pre-recorded lecture materials in advance of the live sessions described below, which will involve interactive practical exercises. Readings and videos will be made available several weeks in advance to facilitate time management.

[Please note that session and break times are approximate. More details to follow during the session.]

11:00 am – 12:45 pm. Live Session A: Models of Qualitative Inference

We cover four models of inductive inference using case-study materials: eliminative induction, abductive reasoning, Bayesian models of information updating, and qualitative causal inference. We will discuss the utility of the first three approaches, but also their potential limitations as strictly evidence-based approaches. While qualitative causal inference draws on the first three models and hence has many similarities with them, it is a design-based approach, based on causal graphs and the satisfaction of formal criteria of causal inference. This session will briefly introduce material on research designs – potential outcomes, the fundamental problem of causal inference, and the theory of causal graphs – and will discuss how to conduct qualitative causal inference.

There will be a brief and optional video on causal graphs (approximately 30 minutes).

Readings:


1:30 pm – 4:00 pm. Live Session B: The Nuts and Bolts of Qualitative Causal inference

Building on the first session, the afternoon session will first consider some published research that comports, implicitly or explicitly, with qualitative causal inference. We’ll use this material to refine our understanding of the formal criteria of qualitative causal inference, to learn how to evaluate published research, and to employing causal graphs and qualitative causal inference in our own work. The second half of the session will discuss how students can develop causal graphs from their own hypotheses; we will discuss some examples in class. Students are encouraged to try their hand at developing causal graphs prior to this session (and after doing the readings and watching the optional video); we can then discuss and develop student examples in class.

Readings:


6:00 pm – 9:00 pm: Office hours to discuss your causal graphs and their use in qualitative causal inference.
This multi-day module sequence provides an overview of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and fuzzy sets, including instruction in its use within RStudio. At the end of the sequence, participants should be able to distinguish better from worse QCA applications and to implement their own first QCA on their own data.

QCA is inherently multi-method, combining within-case and cross-case analysis. It is specifically designed for studies with moderate-sized Ns; however it is also sometimes used on large datasets. Within the limitations facing empirical data, QCA is best seen as a tool for unraveling causal complexity, with different configurations of causally relevant conditions leading to the same outcome. Module topics include: necessary/sufficient causation, causal complexity, counterfactual analysis, crisp-set and fuzzy-set configurational analysis using truth tables, robustness tests, and post-QCA case selection for process tracing – all applied to empirical examples using the R software environment.

Day 1 provides an overview of Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and fuzzy sets. It aims to introduce participants to the basics of set-theoretic methods and QCA and to give them a solid foundation for the application of QCA on social science data. Topics include: causal complexity, set theory and set calibration, analyses of necessity, and parameters of fit.

This session introduces QCA, especially its use as a tool for deciphering and unraveling causal complexity. Participants will be introduced to the course topic, the content and sequence of the course sessions, as well as the course resources. We will also touch upon the basics of set-theoretic methods, the epistemology of QCA, its different variants, and how it compares to other standard qualitative and quantitative social scientific research designs. The centerpiece of the first session will be a demonstration of QCA on the basis of a recently published study.

After this, we address the question of how to prepare observational data to perform QCA, i.e. how to calibrate, and we turn to the methodological foundations of QCA including a thorough discussion of the basic mathematical concepts of QCA. The session begins with an outline of sets and set membership, including the notion of fuzzy sets as opposed to crisp sets. Almost all cross-case evidence can be represented in terms of crisp or fuzzy sets. Unlike “variables”, sets must be calibrated, and the calibration of fuzzy sets relies heavily on external knowledge, not on inductively derived statistics like means and standard deviations. This use of external knowledge provides the basis for a much tighter coupling of theoretical concepts and empirical analysis. Once we address the question of calibration, we turn to Boolean algebra, formal logic and operations on complex expressions.
Required readings:

- 3.6 Introductions to R (examples; you find many more online)
  - https://www.datacamp.com/courses/free-introduction-to-r
  - http://tutorials.iq.harvard.edu/R/Rintro/Rintro.zip

Recommended readings:

How does sustained attention to meaning making in the research world contribute to the study of politics? What are the promises, and perils, of social research that invites the unruly minutiae of lived experience and conceptual lifeworlds to converse with, and contest, abstract disciplinary theories and categories? In this practice-intensive 4-day short course, we explore two ethnographic methods - participant observation and interviewing - with specific attention to their potential to subvert, generate, and extend understandings of politics and power.

11.00am – 12.30pm Session A – Introduction to Ethnography
Timothy Pachirat, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

This session explores the promises and pitfalls of ethnographic approaches to the political.


1.00pm – 2.30pm Session B – What is Ethnographic Interviewing?
Fred Schaffer, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

In this session, we examine the family of practices that characterize ethnographic interviewing and explore in more depth one type of ethnographic interviewing: ordinary language interviewing. Ordinary language interviewing is a tool for uncovering the meaning of words in everyday talk. By studying the meaning of words, the promise is to gain insight into the various social realities these words name, evoke, or realize.


2.30pm – 4.00pm Session C – Ordinary Language Interviewing I
Fred Schaffer, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Participants learn how to conduct a basic ordinary language interview and practice doing one focusing on words of their own choosing.
Session 1: Strengthening Natural Experiments Through Qualitative Evidence (4th session in the module sequence)

We highlight the essential role of qualitative methods in the analysis of natural experiments. We present examples that illustrate how qualitative evidence can bolster the credibility of causal assumptions and aid in the interpretation of quantitative results. We discuss how qualitative methods can help address some of the criticisms of natural experiments, as well as how natural experiments can bolster the inferences drawn from qualitative evidence.

Readings:


Optional:


Session 2: Building Blocks for the Design of Randomized Experiments (5th session in the module sequence)

This session introduces the core building blocks for experimental designs, including selection bias, different randomization procedures, assumptions necessary for causal identification and sampling techniques.

Readings:


Optional:


Session 3: Identification, Estimation, Dealing with Threats to Inference and Power Analysis (6th session in the module sequence)

In this session, we will discuss different causal estimands, their estimation processes and potential threats to inference. We will learn how to test for covariate imbalance and methods for covariate adjustment. Finally we will review the concepts and practicalities of assessing a study’s statistical power for detecting treatment effects.

Readings:


Optional:

• 5.3.3 Gelman, A. and Loken, E. (2013). The garden of forking paths: Why multiple comparisons can be a problem, even when there is no “fishing expedition” or “p-hacking” and the research hypothesis was posited ahead of time. Department of Statistics, Columbia University.

• 5.3.4 EGAP: 10 Things to Know About Statistical Power

• 5.3.5 EGAP: 10 Things to Know About Pre-Analysis Plans
Tuesday, June 15
Module 6 – Within-Case and Small-N Analysis II - Process Tracing and Bayesian Reasoning
Andrew Bennett and Tasha Fairfield

11:00 am—1:00 pm. Live Session A: Process-Tracing Exercises

Participants will work together in breakout groups on various exercises designed to get us thinking about evidence in relation to alternative hypotheses.

Required Readings:


Prepare the exercises here:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LOg4MMTnrBooJvzRA_KPBB9kaPEIKLeOboaBy8zF2wQ/edit?usp=sharing

2:00 pm—4:00 pm. Live Session B: Comparing Rival Hypotheses & Assessing Evidentiary Import

The way we intuitively approach qualitative case-study research is similar to how we read detective novels. We consider different hypotheses to explain what occurred—whether democratization in South Africa, or the death of Samuel Ratchett on the Orient Express—drawing on the literature we have read (e.g. theories of regime change, or other Agatha Christie mysteries) and any other salient previous knowledge we have. As we gather evidence and discover new clues, we update our beliefs about which hypothesis provides the best explanation—or we may introduce a new alternative that we think up along the way. Bayesianism provides a natural framework that is both logically rigorous and grounded in common sense, that governs how we should revise our degree of belief in the truth of a hypothesis—e.g., "mobilization from below drove democratization in South Africa by altering economic elites’ regime preferences," (Wood 2001), or "a lone gangster sneaked onboard the train and killed Ratchett as revenge for being swindled"—given our relevant prior knowledge and evidence that we obtain during our investigation. Bayesianism is enjoying a revival across many fields, and it offers a powerful tool for improving inference and analytic transparency in qualitative process-tracing research.
This live session is designed to help participants become comfortable with the basic components of Bayesian reasoning—comparing rival explanations, and assessing the inferential import (or probative value) of evidence. Bayesian reasoning—and essentially all causal inference—involves working with mutually exclusive hypotheses. Contrary to common perceptions, this requirement does not restrict the level of complexity or the number of causal factors that we can include in our explanations. In breakout groups, participants will practice constructing a set of well-specified mutually exclusive hypotheses from two or three causal factors that might matter for redistribution, or for the rise of populist leaders (your group’s choice of topic). We will then practice evaluating likelihood ratios, which determine the inferential import of the evidence—namely, how strongly does the evidence favor one hypothesis over a rival? Here we must “mentally inhabit the world” of each hypothesis and ask which one makes the evidence seem more expected. This is the key analytical step that tells us how to update our prior views about the plausibility of our hypotheses—we gain more confidence in whichever hypothesis makes the evidence more expected.

Required Reading:


4:30 pm—5:30 pm. (Optional) Drop-In Office Hours

Come ask questions or just join in to chat about Bayesian reasoning and ways to get more involved with the growing community of scholars who are using this approach!
Set relations (necessity and sufficiency)

In this session we will discuss the analysis of necessity. We discuss the so-called parameters of fit that are central to any QCA study, i.e. the measures of consistency, coverage, and relevance of necessary conditions. We will further discuss ways of visualizing patterns of necessity, SUIN conditions, and some methodological issues that are related to the parameters of fit.

After this, we turn to the analysis of sufficiency. We will define the notion of a truth table in crisp-set and fuzzy-set QCA and how it differs from a data matrix. We will show how to analyze truth tables with respect to sufficient conditions in order to derive solution formulas. This includes the Quine-McCluskey Algorithm for the logical minimization of the sufficiency statements in a truth table. Furthermore, we will discuss parameters of fit for sufficiency, problematize some of their properties, and elaborate on potential improvements of these formulas.

Required readings:

Recommended readings:
- 7.8 Thomann, E. and M. Maggetti (2017). Designing research with Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA): Approaches, challenges, and tools, Sociological Methods and Research.
Tuesday, June 15
Module 8 – Ethnographic Methods II
Timothy Pachirat and Fred Schaffer

11.00am-12.30pm  Session A – Ordinary Language Interviewing II
Fred Schaffer, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Participants learn about and practice using additional types of ordinary-language questions as well as strategies for approaching people to interview.

12.30pm - 2.30pm Session B – Interviewing Fieldwork Exercise and Write-Up

Each participant conducts two (Zoom, phone, or in-person) ordinary language interviews with interviewees pre-selected by each participant. Participants then write-up their main findings.

2.30pm – 4.00pm Session C – Interviewing Debriefing
Fred Schaffer, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

In this session, we discuss the challenges that participants encountered in identifying people to interview, conducting ordinary language interviews, and writing up results. We also discuss what participants discovered substantively in doing their interviews. By this time, participants have been assigned to the sites in which they will do their participant-observation field exercise. Participants work with their fieldsite groups during this session’s exercise and in the short course’s subsequent exercises.
Session 1: Nuts and Bolts of Implementing Randomized Experiments (7th session in the module sequence)

In this session, we discuss the nuts and bolts of implementing field experiments, from designing a data collection strategy to survey design, electronic data collection, hiring enumerators, methods for ensuring data quality and treatment compliance, to working with implementing partners. We will also continue our discussion on integrating quantitative and qualitative methods.

Readings:

- 9.1.1 IPA’s Research Protocols
- 9.1.2 EGAP Methods Guide: Ten Things to Know About Survey Design
- 9.1.3 EGAP Methods Guide: Ten Things to Know About Survey Implementation

Optional:

Session 2: Ethics, External Validity, Research Transparency, and the Role of Randomized Experiments in Social Science (8th session in the module sequence)

In the first half of this final session, we will discuss a wide variety of viewpoints on the ethics of conducting field experiments in political science, including the ethics of randomizing (and withholding) treatments, interference, power dynamics in the field, and keeping respondents and field staff safe. In the second half, we will zoom out to discuss the role and comparative advantage of field experiments compared to other methods, with a particular emphasis on external validity. We will review some approaches in the applied literature that attempt to address restrictions to external validity. We will also discuss how qualitative methods can be incorporated to provide insights on a field experiment’s external validity. Finally we will review the best practices in research transparency.

Readings:


Optional:


Wednesday, June 16  
Module 10 – Within-Case and Small-N Analysis III - Process Tracing and Bayesian Reasoning  
Andrew Bennett and Tasha Fairfield

11:00 am—12:45 pm.  Live Session A: Assessing the Inferential Weight of Evidence

One of the most important things that Bayesian reasoning can do for process tracing and qualitative research more generally is to help us make better judgments about how strongly our evidence favors one hypothesis relative to rivals. In this session, we will practice assessing the *weight of evidence*—an intuitive concept promoted by Jack Good and Alan Turing that is directly related to the likelihood ratio. Our group exercise will draw on recent research about state-building and the origins of institutional strength (or weakness).

Recommended Reading:


1:15 pm—2:45 pm.  Live Session B: Scrutinizing Case Study Research

In this session, we will practice using the Bayesian framework to critique published case-study research. To what extent do authors implicitly follow Bayesian reasoning when analyzing their evidence? How strongly does the evidence actually support their argument over rivals? Bayesianism is both a tool for making better inferences, and a framework for pinpointing disagreements among scholars and building consensus. Working in breakout groups with an example from research on market reform, participants will assess how closely the author’s conclusions do, or do not agree with a Bayesian analysis.

3:15 pm—4:00 pm.  Live Session C: Bayesian Reasoning in Perspective

We will conclude this portion of the module by highlighting the relative advantages of Bayesianism and how it differs from frequentist statistical inference, set theoretic approaches, and other methodologies for process tracing.

Recommended Reading:


4:30 pm—5:00 pm.  (Optional) Drop-In Office Hours
Limited diversity

Continuing to build on the previous session on sufficiency, we discuss the problem of incomplete truth tables: logical remainder rows. We will explain how this phenomenon of limited diversity arises and which basic strategies are at the researcher’s disposal to mitigate its impact on drawing inferences. Above all, we will show how counterfactual thinking can be used to resolve problems of limited diversity. Based on this, we introduce the “standard analysis” and the “enhanced standard analysis” by distinguishing between easy and difficult counterfactuals, and between tenable and untenable assumptions on remainders.

Required readings:


Recommended readings:

1.00 – 2.30pm Session B – Ethics and Praxis in Participant Observation II
Timothy Pachirat, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Part Two of an exploration of the practice of participant observation, with special emphasis on jottings, fieldnote writing, and the ethics of fieldwork. Instructions and discussion of fieldwork exercise.


Session C – Participant Observation Fieldwork Exercise

Participants conduct participant-observation exercises in pre-assigned sites. Both socially distanced in-person and digital options will be provided.

Session D – Fieldnote Writing  Participants use this time to write up a set of fieldnotes based on jottings taken in their fieldsites.
Thursday, June 17
Module 13 – Multi-Method Research I
Jason Seawright

This schedule is subject to changes (minor or major) depending on how long each topic actually takes us to cover, as well as on the needs of the class.

**Day 1: Best Practices in Multi-Method Research**

We will have two two-hour synchronous sessions in which we will discuss the principles and justification for multi-method research, and work through examples of good and bad application, with a focus on multi-method designs joining qualitative techniques with regression. We will explore the assumptions used by each family of techniques for causal inference, discuss research designs that target those assumptions for testing via other methods, and explore problems of case selection, generalization, and the research cycle.

**First Segment: Foundations of Multi-Method Research.**

The first session will address the question of why bother with multi-method research. We will explore an example of good multi-method research in depth, discuss critiques and drawbacks to multi-method research, and compare different methodological approaches to multi-method design.

- 13.1.1 Seawright 2016: Chapters 1, 2, and Appendix. (book to purchase)

Recommended:


- 13.1.4 Bennett and Checkel 2015: Chapter and Appendix.

**Second Segment: Combining Case Studies and Regression.**

The second session will cover concrete design ideas involving various forms of process tracing and regression. We will suggest a set of designs in which qualitative methods test measurement assumptions, explore for confounding variables and inappropriate controls, and generate hypotheses about causal pathways. Regression, in these designs, offers quantification of average treatment effects and formal hypothesis testing.
• 13.2.1 Seawright 2016: Chapters 3 and 4. (book to purchase)

Recommended:


Thursday, June 17
Module 14 – The Logic of Qualitative Methods, Part I
Gary Goertz and James Mahoney

Modules 14 and 18 cover many classic and standard topics of qualitative methodology, with a special focus on how to write a qualitative dissertation or manuscript for publication as a book at an excellent university press. We survey the key research design, case selection, and theoretical issues that arise with such a project. The individual topics for this specific module are research design, concepts, and complex theories. The sessions use logic and set theory as a foundation for discussing and elucidating qualitative methods.

Each one-day module consists of three 80 minute synchronous sessions; a lunch break is scheduled after the first session and a coffee break is scheduled after the second session. Each 80 minute session is broken down into three components: (1) a 50 minute lecture; (2) a 10 minute breakout session; and (3) a 20 minute reconvening session with Q&A. The breakout sessions will involve participants working together on an exercise related to the lecture material. Each participant will be randomly assigned to a breakout group; they will stay in the same breakout group for the whole module.

The asynchronous content of these modules consists of the reading material listed below. Students are asked to do the required reading in advance of the session. We have kept the amount of required reading to a manageable amount. For both modules, we will be using the following reading as a running example: Marissa Brookes, *The New Politics of Transnational Labor: Why Some Alliances Succeed* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), chapters 1 and 4. It is essential to read these two chapters prior to the first module sessions. We will also assign the theory/research design chapters of a variety of recent qualitative methods books as exercises for breakout sessions to illustrate “real-life” qualitative methods and research design issues.

**Qualitative Research Design**
80 minutes/11:00-12:20
Gary Goertz, University of Notre Dame

This opening session focuses on introducing classic qualitative research, including its type of questions, case-based orientation, and grounding in logic. The session explores the issues involved in writing two kinds of books: (1) a book about a real world puzzle focused on a rare event or surprising outcome in one or a small number of cases; and (2) a book that develops a general theory of an outcome, and then selects one or more case studies to evaluate the theory. We explore the research design issues that arise in these two kinds of studies, including framing the research question, developing a theory, considering rival explanations, selecting appropriate methodologies, and choosing cases and pursuing generalization.
Required Reading:


***40 Minute Lunch Break***

Social Science Concepts
80 minutes/1:00-2:20
Gary Goertz, University of Notre Dame

This session provides basic guidelines for the construction and evaluation of concepts. It provides a framework dealing for dealing complex concepts, which are typical in much social science research, as well as the popular construction of global indices, such as HDI, poverty measures, and the like generated by IGOs, NGOs, the EU, World Bank, and so on. The session also covers common advice for building conceptual typologies.

Required Reading:


Recommended:

• 14.2.2 Goertz 2020, *Social Science Concepts, chapter 1, rest of chapter 2, and chapter 8 on typologies*

***20 Minute Coffee Break***

Complex Theories
80 minutes/2:40-4:00
James Mahoney, Northwestern University

This session explores the construction of complex causal theories in qualitative research. Using concrete examples as illustrations, the session considers the use of logical ANDs and logical ORs when building explanations concerning necessary conditions, INUS conditions, and SUIN
conditions. Special attention focuses on the logic of 2x2 tables, typologies, and the value of writing out simple Boolean equations to summarize qualitative theories.

Required Reading:


Recommended:


**Set-theoretic multi-method research (SMMR) and robustness tests**

This session discusses various possibilities of building a solid QCA beyond the analytic moment. It discusses ways to increase confidence in the QCA results we obtain and to integrate case knowledge in the process. As such, we introduce tools for evaluating the robustness of QCA solutions and tools for set-theoretic multi-method research (SMMR).

**Required readings:**


**Recommended readings:**


• Braumoeller, Bear. 2015. “Guarding Against False Positives in Qualitative Comparative Analysis.” Political Analysis, online first. DOI:10.1093/pan/mpv017
Session A – Fieldsite Group Review of Fieldnotes

Participants exchange and comment on each other’s fieldnotes.

12.30pm – 2.00pm Session B – Fieldsite Group Discussions and Presentations
Timothy Pachirat, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Participants combine with other fieldsite groups to discuss the experience of doing participant observation.

2.30pm – 4.00pm Session C – Overall Debriefing (interviewing and participant observation)

In this session, we reflect together on the following three clusters of questions: (1) How can participant observation, lifeworld interviewing, and ordinary language interviewing be fruitfully combined when doing ethnographic fieldwork? What are the potential pitfalls of such a combination? (2) To what extent does the method one adopts shape what one apprehends? Specifically, do we learn something different when we access meaning by means of (relatively unstructured) participant observation as opposed to (relatively structured) interviewing? (3) Is there anything that you learned about participant observation and/or interviewing that might or will inform your *own* research?
Day 2: Frontiers in Multi-Method Research

We will have two two-hour synchronous sessions in which we will discuss current cutting-edge topics in multi-method research, including multi-method designs involving various kinds of experiments, designs for concept formation, testing hypotheses about measurement, and theory building, and multi-method designs in which case-study and qualitative techniques are used to generate the final causal inference.

First Segment: Combining Case Studies and Experiments.

The first session will look at how qualitative techniques can enhance the quality and credibility of natural experiments, field experiments, survey experiments, and laboratory experiments. We will develop a wide range of potential design elements and discuss which are relevant to all experiments and which apply to only certain kinds.

- 17.1.1 Seawright 2016: Chapters 6 and 7. (book to purchase)

Recommended:
- 17.1.3 Bennett and Checkel 2015: Chapter 8.

Second Segment: Turning the Table; Conceptualization and Measurement.

The second session will look at multi-method designs in which qualitative methods offer the final causal inference. How can statistical design components be usefully embedded into process-tracing and comparative historical analysis? We will also explore multi-method approaches to concept formation, measurement, and theory building, with special attention to how qualitative research can complement machine-learning approaches.

- 17.2.1 Seawright 2016: Chapter 8.
 Modules 14 and 18 cover many classic and standard topics of qualitative methodology, with a special focus on how to write a qualitative dissertation or manuscript for publication as a book at an excellent university press. We survey the key research design, case selection, and theoretical issues involving doing such a project. The individual topics for this module are sequence and narrative analysis, counterfactual analysis, and generalization and multimethod research. The sessions use logic and set theory as a foundation for discussing and elucidating qualitative methods.

Each one-day module consists of three 80 minute synchronous sessions; a lunch break is scheduled after the first session and a coffee break is scheduled after the second session. Each 80 minute session is broken down into three components: (1) a 50 minute lecture; (2) a 10 minute breakout session; and (3) a 20 minute reconvening session with Q&A. The breakout sessions will involve participants working together on an exercise related to the lecture material. Each participant will be randomly assigned to a breakout group; they will stay in the same breakout group for the whole module.

The asynchronous content of these modules consists of the reading material listed below. Students are asked to do the required reading in advance of the session. We have kept the amount of required reading to a manageable amount. For both modules, we will be using the following reading as a running example: Marissa Brookes, *The New Politics of Transnational Labor: Why Some Alliances Succeed* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2019), chapters 1 and 4. It is essential to read these two chapters prior to the first module sessions. We will also assign the theory/research design chapters of a variety of recent qualitative methods books as exercises for breakout sessions to illustrate “real-life” qualitative methods and research design issues.

**Sequence and Narrative Analysis**  
80 minutes/11:00-12:20  
*James Mahoney, Northwestern University*

This session offers an introduction to sequence and narrative analysis as a qualitative methodology for individual cases. The session links two aspects of qualitative analysis: (1) constructing a chronological narrative that shows how a set of causal factors work together to produce an outcome; and (2) focusing on key pieces of evidence that allow the analyst to assess the validity of competing theories. The session explores the value of using figures when constructing narratives, and it explores the value of using logic and set theory when using evidence to adjudicate among rival theories.
Required Reading:


Recommended:


***40 Minute Lunch Break***

**Counterfactual Analysis**

80 minutes/1:00-2:20

James Mahoney, Northwestern University

This session considers the use of counterfactual analysis as a tool for evaluating complex causal theories at the level of individual cases. The session especially focuses on the evaluation of necessary condition hypothesis with counterfactual analysis. The session uses several concrete examples and set theory to illustrate how counterfactual analysis is a crucial part of process tracing and hypothesis evaluation in qualitative research.

Required Reading:

Recommended:


***20 Minute Coffee Break***

80 Minutes/2:40-4:00
Multimethod Research, Generalizations, and Case Selection
Gary Goertz, University of Notre Dame

This session will explore the linkage between multimethod research, causal mechanisms and case studies. The session considers the importance of having a clear theory for selecting cases. In particular, it analyses the logic of case selection for multimethod research when the goal is to investigate causal mechanisms. It also discusses core forms of generalization and the systematic use of case studies to test theories.

Required Reading:


Recommended:

Friday, June 18
Module 19 – Strategies for Measurement: Indicators and Validity in the Real World
Pamina Firchow

In this module, we will focus on the creation and use of indicators for a variety of different measurement purposes in qualitative and mixed methods research. In the social sciences in particular, before empirical relationships can be studied, the concepts of interest need to be defined and a method for making systematic observations developed. These two stages of measurement are commonly referred to as conceptualization and operationalization, respectively. While scholars range in the extent to which they rely on inductive or deductive logics of inquiry, as well as the extent to which they capture their data using qualitative or quantitative methodologies, all social science researchers must find their way from an abstract concept to concrete observations. In order to do this, indicators are often necessary to move from a conceptual definition to its operationalization in measurement.

We will start by looking in more depth at instances in applied and scholarly measurement efforts where indicators are used to develop concrete observations, we will also explore how indicators are traditionally created and implemented and what kinds of methodological advantages and challenges come with developing universalized indicators by external experts that are applicable for comparative projects across contexts and in large-N studies. Then, and drawing on literature on measurement by interpretivists, we will explore how we might begin to reconcile issues of concept validity and inclusion in mixed methods measurement systems by using participatory and collaborative tools for indicator development such as the Everyday Peace Indicators.

**Session 1: Standardized Conceptualization and Operationalization in Measurement**
11.00am – 12.15pm

Here we will go over the standard approaches to specifying and defining an agreed upon meaning about what is meant when we use a particular term (conceptualization) and then identify the indicators that will be used to measure the concept (operationalization). After a brief overview of reliability and validity in measurement and concepts, we will look at examples of how both qualitative and quantitative indicators are used by scholars and policymakers and conduct a mini-experiential indicator generation exercise.


*Recommended readings*


TBD

**Session 2: Why strive for Concept Validity? The use (and abuse) of Indicators.**
12.45pm – 2.00pm

Concepts are at the core of both qualitative and quantitative analysis and inferences will be flawed unless concepts are coherent and measured properly. Yet, how do we ensure universality if there is diversity in the way individual concepts are understood in different contexts. For example, the presence of police may mean something very different to someone living in South Minneapolis than it would to someone in North Minneapolis, therefore we cannot assume that the presence of police means security to everyone. In addition, the paradox of measurement, or the inability to ensure that all aspects of a concept are included in the conceptual data container, limits our ability to ensure that we are measuring difficult to define concepts adequately. In this session we explore these criticisms of measurement in more depth.


• 19.2.3 View Video Presentation of Book: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q9b41hlzEyg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q9b41hlzEyg)


Recommended readings


Session 3: Participatory and Collaborative Approaches to Measurement
2.30pm – 4.00pm

It is rare for scholars of all methodological stripes to conceptualize their variables with consideration of the perspectives of the researched. This omission leads to questions of power and agency, as well as measurement validity. How can we ‘capture’ and accurately convey difficult to measure concepts in meaningful ways that are keeping with inclusion and representation? This session will examine various attempts to ‘capture’ difficult to define concepts, by introducing the Everyday Peace Indicators project and discussing efforts at producing participatory numbers and statistics.

19.3.1 Familiarize yourself with the [https://www.everydaypeaceindicators.org](https://www.everydaypeaceindicators.org) website, watch the video and read the overview here: [https://www.everydaypeaceindicators.org/copy-of-what-we-do](https://www.everydaypeaceindicators.org/copy-of-what-we-do)


*Recommended readings*

• 19.3.7 Tufts Participatory Assessment


This module will introduce participants to a distinctly interpretive approach to comparative research. It will arm participants with theoretical understanding and practical skills to undertake ambitious interpretive projects that bridge the depth-breadth trade-off and speak to broad and important debates.

**Reading**
The module is based on *The Art and Craft of Comparison* (book to purchase) which lays out the theory and methods for our interpretive approach.

Participants will also be assigned an extract from one of four books to read, as the basis for the group activities in the synchronous session. The extracts are:

- **20.1.1 Fire and Ashes** (2013) by Michael Ignatieff, Chapter One and Ten;
- **20.1.2 Politics in a Time of Crisis** (2015) by Pablo Iglesias, Appendix 2;
- **20.1.3 A Fighting Chance** (2014) by Elizabeth Warren, Chapter Three; and
- **20.1.4 Adults in the Room** (2017) by Yanis Varoufakis, Preface and Introduction

**Asynchronous Content**
We will produce a series of seven mini lectures that introduce the basic tenets of interpretive comparison. They will focus on specific aspects of the approach – theory, design, fieldwork, etc – and will be no longer than 15 minutes each. The total amount of asynchronous content will be around 1.5 hours. You will hear from us but also colleagues who undertake similar research.

**Synchronous Content**
The module runs for one day. It is split into 3 sessions, with two 30-minute breaks in between. There will be two 1h30m sessions of small-group activity. The first will focus on applying theoretical understandings of interpretive comparison to a real-world project. The second will focus on applying practical analytical strategies to a real-world project. There will be a final 1h plenary session – a masterclass on publishing and career-planning in interpretive research.

**11:00-12.30 First group activity**
We will begin by introducing the task (10 mins)
The substance of the session will involve breakout groups identifying and comparing key themes that emerge from the four autobiographies. In doing so they will employ key concepts from *The Art and Craft of Comparison*: puzzling, dilemmas, etc. (60 mins). The aim will be to
produce a 1-page bullet point outline of a research project. We will circulate between the groups during this period.

The session will conclude with all the groups returning to the main session and comparing their themes with each other (20 mins).

Break

13:00-14:30 Second group activity

We will begin by recapping the previous session and introducing the second task (10 mins) The second session will involve a more substantive analysis. Groups will refine their themes and identify examples to illustrate their argument. The aim will be to flesh out the initial 1-page proposal so that by the end of the session each group will have the skeleton of a fictional draft article / chapter (60 mins)

The session will conclude with all the groups returning to the main session and outlining their main argument to each other (20 mins). We will also share our own findings.

Break

15:00-16:00 Masterclass

The final session will involve a Q&A panel discussion about publishing and developing a career doing interpretive comparison research. We will structure it around three questions:

1. From thesis to book
2. Selecting the right journal
3. Explaining your method to reviewers
This module will teach how we can use structural causal models to design and implement qualitative and mixed-method empirical strategies of causal inference. A great deal of recent methodological progress in the social sciences has focused on how features of a research design – such as randomization by the researcher or by nature – can allow for causal identification with minimal assumptions. Yet, for many of the questions of greatest interest to social scientists and policymakers, randomization or its close equivalents are unavailable. We are, in short, often forced to rely on beliefs about how the world works – that is, on models.

Based on a book-in-progress by Macartan Humphreys and Alan Jacobs, and using a software package (CausalQueries) coauthored by Lily Medina, this module will examine how we can engage in systematic causal-model-based causal inference. Specifically, we will explore how researchers can encode their prior knowledge in a probabilistic causal model and use the model to draw inferences about causation – at the level of both individual cases and populations, using both qualitative and quantitative data. Students will learn about the approach on a conceptual level and gain a basic understanding of how to implement the approach in the CausalQueries R package.

The module consists of several substantive sections taught over three days. The module combines synchronous lecture and discussion sessions with the instructors, pre-recorded lectures, exercises in R, and readings. Lectures will introduce the major course topics and teach elements of the package, and exercises will allow students to apply what they are learning by using key components of the CausalQueries package.

There is some preparatory reading and software installation (with a video tutorial), as well as a pre-recorded lecture, for students to complete before the start of the first day of the module. As indicated below, there is also a moderate amount of homework for students to complete between Day 1 and Day 2, and between Day 2 and Day 3, involving watching pre-recorded lectures and completing exercises.

**READINGS**

Prior to the first class, we recommend that students complete the following chapters from the Humphreys and Jacobs book manuscript:

- 21.1.1 Humphreys, Macartan and Alan M. Jacobs, *Integrated Inferences*, manuscript in progress, Chapters 1-10. See: https://macartan.github.io/integrated_inferences/

In addition, we indicate for several topics below the chapters of the guide to the software package to which students may refer:

BEFORE MODULE

Setup: R, RStudio, CausalQueries package

Video tutorial on installation

This short video tutorial will get students started with the CausalQueries Package (CQ.) We will show how to install the package, explain how to access and understand the help files, and briefly introduce CQ’s main functions.

Office hours to assist with installation (2 hours, dates and times TBA)

Lecture to pre-watch: Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs)

This lecture will introduce students to Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs), also known as causal graphs. DAGs will be central to the approach presented in this module. The lecture will outline at a conceptual level how a DAG serves to encode certain kinds of causal knowledge about a domain.

DAY 1

I. Introducing causal models

11:00-11:30am Module introduction.

This session will motivate the module. Why do we need causal models? What are the inferential challenges that they can help us solve? We will preview how causal models allow us to make use of prior knowledge in drawing causal inferences, how they can help us be explicit about the assumptions embedded in those inferences, how they can allow us to answer causal questions not easily addressed with other approaches, and how they can aid the cumulation of knowledge.

11:30pm-12:00pm Q&A on Directed Acyclic Graphs

A chance to ask questions about and discuss the material presented in the pre-recorded DAGs lecture.
II. Making models I

12:00-12:30pm Lecture: How to make a model in CausalQueries

In this session, we will explain how to define and create causal models in the CausalQueries Package using dagitty syntax. We will provide a brief overview of the (optional) arguments and components that make a causal model in CQ. The session will familiarize students with CausalQueries, which they will use throughout the module to implement what they learn in the substantive sessions.


BREAK: 12:30-12:45pm

12:45-1:30pm Q&A on Making Models

An opportunity to ask questions about how to define models in the CausalQueries Package

1:30-2:30pm Exercise: Make your own model, on your own topic

In this session, participants will pick a substantive theory of their choice and depict it as a causal model in CausalQueries. At the end of the session, we will discuss the models that participants created, reflecting on the decisions they made when writing their models.

BREAK: 2:30-2:45pm

III. Causality in a model

2:45-3:20pm Lecture: The potential outcomes framework

This lecture and discussion will introduce the theory of causation that we will be using in the causal-models setting: the potential outcomes framework.

3:20pm-4:00pm Lecture: Potential outcomes (nodal types) on a DAG

This lecture and discussion will show how we can embed causal relationships, as potential outcomes, into a DAG by allowing for the operation of a set of “nodal types” at each node in the graph.
Monday, June 21
Module 22 – Designing and Conducting Field Research (I): Varieties of Fieldwork and Operating in the Field
Jennifer Cyr, Diana Kapiszewski, Diana Kim, and Lauren MacLean

This module considers the design, planning, and execution of field research. We consider fieldwork’s heterogeneity – how it varies across contexts, researchers, projects, and points of time in the same project – and offer strategies for addressing the intellectual, logistical, and social challenges that carrying out field research involves. We consider multiple aspects of preparing for field research, including developing a data-collection plan. We also discuss the ethical challenges that fieldwork raises, which go well beyond obtaining approval from one’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). We introduce various strategies for capturing data in the field, and walk through the basics of data management. We also consider “digital fieldwork,” i.e., using emerging communication technology to collect data, and capitalizing on the increasing availability of digital data. A basic premise underlying the module is that fieldwork entails shifting among research design, data collection, and data analysis. Each session is conducted with the understanding that participants have listened to the pre-recorded lectures and carefully read the assigned materials. The instructors will present key points before introducing a series of activities and question and answer. Students are encouraged to bring specific questions they may have to discuss during the session.

11:00am - 12:00pm – Varieties of and Ethics in Fieldwork

In this session we discuss our conception of field research as entailing repeated shifts among research design, data collection, and data analysis, consider some of the implications of these shifts, and evaluate the benefits of iterated research design. We consider fieldwork’s heterogeneity – how it varies across contexts, researchers, projects, and points of time in the same project. Finally, we address how ethical challenges in the field go well beyond obtaining approval from your IRB.

Asynchronous Material (to listen to in preparation):
- Lecture: Introduction – What Is / Why Do Fieldwork (30 minutes)
  - Diana Kapiszewski
- Lecture: Ethics Before, During and After Fieldwork (30 minutes)
  - Lauren MacLean

Synchronous Activity:
- Activity: Developing and Practicing Your Project Pitch and Informed Consent (oral / written) (60 minutes)
  - Diana Kapiszewski and Lauren MacLean

Readings


**Additional Reference Material**


**12:15pm - 1:15pm – Why (Not) Do Digital Fieldwork?**

The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly disrupted the conduct of field research leading many scholars to adjust their research practices in order to advance their work. Some scholars shifted to conducting research “digitally”, using emerging communication technologies, and capitalizing on the increasing availability of digital data. As we develop new techniques for gathering data, new challenges and questions emerge. How can we protect both research subjects and researchers when working in digital spaces? Whose voices are silenced – and amplified – when fieldwork is conducted digitally? How does conducting human participant research digitally affect the process of gaining approval from Institutional Review Boards (IRBs)? How can our on-the-ground experience with data generation inform our use of digital tools and techniques and help us overcome barriers to employing them? How can researchers determine when it is safe, ethical, and effective to resume on-the-ground fieldwork?

**Asynchronous Material (to explore in preparation)**

• 22.2.1 Explore: Digital Fieldwork website

**Synchronous Activity:**

• Panel / Q&A: Virtual / Digital Fieldwork (60 minutes)
  ○ Jennifer Cyr, Diana Kapiszewski, Diana Kim, Lauren MacLean

**Readings**

• 22.2.2 Abrams, K. M., Wang, Z., Song, Y. J., & Galindo-Gonzalez, S. (2015). Data richness trade-offs between face-to-face, online audiovisual, and online text-only focus groups. *Social Science Computer Review, 33*(1), 80-96.

• 22.2.3 Bampton, Roberta, Cowton, Christopher J. and Downs, Yvonne (2013). The e-interview in qualitative research. In: *Advancing social and business research methods with new media technology*. IGI Global, Hershey, PA, USA, pp. 329343. ISBN 9781466639188

**Additional Reference Material**
1:30pm - 2:30pm – Collecting, Generating, Managing Data from Fieldwork

This session considers how to prepare for field research and how to operate in the field. We discuss how scholars can begin to generate a Data Collection Plan (DCP) and a Data Management Plan (DMP) even before leaving for the field. We also examine various challenges that scholars encounter while operating in the field, and consider strategies for addressing them, and for successfully collecting, generating, and managing data in the field.

Asynchronous Material (to listen to and explore to in preparation)
- Lecture: Preparing and Operating in the Field (30 minutes)
  - Diana Kapiszewski and/or Lauren MacLean
- Lecture: Capturing and Managing Data (30 minutes)
  - Diana Kapiszewski
- Explore: Managing Qualitative Social Science Data

Synchronous Activity:
- Activity: Data Collection Plan (60 minutes)
  - Large group review of key points
  - Breakout rooms of 3-4 people to practice operationalization for own projects
  - Large group discussion and Q&A
  - Diana Kapiszewski and Lauren MacLean

Readings

Additional Reference Material
Over two days we will establish the foundations for treating text as data in social science research. After an introduction explaining the scope and limitations of the approach, in particular how it differs from other forms of research that use text such as discourse analysis, computational linguistics, and psychology, we will address a set of model types that social scientists have found useful. In keeping with the course title, although we will be dealing with quantitative tools, we will emphasize intuition and substantive application over statistical or algorithmic concerns. As far as possible, we will not assist the computer’s text analysis; it will assist ours. We end with a general discussion of how to embed text analyses into a range of research designs. This session will work best if you are ready to bring a wide range of project ideas, at all degrees of bakedness.

The course will be a mixture of video lectures, live question and answer sessions, and in class coding in groups. We will use the R language for the practical work, so some amount of experience with the language will be helpful. The videos should be viewed before class. Assigned readings are designed to be read after class to provide more depth to the lecture, although you are welcome to read them beforehand if you want. Slides for the lectures will be made available as pdf and these will contain links to a wider range of reference material.

The ten sessions listed below will be of rather different length, depending on the length of questions and answers, how the practicals go, and other factors. However, I expect that sessions 1-5 will be on day 1. If time becomes tight, we may skip or curtail sessions 7 and 9 as these are better taken as courses in themselves while being more technically demanding and substantively less relevant than the rest. Let’s see...

While there are no formal office hours the instructor will be available outside class time (in the EST time zone) to discuss topics relevant to the course that we do not find time for in the day. You are welcome to ask questions individually or as groups.

Session 1

Lecture: The very idea of text as data
Q&A on the lecture

Reading:

- 23.1.1 Grimmer and Stewart 2013 ‘Text as Data: The Promise and Pitfalls of Automatic Content Analysis Methods for Political Documents’ Political Analysis.
Session 2

Lecture: Deal with text as statistical data
Q&A on the lecture

Session 3

Lecture: Explore text with your computer
Q&A on lecture

Practical: Storing and manipulating documents, types, tokens, collocations, keywords, and kwics

Readings:

- 23.3.1 The *quanteda* quick start guide: https://quanteda.io/articles/quickstart.html

Session 4

Lecture: Analyze text with dictionary-based content analysis
Lecture: Evaluating dictionary-based content analyses
Q&A on the lectures

Practical: Constructing and evaluating dictionary-based analyses

Readings:

Session 5

Lecture: Learn the dictionary using topic models
Lecture: Evaluating topic models
Q&A on the lecture

Readings:


Practical: Constructing and evaluating topic models
Monday, June 21
Module 24 – Interpretive Methods I: Discourse Analysis and Ideology
Lisa Wedeen and William Mazzarella

This two-module sequence (Module 24 and 28) provides students with an introduction to various modes of discourse analysis. Students will learn to “read” texts while becoming familiar with contemporary thinking about interpretation, narrative, genre, and critique. In the first four sessions we shall explore the following methods: Wittgenstein’s understanding of language as activity and its practical relevance to ordinary language-use analysis (including theories of “performativity”); Foucault’s “interpretive analytics” with hands-on exercises applying his genealogical method; theories of ideology and the methods of ideology critique; anthropological lessons for participant observation in political science. The last two sessions will be devoted to analysis of moving images and media forms. The goal is to provide tools for interpretive skills necessary when dealing with film and other moving image media.

11:00am – 12.30pm Session One: Ordinary Language Use Analysis (Wedeen)

This session introduces participants to Ludwig Wittgenstein’s thought and its relationship to ordinary language-use methods. We shall focus on several key ways in which Wittgensteinian-inspired methods can be used in ethnographic and analytical research. Among the questions we shall ask are: What is the “value added” of concentrating on language? Why is understanding language as an activity important? How can social scientists grapple with vexed issues of intention? What does “performative” mean, and how do political theories about language as performative differ from discussions of performance? How can social scientists uninterested in taking on new jargon use this kind of political theory to further their theoretical and empirical work?


12:50pm – 2:20pm Session Two: Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

This session introduces participants to the techniques of Foucauldian discourse analysis or “interpretive analytics.” Participants will learn how to conduct a discourse analysis, what the underlying assumptions of such an analysis are, and how these techniques can be used to advance political inquiry. The session will consider both the power and limitations of the
method, the ways in which it differs from other modes of interpretation, and its advantages over content analysis.


24.2.3 For this class: please revisit King, Keohane and Verba’s *Designing Social Inquiry* and have this text ready for a class exercise. If you are unfamiliar with this book, we shall discuss that too—from a Foucauldian discourse analysis perspective.

**Recommended:**


2:40pm – 4.10pm Session Three: Ideology  
William Mazzarella, University of Chicago

What is ideology and how does it structure public culture and everyday life? What is the relation between ideology and media, and between ideology and political economy? How does ideology enable or interrupt desire, imagination, and attachment? Is there anything ‘beyond’ or ‘behind’ ideology and, if there isn’t, then what grounds critical analysis (since it might simply be yet another example of ideology)?

**Required background reading:**


HOMEWORK
(for completion before Day 2)

Pre-recorded lecture: Causal questions

This pre-recorded lecture will unpack the different kinds of causal questions that we can ask using the causal models framework. These include questions about causal effects and about causal pathways, framed for an individual case, for a population of cases, or for a subgroup of cases (those that meet some condition).

Pre-recorded lecture: How to define queries in CausalQueries

This pre-recorded lecture explains how to define a causal query in the CausalQueries package. We will introduce the functions with which participants can query their own models and describe how to write causal questions using CQ syntax. The questions might be of the sort, "What is the probability that X caused Y?" or, "If we manipulate the value of X, would the value of Y change?" Querying models will allow participants to make case- and population-level inferences using the CausalQueries package.


DAY 2

IV. Causal questions

11:00-11:45am Q&A on Causal Questions

An opportunity to ask questions about the material on types of causal questions and defining causal queries in the CausalQueries package.

V. Data and estimation

11:45-12:20pm Lecture: Data structures: “qualitative,” “quantitative,” and mixed data
In this lecture and discussion, we will outline the wide range of forms that data can take when updating a causal model. These data structures include what we might think of as “qualitative,” within-case data, such as data on mediating variables within a single case; what we might consider large-N “quantitative” data, such as data on X and Y for many cases; and mixtures of the two, such as data on X and Y for many cases and on mediators for a small subset of cases.

12:20-1:05pm Lecture: Working with data in CausalQueries

Building on the previous session, this session will teach students how to 1) create data with CQ and 2) shape their datasets to be compatible with CQ.

BREAK: 1:05-1:20pm

1:20pm-2:35pm Lecture: How data help us answer our questions

So far, we have learned how to build a structural causal model, how to define questions, and how to bring in data. This lecture and discussion will provide some key intuitions for how causal inference from data operates within a causal model framework. How do data allow us to answer our causal questions? For instance, how does learning about a mediator variable in a causal model (say, between X and Y) provide leverage on X’s effect on Y? How does learning from data on a single case differ from learning from data on many cases?

BREAK: 2:35-2:50pm

2:50-4:00pm Lecture: How to update in CausalQueries

This session explains the basics of updating a model in CausalQueries: the arguments required (i.e., a model and observed data) and the output produced (i.e., an updated model with a data frame of the posterior distribution as returned by stan). We will learn how to do analyses, broadly speaking, correspond to within-case process tracing, to large-N correlational analysis, and the multi-method inference. Students do not need to be familiar with stan to follow the material in this session.

This module considers the differences among, unique features of, benefits of, and challenges inherent in employing more-interactive forms of data collection. These include techniques that mainly generate quantitative data, such as surveys, survey experiments, and field experiments, as well as various types of interviewing including one-on-one in-depth interviews, oral histories, and focus groups. Students will engage in activities related to creating and refining survey questions. A range of practical advice about conducting interviews will be offered, related to protocol development, respondent selection, conducting interviews, and post-interview activities. Each session is conducted with the understanding that participants have listened to the pre-recorded lectures and carefully read the assigned materials. The instructors will present key points before introducing a series of activities and question and answer. Students are encouraged to bring specific questions they may have to discuss during the session.

11:00am - 12:00pm – Conducting Surveys in the Field

This session discusses the comparative advantages and disadvantages of a variety of surveys and experiments in the field. We examine the challenges of sampling in different fieldsites and discuss strategies for do-it-yourself sampling frames. Then, the majority of this session focuses on actual question design. This is the hard work of conceptualization and measurement that will be very helpful to any researcher, even if you are never planning a survey in the field.

Asynchronous Material (to listen to in preparation):

- **Lecture**: Surveys / Survey Experiments / Field Experiments (30 minutes)
  - Lauren MacLean

Synchronous Activity:

- **Activity**: Fixing problematic survey questions (in groups of 5-6) (30 minutes)
  - Lauren MacLean
- **Activity**: Writing one close-ended survey question and one open-ended survey question for your own projects (in groups of 5-6) (30 minutes)
  - Lauren MacLean

Readings


Additional Reference Material
12:15pm - 1:15pm – Conducting Interviews

This session considers who scholars can prepare for, and conduct, one-on-one in-depth interviews. We consider the many challenges and opportunities that conducting interviews in the field entails and offer a range of practical advice on identifying respondents, writing interview protocols, and conducting interviews.

Asynchronous Material (to listen to in preparation)

- **Lecture**: Interviewing (45 minutes)
  - Diana Kapiszewski

Synchronous Activity:

- **Activity**: Writing interview questions for a fictitious project in small groups (20 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr and Diana Kapiszewski

- **Activity**: Independent writing of interview questions for your project (20 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr and Diana Kapiszewski

- **Question and Answer** (20 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr and Diana Kapiszewski

Readings


Additional Reference Material

1:30pm - 2:45pm – Focus Groups: A Practical Guide

Why does one choose to use focus groups in a research project? When does it make sense to use them? When might it not? What are the key points to keep in mind when organizing focus groups? This session is oriented toward the practical use of focus groups. Lectures will help you understand when and how to use focus groups. The group session, by contrast, will focus on exercises and help to answer any specific questions you might have on the use of focus groups in your project.

Asynchronous Material (to listen to in preparation)
- **Lecture**: When to Use Focus Groups (45 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr
- **Lecture**: Key Points to Consider When Preparing for and Carrying out Focus Groups (45 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr

Synchronous Activity:
- **Activity**: Identifying when a focus group is appropriate to use (25 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr
- **Activity**: Creating a data collection plan for focus group (25 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr
- **Activity**: Creating a question protocol (25 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr

Readings
- 26.3.2 Colucci, Erminia. 2007. “‘Focus Groups can be Fun’: The Use of Activity-Oriented Questions in Focus Groups Discussions.” *Qualitative Health Research* 17(10): 1422-1433.

Additional Reference Material
Tuesday, June 22
Module 27 – Computer Assisted Text Analysis II
William Lowe

This is the second module in a two-day sequence establishing the foundations for treating text as data in social science research.

Session 6

Lecture: Learn a semantic space using word embeddings
Q&A on the lecture

Practical: Constructing and using word embeddings


Session 7

Lecture: Get a tireless (but not so bright) research assistant with document classification
Lecture: Learn about sentiment by counting words
Q&A on the lectures

Practical: Document classification and simple sentiment analysis

Readings:


Session 8
Lecture: Line up documents with text scaling
Lecture: Project documents in space with multidimensional text scaling
Q&A on lectures

Readings:


Practical: Text scaling to infer policy preferences

Session 9

Lecture: Get text using an API
Lecture: Get text from the web by scraping
Q&A on lectures

Practical: Some small demonstrations of web scraping, and hints to get you further

Session 10

Discussion (live) with Q&A: Putting it all together: Research designs using text as data analyses
11.00am – 12.30pm Session Four: Participant Observation
William Mazzarella, University of Chicago

The term 'participant observation' seems paradoxical: how can one both be participating and observing, immersed and analytical, at the same time? Does participation give greater authority to analysis, or does it imply sacrificing objectivity? What is the relation between being in a situation and interpreting a situation? How can we ever claim to have access to other worlds, even as participants, across lines of difference? Is the researcher’s job to uncover some kind of underlying order – of ‘society,’ ‘culture,’ ‘history,’ or ‘ideology,’ – or is the point of participation to call such abstractions into question?

Required background reading

- 28.1.2 Sasha Newell, ‘Ethnography in a Shell Game: Turtles All the Way Down in Abidjan’ in *Cultural Anthropology* 34(3): 299-327 (2019)

12:50pm – 2.20pm Session Five: Documentary Film: Analysis and Methods
Rochona Majumdar, University of Chicago

As the most important mass medium of the twentieth and twenty first centuries film and other media has often been used by researchers interested in questions of democracy and dictatorship, minority and majoritarian politics, gender and race based politics. Session five centers around documentaries. Session six introduces students to some key debates in the emerging field referred to as "new" media studies.

2.40pm – 4.10pm Session Six: “New” Media Studies
Rochona Majumdar, University of Chicago


HOMEWORK
(to be completed before DAY 3)

Exercise: Defining and estimating queries

In this exercise, to be completed before the start of Day 3, students will practice defining and estimating causal queries within the CausalQueries package, using data provided by the instructors, and interpreting the answer.

Pre-recorded lecture: Setting restrictions, parameters, priors: conceptual and operational

In this pre-recorded lecture, we will dive further into the weeds of defining models in CausalQueries. We will learn about how to embed into our models richer background information about causal relations, such as beliefs about what kinds of causal effects are possible or what kinds of effects are more likely than others. We do this by setting restrictions or setting priors. To do single-case process-tracing, moreover, we must embed into a model our beliefs about causal effects in the population by setting parameters. In this session, first, we will describe how to restrict a model. Participants will learn how to use the built-in functions to impose restrictions (e.g., monotonicity or non-interaction restrictions) and write their own customized restrictions using CQ syntax. We will then explain how to set a particular value for the parameters in a model for the purposes of process tracing. In the last part of this session, we will provide a brief introduction to the Dirichlet distribution and show how to specify Dirichlet priors within the package.

DAY 3

VI. Making models II: Priors, restrictions, confounding

11:00-11:30am Debrief on updating exercise

In this session, we will “compare notes” on the updating homework exercise. This will be a chance to see how your answers compare to others’ and ask questions about any issues you ran into in updating your models from the data.

11:30am-12:30pm Q&A: Setting parameters, restrictions, and priors

A chance to ask questions about setting model parameters, restrictions, and priors to embed further prior causal knowledge into a model.
10:30-11:00am Lecture: Confounding: conceptualizing and operationalizing in CausalQueries

In this session, we will discuss the conceptual underpinnings and analysis of confounding in causal models. What is unobserved confounding in a causal model? Why do we need to allow for it in our models? And how do we build unobserved confounding into our models in CausalQueries?

11:00-11:30am Break

11:30-12:00pm Exercise: making models with priors and restrictions and confounding

In this session, we will continue working on the models developed on Day 1. Participants will practice including the several (optional) forms of additional information that can be specified in a model within CausalQueries: restrictions, parameters, priors, and confounding.

12:00-12:30pm Break

12:30-1:00pm Exercise: updating models with priors and restrictions

In this session, we get more practice updating causal models using data (provided by instructors), but this time using models with more prior information embedded in them via restrictions and priors. We will compare findings when using an unrestricted model with flat priors to the findings when restrictions and priors are specified to see how richer background information changes the inferences we draw from the data.

1:00-1:30pm Wrap-up
Wednesday, June 23
Module 30 – Designing and Conducting Field Research (III): Archives and Analysis
Jennifer Cyr, Diana Kapiszewski, Diana Kim, and Lauren MacLean

Drawing on the previous module, this module compares the use of interviews and focus groups. It then considers fieldwork for archival research, focusing on the practical tasks that first-time researchers may anticipate. It discusses practical and methodological issues involved in searching for, collecting and organizing, and analyzing archival materials, and the politics and ethics of access and conservation. Finally, the session considers various strategies for analyzing collected data, writing, and presenting initial findings to different audiences while conducting fieldwork. It also considers how to retool a project in the field, and assess progress toward completing field research. Each session is conducted with the understanding that participants have listened to the pre-recorded lectures and carefully read the assigned materials. The instructors will present key points before introducing a series of activities and question and answer. Students are encouraged to bring specific questions they may have to discuss during the session.

11:00am - 11:45am – Interviews or Focus Groups: How to Decide?
With interviews and focus groups, a researcher seeks to talk to people. Under what circumstances does it make sense to talk one-on-one, and when are group interactions a better idea? In this session, we consider the conditions under which focus groups may be more appropriate than interviews in a research design, and vice versa.

Asynchronous Material (to listen to in preparation):

- Lecture: How are Focus Groups and Interviews Different? (30 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr

Synchronous Activity:

- Activity: Comparing / Choosing Between Interviews and FGs (45 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr and Diana Kapiszewski

Readings


Additional Reference Material

- 30.1.2 Bauer, K. W., Yang, Y. W., & Austin, S. B. (2004). “How can we stay healthy when you’re throwing all of this in front of us?” Findings from focus groups and interviews in middle schools on environmental influences on nutrition and physical activity. *Health Education & Behavior*, 31(1), 34-46.
12:00pm - 1:15pm – Participant Observation, Oral History, and Archival Research

This session introduces participants to the process of planning fieldwork aimed at collecting and analyzing archival evidence. Where, when and how does one start? What does one actually do at an archive? What are concrete strategies for time management, navigating physical and digitized archives, note taking, organizing and storing data, as well as ways to efficiently write-up and effectively present findings? In addition to discussing these questions, this session will address research challenges relating to the politics and ethics of archival access and conservation. *Given the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, emphasis will be placed on remote access archival research and digitized sources.

Asynchronous Material (to listen to in preparation)

- Lecture: The Value of Everyday Ethnography and Participant Observation in the Field (10 minutes)
  - Lauren MacLean
- Lecture: How Oral History is Unique And Why Use It (5 minutes)
  - Lauren MacLean

Synchronous Activity:

- Lecture: Why and How to do Archival Research? (20 minutes)
  - Diana Kim
- Activity: Entering, Being In, and Leaving a (Virtual) Archive (55 minutes)
  - Diana Kim

Readings


Additional Reference Material

- 30.2.3 APSA Comparative Politics Newsletter, Fall 2019. “Comparative Politics and History”


**1:30pm - 2:45pm – Analyzing and Retooling in the Field**

This session considers various strategies for engaging in data analysis, beginning to write, and presenting initial findings to different audiences while conducting fieldwork. It also considers how to retool a project in the field, and assess progress toward completing field research. It also serves as the wrap-up session for the three-module sequence.

**Asynchronous Material (to listen to in preparation)**

- **Lecture**: Analyzing, Iterating, Re-tooling, Assessing Progress in the Field (45 minutes)
  - Diana Kapiszewski and Lauren MacLean

**Synchronous Activity**

- **Activity**: Review table on Identifying and Diagnosing Research Design Opportunities and Problems; then apply to a few examples from your experience (we will have a few examples ready too) (30 minutes)
  - Diana Kapiszewski and Lauren MacLean
- **General Q&A from all three modules** (45 minutes)
  - Jennifer Cyr, Diana Kapiszewski, Diana Kim, Lauren MacLean

**Readings**

- 30.3.2 Kapiszewski, D., MacLean, L.M. and Read, B.L. Forthcoming. “Dynamic Research Design: Iteration in Field Based Inquiry.” *Comparative Politics*.

**Additional Reference Material**

How does one go about finding a topic for a dissertation, book, or article?

Little assistance will be found in the annals of social science methodology. Consigned to metaphor – bells, brainstorm, dreams, flashes, impregnations, light bulbs, showers, sparks, and whatnot – inspiration falls outside the traditional rubric of methodology.

One might imagine that insights could be garnered from published work. However, articles and books are generally unrevealing. For professional reasons, authors of scientific studies are forced to engage in an elaborate and stylized game of deception. In order to avoid charges of “curve-fitting” or “fishing” they must adopt the Dogma of Immaculate Conception. Accordingly, they narrate their project as if the theory was hatched in complete isolation from the data used to test it.

Published work follows a standard protocol. Typically, the author begins by outlining a topic or research question. Then, she states a general theory, and from thence a specific hypothesis and research design. Finally, the evidence is presented and discussed, and concluding thoughts are offered. Scientific studies thus present an appearance of order and predictability, a step-by-step descent down the ladder of abstraction.

This is nothing at all like the progress of most research – which, in our experience, is circuitous and unpredictable. Unfortunately, we learn little about this process as it is not in the author’s interest to divulge deviations from scientific orthodoxy. The early stages of the scientific journey therefore remain mysterious.

To be clear, there is no right or wrong way to begin. All that matters is where one ends up. And yet, where one ends up has a lot to do with where one starts out. Decisions made at the beginning of a research project structure everything that follows, as changing topics midstream is costly. Once one has developed knowledge and expertise in an area it is difficult to re-tool. And once one has gathered evidence it is difficult, expensive, and sometimes impossible to revisit research sites, i.e., archives, field sites, interviewees, or respondents.

The choice of topic serves as a critical juncture. Once that threshold is crossed the research process is highly path-dependent. It follows that the earliest stage of research, where a topic is identified, is the most crucial stage of all. Nothing of scientific interest is likely to arise from research on a topic that is trivial, redundant, or intractable. No matter how well-executed, little can be expected from it.

This module is focused on the search part of research.
Before the module, please read John Gerring and Jason Seawright, *Finding Your Social Science Project* (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming), which will be posted on the IQMR site. Please also write a short (one or two-page) description of a “blue sky” (novel) idea for research. It should be a new idea, something you come up with that is independent of your dissertation research. Your write-up should include a central hypothesis, a theory (or explanation), and a preliminary research design.

The assigned reading offers a lot of advice about how to do come up with ideas for research. This is an opportunity to try out some of these techniques. In any case, keep a record of your progress and provide a one-paragraph description of how you came up with the idea. What were you doing? (If it was several things, what was the sequence?) Where did your inspiration come from? Was there a lightbulb moment?

You needn’t hand in the project idea but please have a copy accessible on your laptop. We will use these proposals as the basis for discussion over Zoom (probably in break-out rooms).

The module will include some lecturing, punctuated by discussion. We will also think about some research domains and discuss various ideas for how to come with ideas for research in those domains.

**Session 1: Getting Ideas**
11.00am – 12.15pm

In this session, I will do some lecturing based loosely on Chapters 1-7 of the book. This will cover a brief overview of our topic – what others have done, our (Jay and my) approach to it, current practices, and various strategies and heuristics for stimulating the creative juices. Note that I won’t attempt to cover all the material in the book; indeed, it would be impossible to do so. My main objective is to refresh your memories (and my own) and provide a basis for discussion. So please come prepared with questions and comments – and personal experiences.

**Session 2: Your Ideas**
12.45pm – 2.00pm

In this session, we will break into Zoom sections in which you will present your ideas (as discussed above). Then we will reconvene to discuss some of your proposals and your overall experience.

**Session 3: Theorizing and Refining**
2.30pm – 4.00pm

In this session, I will do some lecturing based loosely on Chapters 8-11 of the book. As previously, I cannot cover the material in depth but I will put up some slides in the hopes that this will jog memories and elicit discussion.
Wednesday, June 23
Module 32 – Re-thinking Small-N Comparisons
Erica S. Simmons and Nicholas Rush Smith

Secondary Instructors:
Mala Htun (University of New Mexico)
Francesca Jensenius (University of Oslo)
Thea Riofrancos (Providence College)
Rachel Schwartz (Otterbein University)
Joe Soss (University of Minnesota – Twin Cities)

Qualitative comparative methods—and specifically controlled qualitative comparisons—have been central to some of the most influential works of social science. Yet, even as controlled comparisons have produced lasting insights and continue to dominate research designs, they are not the only form of comparison that scholars utilize. There is little methodological guidance in political science, however, for how to design comparisons that do not rely on control as a central element, and little epistemological insight on why such comparisons might be compelling. As a result, scholars often eschew research designs premised on non-controlled comparisons and rarely explain the utility of such comparisons when they do use them. The consequences for our understandings of politics are severe. When we limit the kinds of comparisons we make, we necessarily constrain the questions we ask and limit the knowledge we produce.

In this session, we will explore logics of comparison that are not motivated by control. These logics are relevant to scholars working in both positivist and interpretivist traditions. The session will be driven by four questions: What kinds of questions lend themselves to non-controlled comparisons? How should we design non-controlled comparative research? In particular, how should we think through case selection? What kinds of insights about the world are non-controlled comparisons positioned to produce?

Three central components of the comparative method will frame our discussion. First, we will encourage participants to rethink what a case is. We will do so by challenging dominant geographic conceptions of cases and engaging alternative types of cases, including political processes (how things happen), practices (what people do), meanings (how people interact with symbolic systems), and concepts (how people order the world). Second, we will explore what it might look like to expand our notion of what it means to compare. We will push ourselves to conceptualize comparison as a method that includes greater attention to the lived experiences of the people we study, the political concepts they deploy, and the ways those experiences and concepts shape their political worlds. Finally, we will consider the explanatory goals of political science. While many studies emphasize variations in outcomes (and we often encourage graduate students to think in these terms), in this session we will think through what it might mean to expand the possibilities to include variations (or lack thereof) in political processes, practices, meanings, and concepts.
In exploring the value of non-controlled approaches to comparison the intention of this session is not to deny the utility of existing modes of comparison. Rather, it is to begin specifying logics of comparative inquiry that are available to scholars beyond the already well-defined logics of controlled comparison. In so doing, we suggest that by expanding modes of qualitative comparative inquiry, social scientists can both uncover new questions and drive innovations in how we answer existing questions. It is often difficult to tackle ambitious questions about power and governance—issues at the core of political science inquiry—while looking for cases that meet the standards of controlled comparison. If we can expand how we think about comparison, we can expand how we think about the world, and that will improve our understanding of it as a result.

This session will explore some of the tools to conceive of and develop these kinds of comparative approaches to small-N qualitative research.

Assigned Readings:

- 32.1.1 Introduction from *Undermining the State from Within: The Institutional Legacies of Civil War in Central America*, Rachel Schwartz, Otterbein University

Please read the following chapters from *Rethinking Comparison: Innovative Methods for Qualitative Political Research*. Cambridge University Press. Forthcoming.

- 32.1.2 Chapter 1: Rethinking Comparison, Erica S. Simmons, University of Madison – Wisconsin and Nicholas Rush Smith, City University of New York – City College

- 32.1.3 Chapter 5: On Casing a Study versus Studying a Case Joe Soss, University of Minnesota – Twin Cities

- 32.1.4 Chapter 6: From Cases to Sites: Studying Global Processes in Comparative Politics Thea Riofrancos, Providence College

- 32.1.5 Chapter 10: Comparative Analysis for Theory Development Mala Htun, University of New Mexico, Francesca R. Jensenius, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

**Project research designs**

Students will read designs for designated breakout group for crit session (see below)

Module Assignments:

At least one week prior to the module date (by Wednesday, June 16), students are required to upload a project proposal to a shared Dropbox (details forthcoming) that will form the basis of discussion for the “crit” session that will close out the module. The proposal can be an early
idea for the student’s dissertation project, a reworking of an initial dissertation project after the student has completed fieldwork and rethought their approach, or a wholly new project altogether. The proposal should be three double-spaced pages maximum. It should have the following components:

- A research topic
  - The description of a research topic could take a variety of forms but it should describe as precisely as possible the specific thing the student wants to investigate. For example, the student might pose the research topic as a specific question the student seeks to answer. Note that the research topic or research question need not be causal in nature but could be about how political processes function, how political concepts are used, or how political meanings work.

- A working hypothesis or tentative argument
  - The hypothesis or tentative argument should be as specific as possible to the topic under investigation. This section should also make it clear how the hypothesis or answer, if borne out by research, would affect how we think of the research topic, concept, or process beyond the specific research site.

- A comparative research design
  - Students may either propose a research design based upon the logics of a controlled comparison or deploy a non-controlled comparative strategy as outlined in the module readings. Regardless of type of comparison, students should explain a) why this is an appropriate type of comparison for answering the research question, b) potential limitations of the type of comparison being deployed, and c) strategies the student could use to respond to these limitations.

- A discussion of the project’s stakes
  - The student should describe why the project matters for either intellectual, political, practical, or personal reasons. How would studying the project in the way described in this proposal affect our knowledge of politics in terms of what we know about the specific topic, how we understand a body of scholarly literature, or how we would act politically in the world?

Module Timeline:

11:00 – 12:30: Introductory session

The introductory section will feature a presentation of a forthcoming edited volume with Cambridge University Press, Rethinking Comparison, by the volume’s editors. The presentation will feature discussion of the uses of controlled comparisons for political inquiry, their potential limitations, and an overview of how rethinking what a case is, what appropriate units of analysis are, and what the outcomes are we seek to explain can enhance political inquiry. Additionally, the module will feature a discussion of a research project on civil war violence in Central America that won the Gabriel A. Almond Dissertation Award while not relying on controlled comparisons.
1:00 – 2:30: Rethought Comparisons
Three authors from the forthcoming volume Rethinking Comparison will present their chapters, how they developed their research projects, and how the comparative research strategy they describe can be usefully deployed. Each faculty member will present for approximately ten minutes, leaving the majority of the session open for Q&A.

2:45 – 3:45: “Crit” session
Students will be assigned ahead of time to a small breakout group (approximately 10 students, depending on session size) by the module leaders. Led by one of the module’s faculty presenters, each group will discuss several students’ proposed research designs (to be selected ahead of time by faculty discussion leaders) for a group discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of each research design and how they could be improved, as part of a general discussion for how the range of small- n comparisons could be expanded.

3:45 – 4:00: Wrap-Up Discussion
Return to whole group for concluding discussion.
This module serves as an introduction to the empirical study of social networks. It begins with the very basics, covering ways to describe positions within networks and networks as a whole. Next, it surveys recent empirical research that explores the role of networks in outcomes such as development, protests, and conflict, and identifies many open questions across the social sciences. Finally, it presents an overview of tools that researchers can use to gather original network data in the field. The second module, Social Network Analysis II, will then walk a researcher through the tools to actually use the network data gathered—how to store it, visualize it, describe it, and analyze it.

The asynchronous component of this pair of modules entails readings to complete before each module, a problem set-style exercise to complete between the two modules, software to install, and a tutorial to consult in advance to practice using the software. While meeting synchronously, content will be introduced through interactive lectures with opportunities for live questions throughout.

11:00am – 12:20pm Introduction to Social Network Analysis

This session introduces the terminology of social network analysis. It focuses on node- and network-level features, both how to describe them precisely and what they mean substantively.

Required reading:


Recommended:


This session presents an overview of empirical research that examines the relevance of session one’s network features in the real world. It highlights many open questions and flags research designs that could help to answer them.

**Required reading:**


**Recommended:**


**2:40pm - 4:00pm Collecting Network Data in the Field**

This session serves as a primer on collecting original social network data via surveys in field settings. It covers a variety of design issues, including which ties to measure and how to do so.

**Required reading:**


Recommended:


We live in challenging times that are ready made for comparative historical analysis. (CHA) A failed insurrection in the world’s oldest democracy; a pandemic disrupting global supply chains; China's ascendancy altering geopolitical dynamics, and global warming potentially disrupting everything. This course provides guidance for scholars interested in analyzing such macro-historical phenomena and are looking to CHA for methodological advice. It uses CHA as a broad umbrella term that includes literatures as diverse as historical sociology, American political development, IR constructivism, global history, historical institutionalism, comparative political economy, democratization studies and basically any literature interested in temporal dynamics or historical processes.

CHA’s emphasis on history has three implications on which this course elaborates:

- **Exploration**: CHA investigates complex, often changing phenomena and thus relies on exploration to identify relevant questions. In studying historical changes, CHA is mindful that it also has to update the research questions that it investigates.

- **Time**: CHA employs very distinct temporal vocabulary to analyzes "objects in motion". This vocabulary draws on culturally embedded historical time (i.e. dates, events, periodization, directionality) and clock-like, context-independent physical time (i.e. tempo, duration, timing, sequencing, stages).

- **Abduction**: CHA places questions before methods and thus employs a more heterodox methodological tool sets to properly align its causal inference strategies with the ontological characteristics of the questions. It thus intermingles inductive insights with deductively derived hypothesis in a range of abductive causal inference strategies (i.e. historical explanations, path dependency, process tracing).

CHA’s methodologically heterodox translates in three distinct strands of CHA. These strands configure the aforementioned three elements in distinct ways:

- **Eventful Analysis**. It is the most interpretive, descriptive, and exploratory CHA strand. It tries to establish what is going on, elucidate existing concepts, and identify historical continuities and discontinuities. It pays close attention to historical time and draws on physical time to analyze the rhythms at which history unfolds.

- **Longue Durée Analysis**. It explores longer-term, slower moving patterns of historical change by using time series and panel data. It uses physical time to differentiate distinct trend patterns. It is the least developed strand in CHA and used by scholars focusing on long-term economic processes, emergence of representative institutions, evolutionary psychology and demographic factors.

- **Macro-Causal Analysis**. It is the least historical but also most established CHA strand. It focuses on cross-sectional variations by developing historically situated and theoretically grounded explanations. It also pays attention to the causal effects of various elements of physical time.
Reading:
• 34.0.2 Mahoney, James, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. 2003. Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 3-38.
• 34.0.3 Mahoney, James, and Kathleen Thelen, eds. 2015. Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis: Resilience, Diversity, and Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 3-36.

Pedagogy
The course uses flip classroom pedagogy to eliminate online lecturing and substituting it with break-out sessions. There will be no lectures. Students will prepare the content by either watching a few short lectures, and mostly by reading chapters from my forthcoming book. The material is deliberately kept short, to no more than 30 pages of reading for each sessions. The syllabus recommends supplemental reading for students with a deeper interest in the material. Students have the option to sign up for either an introductory or and advanced track. (Details for this sign up will be posted on the Blackboard course site) Both tracks participate in a joint 30 to 40 minute review session in each of the 90 minutes sessions. This review session will clarify and elaborate on issues that came up in the readings and on which students posted online. They might involve brief lectures elaborating on issues that came up in the online discussion, but it will not summarize the materials were expected to prepare. The two tracks then will split into separate smaller 4-8 student breakout sessions. The introductory track will employ group-based exercises meant to deepen the material covered in the readings. The advanced track will instead apply the material to research projects that students have to submit before the start of the IQMR. The advanced tracks is meant to help students apply the material directly to their own research projects. The final course webpage will provide further details. As a general rule of thumb, if you have minimal familiarity with CHA and not working on a CHA related project, sign up for the introductory track. If you had some exposure to CHA and are working on a CHA project, you might benefit from the advanced track. If you are unsure, feel free to contact me. (Markus.Kreuzer@Villanova.edu)

Module Content
Session 1: Historical Thinking: Using the Past to Explore the Present
Learning Objectives:
• CHA presumes that good research questions rarely pose themselves and therefore require some initial exploration, journalistic-like description, and ultimately establishing a baseline for our understanding of what is going on in macro historical phenomena. Historical thinking plays a central role in this exploratory research stage by helping answer the question of "Whether this time is different?" and if so in what particular ways.
This module explores the key elements of historical thinking. It shows how CHA scholars use the past to explore the present and help discover new unknown unknowns and new research questions.

Readings:


Session 2: Varieties of Time: Studying Objects in Motion

Learning Objectives:

- Historical thinking does not come naturally but is an acquired skill requiring learning a specific temporal vocabulary. Mastering this vocabulary and understanding time is just as crucial for doing CHA as mastering the mathematical vocabulary and probability theory is for doing statistics. And yet, we rarely provide clear conceptual differentiation underpinning this temporal vocabulary. This module discusses our cognitive biases that impede historical thinking. It differentiates different notions of historical time employed in CHA, how they differ from elements of physical time and how the complement each other. It also underscores the usefulness of data visualization to help detect interesting patterns in historical and physical time.

Readings:


Session 3: Eventful Analysis: Why Dates Matter
Learning Objectives:

- Eventful analysis is the most interpretive of the three CHA strands. It helps to address the following research tasks:
  - Description: Figuring out what precisely is going on, identify patterns to formulate research questions.
  - Elucidating concepts: constructing new concepts or updating existing ones
  - Periodization: pin-pointing historical continuities and discontinuities to help identify patterns of qualitative changes over time.
  - Directionality: do discontinuities add up to a broader arc that history is taking or not.

Readings:

- 34.3.2 Capoccia, G., & Ziblatt, D. (2010). The Historical Turn in Democratization Studies. Comparative Political Studies, 43(8–9), 931–46.
The course will walk students through how to collect social media data and how to use it robustly in social scientific research projects. The class will primarily be taught synchronously (i.e. ‘live’) via Zoom during the scheduled hours of the class (June 24th and 25th, 11am to 4pm Eastern).

Prior to the course, students will be asked to download the working manuscript *Social Media as Social Science Data*, along with the provided source code repository. Read the first and last chapters of the book, and any of the middle three chapters that are of particular interest to your research goals. In addition, students are asked to create accounts with Twitter’s Academic API a week in advance of the workshop (as it take several business days for that to be “approved”). Finally, students are asked to install an up-to-date version of Python 3, and a list of additional free software packages prior to the class so that we can hit the ground running.

**Module Schedule:**

11:00-11:30: Introductions, discussion of what each student wants to collect and use social media data for (this section will be revised based on the number of students, i.e. if the class is too large, we will skip individual project discussion for time).

11:30-12:15: Intro lecture on Social Media as Social Science Data: what it’s good for, what data is available, what the common methodological problems are that we run into.

12:15-1:30: Break

12:30-1:30: Integrated lecture and discussion of the ethics of social media data collection: review of IRB protocols on the matter, examples of tricky areas, the general ethics of scraping public data, the concerns of researcher trauma.

1:30-2:00: Break

2:00-3:00: Setting up a basic scraping infrastructure: scraping timelines, storing the JSON files, setting up a database for storing the data. Instructor will walk through basic examples, and then in real time help students get their own code working via screen sharing.

3:00-3:15: Break

3:15-4:00: Advanced streaming techniques: downloading by keyword, geocode, language. Basic network analysis.
This module introduces students to methods of discourse analysis employed by political theorists and historians of political thought and to critical approaches to intellectual history. Building on earlier modules on discourse analysis, the first session will introduce participants to different approaches to “reading” texts, and will examine debates over meaning, concepts, context, and the explanation of historical change, as well as engaging with ongoing debates about the politics of historiography. We will discuss the techniques of the Cambridge school and the German tradition of _Begriffsgeschichte_ (concept history). Participants will engage in a practical exercise of concept analysis during the second session of the day, and we will discuss their findings, and the methodological challenges they encountered in the final session of the day.

In both modules on Interpretation and History, we expect students to come to the sessions having completed all of the required readings. These two sessions will be conducted in the style of an academic seminar rather than in lecture form, with a view to allowing your research interests to shape our discussion of the readings.

**Session 1: Interpretive debates in intellectual history**

This module introduces students to methods of discourse analysis employed by political theorists and historians of political thought and to critical approaches to intellectual history. Building on earlier modules on discourse analysis, the first session will introduce participants to different approaches to “reading” texts, and will examine debates over meaning, concepts, context, and the explanation of historical change, as well as engaging with ongoing debates about the politics of historiography. We will discuss the techniques of the Cambridge school and the German tradition of _Begriffsgeschichte_ (concept history). Participants will engage in a practical exercise of concept analysis, and we will discuss their findings, and the methodological challenges they encountered in the final session of the day.

**Required Readings**


Practical exercise

Students will be asked to work collaboratively (in groups of up to 4 participants) to develop a history of a particular concept. You will use online resources to investigate the meaning of the concept in question, how it has changed over time, and the kinds of conceptual challenges that these changes pose for scholars doing historical work. We would ask you to make note not only of this concept history, but also of the challenges you faced when attempting to investigate it. Naturally, the limited time you will have available to complete this task will pose a significant constraint, but the goal is for you to come face to face with some of the challenges of this kind of work. Groups will be able to choose one of two concepts, which we will circulate in advance. We hope that by the second session of the day the similarities and divergences in your respective experiences will allow for a fruitful debriefing and discussion of the methods of intellectual history.

Session 2: Debrief and further discussion

Participants will have some time at the beginning of this session to finish writing up their findings from the morning. We will then discuss the exercise in the light of the morning’s readings and of discussions of the various ways in which one might “empoit” your research findings.

Required Readings


Suggested further readings


• 36.2.8 Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).
Social Network Analysis I taught how to think about the importance of networks and how to design a study to collect relevant network information from the field. This module assumes you have network data and teaches the first stages of analyzing it. It begins by presenting tools for storing network data and representing the network with pictures using Gephi. Then it will offer two sessions devoted to analyzing the network in R. These sessions assume basic familiarity with R. They will cover how to measure the node and network attributes covered in Social Network Analysis I and how to assess the significance of patterns that appear in the network.

11:00am – 12:20pm Visualizing Network Data

This session will cover how to store network data collected in the field and how to visualize the measured network(s). We will use the opensource software called Gephi to make our network visualizations. We’ll pay special attention to making figures that help us as researchers notice meaningful patterns in the data and that can serve as polished representations of our data in published research.

Required readings/tasks:

- Download Gephi, available at https://gephi.org
- Grandjean, M. “Gephi: Introduction to Network Analysis and Visualization.” Available at www.martingrandjean.ch/gephi-introduction/

*** 40 Minute Lunch Break***

1:00pm - 2:20pm Working with Network Data in R Part I

This session presents basic tools for analyzing networks in R. It assumes only a basic familiarity with R. It will teach ways to calculate node and network level attributes (degree, centrality, path lengths, etc.).

Required readings/tasks:

- Download R, available at www.r-project.org/
- Download RStudio, available at www.rstudio.com
- Install R package igraph, documentation at https://igraph.org/r/
Recommended:

- 37.2.1 Chapter 1, A quick reminder of R Basics, in Ognyanova, Katherine. “Network Analysis and Visualization with R and igraph.” Available at https://kateto.net/networks-r-igraph

*** 20 Minute Coffee Break***

2:40pm – 4:00pm Working with Network Data in R Part II

This session will wrap up the presentation of basic tools for calculating node and network level attributes. Then it will present more advanced tools for characterizing patterns in the network. Should we be surprised by the number of ties connecting friends of friends in our data? Are the many ties connecting people who share some attribute a coincidence? If we had surveyed more nodes, would our results be different?


Recommended:

- 37.3.2 Chapter 2, Networks in igraph, in Ognyanova, Katherine. “Network Analysis and Visualization with R and igraph.” Available at https://kateto.net/networks-r-igraph
Module Content

Session 4: Macro-Causal and Longue Durée Analysis

Learning Objectives:

- Longue durée analysis takes its inspiration from the French Annals historians and draws on notions of slower moving, long-term changes analyzed in natural history (i.e. history focused on more inanimate rather than cultural objects). It commonly uses time series data to identify long-term, cross-sectional trends. Such trends expand the time scale and thereby liberate scholars from what Raymond Grew called the "tyranny of what happened."
- Macro-causal analysis focuses less on exploring patterns of change and more on causal patterns. It tries to identify complex, historically situated causal pathways. It seeks to break out from what Pierson called short/short explanations.

Readings:


Session 5: What About Causality? CHA and Abduction

Learning Objectives:

- Despite its emphasis on exploration, CHA remains committed to provide theoretically grounded explanations that are empirically validated through transparent and replicable causal inference strategies. However, given its commitment to place questions before methods, CHA has been unwilling to define itself in terms of a single causal inference strategy. It has engaged in a long-standing dialogue with qualitative and quantitative research designs about their appropriateness for the particular phenomena studies. CHA offers no clear answer about which strategy is preferable to others but instead tries to align methods with questions. This module therefore provides a broad map to guide how CHA two most widely used causal inference strategies - historical explanations and process tracing - are to be deployed.
Session 6: Historical Explanations

Learning Objectives:

- CHA uses, what several scholars call, historical explanations that increasingly have been influenced by path dependency. Historical explanations are particularly well suited for explaining historical change. They recognize that change itself is too fluid to be easily explained and thus needs to be analytically differentiated into periods of discontinuities and continuities. They explain discontinuities through a distinct set of analytical steps whose goal is to illuminate the generative process that produced a particular discontinuity. Similarly, historical explanations view continuity as something that needs to be explained, rather than to be assumed, by looking for the increasing return mechanisms that reproduce a particular set of events.

- As the prior modules have underscored, CHA is very heterodox indeed. This makes it flexible but also fuzzier than other more variance-based methodologies. We therefore look back to see how CHA might be low tech, when it comes to its causal inference strategies, but also high-brow and far more resilient when comes to its ontological assumptions. Taking dates and zips zones seriously might limit the use of variance based research designs but it also reduces the confounders that result from backgrounding time and geography.

Readings:

Module schedule

11:00-11:45: Downloading additional elements of Tweets: images, video, images, hashtags, urls.

11:45-12:00: Break

12:00-1:00: Content analysis techniques and social media data: introducing naïve topic analysis, and neural nets for trained topic modeling.

1:00-1:30: Break

1:30-2:30: Geocoded data analysis: combination of lecture and discussion of how to code for specific tasks.

2:30-2:45: Break

2:45-4:00: Open time for one-on-one work with instructor to help get any code working, or discuss specific project plans and needs.
This module introduces students to the challenges of working with materials drawn from different social, cultural, and historical settings, and explores creative interpretive strategies for addressing these challenges. Students will be introduced to the basics of the historical method, and will be encouraged to think about how a careful attention to questions of temporality can shape and reveal new avenues in their empirical research. All three sessions will be attentive to the problem of analyzing historical materials from the standpoint of the present. Shifting meanings over time, and transformations in the criteria for judgment, present particular problems for historical researchers. In light of these challenges, students will be invited to think through the strategies available for working in a partial archive, with attention to the virtues and pitfalls of creatively thinking about historical source materials.

Session 1: History as social science: The study of structures and events

This session introduces students to the historical method, highlighting two key challenges to the study of historical events. Students will begin the session by working in groups to identify their own archival challenges, specifically related to two questions. First, how does the problem of temporality enter their work? And second, how do the events they study refashion the very structures of the societies on which their research is centered?

Required Readings


Session 2: The Politics of Historical Interpretation

At the core of historical research are questions of evidence, of both the power of the archive and the archive of power. This section explores key debates and controversies that have shaped the considerable theoretically informed literature on the shifting coordinates of historical evidence.
Required Readings


Session 3: Practical and interpretive challenges of archival research

This session will introduce students to the more mundane practical challenges that scholars face, as well as some of the hidden possibilities that await them in the course of archival research. The readings for this session are designed to give participants a sense of the importance of understanding the production of the archive itself. We will examine questions of interpretation raised by these readings as well as exploring how fleeting or fragmentary records might nevertheless yield a wealth of historical insights.

To conclude this session, we will invite participants to examine a brief archival fragment. The goal of this exercise will be to attempt to bring some of the discussion of the previous two days to bear on the examination of a historical document.

Required Readings


Suggested further readings


• 40.3.8 Randolph Head, “Knowing the State: The Transformation of Political Knowledge in Swiss Archives, 1450-1770,” *Journal of Modern History* 75 (2003): 745-82.


