Qualitative & Multi-Method Research

Contents

APSA-QMMR Section Officers

President: Peter Hall, Harvard University
President-Elect: Melani Cammett, Harvard University
Vice President: Kathleen Thelen, MIT
Secretary-Treasurer: Colin Elman, Syracuse University

Executive Committee: Jeremy Menchik, Boston University
  Kendra Koivu, University of New Mexico
  Jason Seawright, Northwestern University
  Layna Mosley, University of North Carolina

Newsletter Editors: Tim Büthe, Duke University and
  Alan M. Jacobs, University of British Columbia

Annual Meeting Program Chair: Adria Lawrence, Yale Univ.

Letter from the Section President

Peter A. Hall
Harvard University
phall@fas.harvard.edu

As the incoming President of the QMMR section, I want to begin by thanking Lisa Wedeen for her service in this role over the past two years and Colin Elman, the indefatigable Secretary-Treasurer of this section for all the work he has done over many years to keep it running and robust, as well as the editors of this publication and the members of the section's Executive Committee for the time they devote to the profession. Since its founding in 2003, this section has become one of the largest and most vibrant in the APSA, reflecting an efflorescence of new work and debate about qualitative and multi-methods in political research.

This year, one of the most prominent of those debates is about how to ensure the integrity of research in political science and the role of transparency in that process. In the first instance, this debate has been inspired by the work of an ad hoc committee created in 2010, on the initiative of Arthur Lupia, Colin Elman and several other political scientists, to propose new ways of advancing Data Access & Research Transparency (DA-RT). The DA-RT group has sponsored a number of APSA panels and workshops to discuss such proposals, but many political scientists are only now becoming aware of this initiative and its implications.

Some of those implications are upon us, as the editors of 27 leading journals in political science have signed a joint statement agreeing to implement by January 2016 a series of principles that include to "require authors to ensure that cited data are available at the time of publication through a trusted digital repository" and to "require authors to delineate clearly the analytic procedures upon which their published claims rely, and where possible to provide access to all relevant analytic materials." Many editors are currently considering how to implement these steps.

Animated by concern about what these measures might require in particular of scholars doing qualitative research and research with human subjects, more than a thousand political scientists signed a petition last November asking journal editors to delay implementing these DA-RT principles until there can be more deliberation in the discipline about their implications for scholars doing different kinds of research.

I can report that the QMMR section is currently sponsor-

ing a systematic process of deliberation about the issues involved in securing transparency in qualitative research. This follows up a motion passed unanimously at our 2015 business meeting that called for such a process and tasked the editors of this publication, Tim Büthe and Alan Jacobs, with drawing up plans for one, building on the excellent symposium they edited on this topic in the spring 2015 issue of *QMMR*. Tim and Alan have done a remarkable job of designing a process that will allow for wide consultation about these issues and culminate next fall in a series of reports about the value, costs, risks and practicalities of research openness for specific types of qualitative scholarship in political science. Their plan has now been approved overwhelmingly by the executive committee of the section and by 98 percent of participating section members in a poll that attracted the highest turnout we have ever had.

These Qualitative Transparency Deliberations will be led by a steering committee of about nine scholars, who will consult the broad community of qualitative researchers, bilaterally and through an online platform, with a view to identifying the major issues that efforts to secure research transparency raise for scholars doing multiple kinds of qualitative research. The steering committee will then recruit about a dozen working groups of three scholars, each of which will consult widely and consider the issues associated with research transparency that arise within a specific type of qualitative research or bear on a specific dimension of various kinds of research.

We hope to be able to sponsor a meeting of these working groups in June and again just prior to the start of the 2016 APSA Annual Meeting with a view to putting online in the early fall the statements prepared by each of these groups. These statements may suggest specific standards or guidelines to be applied to a particular type of research or discuss the general issues associated with ensuring the integrity of research there. Our expectation is that each will seek to articulate the (possibly multiple) understandings of research transparency current among scholars undertaking specific types of qualitative research.

Once we have the relevant online platforms up and running, we will be alerting all members of the section to them via APSANet. I urge you to participate in these deliberations. The objective is to ensure that all relevant views are heard and that these issues are discussed more widely in the profession. Our hope is that this process will clarify the issues associated with research transparency in qualitative research and inform any actions that journal editors or APSA might take on such matters. These are important issues deserving of your attention.

An outline of the planned Qualitative Transparency Deliberations can be downloaded from www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/QualitativeTransparencyDeliberationsProposal.pdf.

Anyone seeking more basic information about the initiatives that have inspired this deliberative process can consult this website for an account of the DA-RT initiative (http://www.dartstatement.org/); this website for recent debates about it (http://dialogueondart.org/); and this website for the Symposium on these issues in the last issue of this publication (www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/Qualitative_Methods_Newsletters/Qualitative_Methods_Newsletters/). I hope you will share the deep gratitude we all owe to Tim Büthe and Alan Jacobs for all the work they have done to encourage informed discussion of these issues and that you will participate as this deliberative process moves forward.

Letter from the Editors

In this issue, we are delighted to present a symposium, inspired by a panel at the 2015 APSA Annual Meeting, that explores a range of innovative linkages between the ventures of interpretation and causal inference. In remarkably diverse ways, the essays in this collection propose approaches to empirical research that combine tools and logics of causal inferences with techniques and understandings typically associated with interpretive inquiry. Our contributors make the case, respectively, for joining cross-case comparison to ethnography, interpretation to process tracing, ethnographic fieldwork to social network analysis, and interpretive discourse analysis to the quantitative measurement of identity. As Guest Editor of the symposium, Edward Schatz both introduces the pieces and offers a concluding synthesis that unpacks a set of conceptual ambiguities and tensions with which positivist-interpretivist bridge-building efforts must grapple.

Readers can also find in this issue the details and citations for all section awards presented at the 2015 business meeting. And we present here the first installment of our new Book Scan, based on a systematic search of a wide range of publisher lists for recent releases that seek to develop or teach approaches to qualitative or multi-method research. We look forward to seeing the Book Scan, together with the Journal Scan introduced in the last issue, become regular features of *QMMR*.

Finally, we would like to offer thanks to several people: to Edward Schatz for his outstanding editorial contributions to the symposium; to Allison Forbes for careful copy-editing of the symposium; and to Alex Hemingway for his invaluable assistance with compiling the Book Scan.

We look forward to hearing your thoughts on this issue of *QMMR*, and invite section members to send us proposals for future *QMMR* symposia.

Alan M. Jacobs   Tim Büthe
alan.jacobs@ubc.ca   buthe@duke.edu

Symposium: Linking Interpretation and Causal Inference

Guest Editor, Edward Schatz

Introduction

Edward Schatz
University of Toronto

How do our interpretations link up to our causal claims? How does attention to causality refine our interpretations? In one sense, it is strange that we find ourselves asking these questions. After all, interpretive researchers routinely find themselves using causal language, and scholars oriented toward establishing causal claims also spend much time interpreting actors' motivations and beliefs. If political scientists *ipso facto* do both, what's the big deal?

In another sense, the fact that we pose these questions (which structured an APSA panel in 2015) speaks to a particular moment in the discipline. Consider the institutional architecture of APSA, wherein Interpretive Methodologies and Methods is officially designated by APSA as a "related group" that is separate from the QMMR section. Does this institutional architecture reflect how our research communities actually work? The hunch that authors in this symposium share is that it does not.

The purpose of this symposium is to take stock of recent thinking about methods, methodology, epistemology, and ontology that proposes the forging of links between hermeneutic and causality-oriented analysis. A variety of perspectives is represented below, but if there is one thing that all authors agree upon, it is that the two are not mutually exclusive. The question they all tackle is this: what are the specific links that may be forged? Moreover, what are the ways to make these links most productive?

By interpretation, the authors below have in mind attention to the meaning-making processes that—depending on one's intellectual taste—either characterize an important part of the human experience or constitute its core. By causal inference, they have in mind attention to establishing explanatory claims—either about particular instances or about a class of events. Both of these understandings, as we will see, are fairly general and leave two crucial questions open for further debate: (1) to what extent and in what ways must causal accounts pay attention to meaning-making, and (2) what kinds of simplification are ultimately most productive?

The four papers below contribute to these discussions based on the authors' various, original, theoretically-grounded

Edward Schatz is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto. He is online at ed.schatz@utoronto.ca and https://www.utm.utoronto.ca/political-science/associate-professor-ed-schatz.

and empirically-rich research. In a sense, it is not surprising that where one comes down on the above questions is in part a function of whether one begins with ethnography, with process-tracing approaches, with discourse analysis, or with another approach entirely. Each approach brings different sorts of leverage and intellectual inclinations to the research endeavor. Yet, it is in another sense strange that one's inclinations about foundational matters in the philosophy of science would be a function of the methods one uses.

Ludvig Norman offers to fuse process-tracing approaches with a specific focus on meaning-making processes. Illustrating via his own work on the evolving decision-making powers of the European Union, he proposes *interpretive process tracing* as an approach that allows scholars to identify types of causal mechanisms rarely considered in our discipline. The result is not just a thicker account; it is a more plausible one.

Steven Samford also suggests that a thicker account can be fundamentally different and more convincing than its thinner alternatives. Taking a page from political sociology, he considers how social network analysis (SNA) is enriched via ethnographic immersion, showing that patterns of regulatory compliance in Mexico are hard to interpret without sustained attention to the social meanings at play in particular fieldwork sites.

For their part, Erica Simmons and Nicholas Smith invite political ethnographers—who often grapple with interpretive approaches—to consider techniques from the comparativist's toolbox. Based on research from their respective books on Bolivia/Mexico and South Africa, they argue that such *comparative ethnography* broadens the scope of generalizations offered while retaining an ethnographic sensibility that is faithful to shared meanings in particular contexts.

In what is perhaps the most methodologically ambitious of the symposium contributions, Bentley Allan and Ted Hopf discuss their decade-long project to build a national-identity dataset based on textual materials dating from 1810. *Making Identity Count* promises to offer a treasure trove of numerical data that rests upon painstaking interpretation of national identities via inductive discourse analysis.

In the paper that concludes the symposium, I take stock of our collective stock-taking. I propose that we advance our conversations about linking causal inference and interpretation only to the extent that we pay close attention to polyvalent meanings behind the words invoked to unite our research traditions.

Interpretive Process Tracing and Causal Explanations

Ludvig Norman
Uppsala University, Sweden

Recent years have seen an increasing focus in political science and international relations (IR) research on longer-term causal processes and the internal dynamics of single cases, through a method commonly referred to as process tracing. Discussions regarding standards for ensuring reliable process tracing have been dominated by an emphasis on deductive styles of inquiry, Bayesian procedures for formulating and testing well-defined hypotheses, and attempts to characterize process tracing as a complement to large-N studies. Many of these efforts are praiseworthy, not least for pushing researchers to justify more explicitly their methodological choices. However, they have also been associated with certain costs. In particular, they tend to exclude context sensitive modes of inquiry that characterize interpretive research.[1]

Contrary to this tendency, I suggest several reasons why process tracing would be enriched by efforts to more clearly incorporate *interpretive* elements. Process tracing is highly consonant with the interpretivist tradition of providing inductive and contextually thick accounts of meaning making, as well as attending to the dynamics of social institutions. Interpretive process tracing (IPT) combines the study of intersubjective meanings with causal explanations of particular outcomes.[2] It is thus able to identify a broader range of causal mechanisms than those commonly studied in political science. By being attentive to mechanisms that capture non-intentional, habitual action, and the importance of social identities for such actions, IPT can generate more nuanced and more accurate explanations.

There are also integrative gains to be reaped in the other direction. Interpretive scholarship can benefit from using process tracing to identify and theorize mechanisms that account

for particular outcomes. Interpretive research tends to emphasize constitutive explanations, achieved by studying and categorizing the properties of specific social systems. Such explanations are important. However, the tendency in interpretive research to refrain from causal arguments is often unwarranted. As I will discuss, IPT entails the study of how the dispositional characteristics of particular social systems are actualized and shape the actions of individual and collective agents in particular settings. In the approach that I propose, constitutive explanations can thus be used to inform how causal mechanisms generate particular outcomes. For IPT, the point of interpretation is thus not only, as Geertz argues, "to aid in gaining access to the conceptual world in which our subjects live"[3] but also to help us capture the processes through which such worlds change and how these changes condition the emergence of some social and political effects rather than others.

This paper discusses the component parts of IPT and argues that a focus on mechanisms can be made to work with the meta-theoretical assumptions of interpretive research to supply causal explanations. The argument for this approach is illustrated through a brief example drawn from my own work in the field of European Union (EU) studies.

Interpretive Process Tracing

Process tracing, including its interpretive variants, is a family of tools used to study how causal processes unfolding over time produce particular outcomes. It is primarily a within-case method that favors the study of feedback dynamics, path dependencies, cases of complex causality where multiple factors interact, as well as processes in which the *sequence* in which events unfold over time is important for explaining outcomes. More specifically, process tracing is intimately associated with the identification of the mechanisms that help make sense of complex processes. One common form of process tracing focuses on long-term causes to explain particular outcomes. In such cases, researchers seek to account for an outcome of intrinsic or theoretical interest by looking not just at the immediate circumstances that triggered the outcome, be it a revolution, a civil war, or the initiation of a transition towards democracy, but at the longer-term process that over time gave rise to that outcome. A snapshot view of the actual point at which a threshold was reached, the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back, would supply only a partial and unsatisfactory explanation.[4] By widening the temporal scope, however, more nuanced, comprehensive and accurate accounts can be formulated of how mounting social and political tensions produce particular outcomes. In line with this perspective, process tracing studies have helped to produce theoretically-informed explanations of, among other things, how timing and sequence matters for institutional stability and change, the evolution of welfare systems, and regional integration in Europe.[5]

Interpretive process tracing, similar to many process-

[1] Bennett and Checkel's (2014) recent and important contribution to these debates signals an openness to methodological pluralism. However, theirs is an exception to debates that have largely worked to increase, rather than to diminish the distance between process tracing and interpretive methods.

[2] I draw here on Guzzini (2012) who coined his approach "interpretivist process tracing" and defined some of the meta-theoretical underpinnings of the approach discussed here. While not using the term, Pouliot (2014) and Hopf (2012) have also sought to integrate interpretive modes of inquiry with process tracing. I use the term *interpretive* process tracing throughout this text, rather than the slightly more cumbersome *interpretivist*.

[3] Geertz 1973, 24.

[4] See Pierson 2004.

[5] See for instance Mahoney and Thelen 2010 and Pierson 2004.

tracing accounts, proceeds by seeking to explain particular outcomes. However, it is also characterized by efforts to study intersubjective social institutions as part of causal processes. Guzzini has supplied the meta-theoretical building blocks in IR for this sort of approach.[6] He and several collaborators applied a variant of IPT to study the varied return of geopolitical foreign policy discourses across six European countries in the aftermath of the Cold War. The approach takes a constructivist starting point by contesting the allegedly unambiguous character of international events. Instead, the authors offer a contextual and historically informed analysis of differing responses to these events. Crucially, this is done by identifying and theorizing the mechanisms that help to explain the presence or absence of a geopolitical discourse. The central mechanism explains how crises in foreign policy identities trigger symbolic actions connected to the rise of a specific brand of geopolitically-driven foreign policies. Hopf, while not employing the term explicitly, can also be said to use IPT.[7] He demonstrates how widely shared intersubjective self-understandings shaped foreign policy decision making in the Soviet Union during the early period of the Cold War. Hopf also emphasizes the need to understand identities as relational constructs. This is an important point and further indicates how social identities can be understood in processual, rather than static, terms. Pouliot, while focusing more narrowly on the concept of practice, suggests modes of analysis that place the researcher closer to particular agents.[8] He has also supplied crucial conceptual tools for IPT, in particular by addressing the difficult question of how to bring insights from contextually thick studies outside the confines of a particular case.

While sharing important assumptions with interpretivism broadly defined, interpretive process tracing can also be differentiated from interpretive ethnographic work, which emphasizes techniques such as participant observation to uncover contextual meanings and their concomitant practices. IPT is less open ended in the sense that it seeks to identify and account for the interconnected steps in a relatively well-delineated sequence of events. By implication, IPT is slightly less amenable to the kind of deep immersion in particular contexts that characterizes rigorous interpretive ethnography. IPT, rather, aims to reconstruct processes that have already unfolded. Invariably then, any setting that is available for study will be, to some extent, temporally removed from the one that produced the outcome of interest. An obvious drawback to this approach is that it necessitates a more restricted analytical focus, which prevents potentially important features of a particular setting from informing the analysis. Often this is dealt with by drawing on complementary streams of evidence such as interviews, textual material such as policy documents, archival material, and selected secondary sources to pinpoint the relevant steps in a particular process.

Interpretive process tracing combines interpretive and inductive techniques with more deductive techniques. As familiarization with a particular context increases through inductive and interpretive insights, mechanisms bringing about particular outcomes can be identified and case-specific implications of alternative theories can be articulated. Through this more "constrained immersion" in particular social settings, studies become gradually less open ended and the contrast space for a particular outcome can be more clearly defined. This means that we narrow down the range of possible outcomes in contrast to which we should understand the observed outcome. Relatedly, as the investigation progresses, relevant points of within-case comparison are chiselled out, allowing the researcher to determine why one outcome rather than another occurs. The aim of process tracing from this perspective is to supply causal explanations rather than to exclusively interpret local meanings and the practices through which social institutions are constituted.[9]

Interpretive research often avoids causal arguments. Instead, constitutive explanations, more common in interpretive political research, seek to uncover the properties of particular social systems and answer questions regarding their dispositional character. For instance, Wedeen's study of public spheres of deliberation in Yemen provides the basis for rethinking the meaning of democracy and the range of practices that we might want to include under this general rubric.[10] Crucially, it also offers an opening to think more generally about the dispositional characteristics of the system in and through which democratic practices occur. In this case, such insights can be connected to discussions about the limits and possibilities of promoting democracy from the "outside," and what the consequences might be if such attempts are informed by a universalized, narrow definition of democracy.[11] Constitutive explanations like this are often valuable, and IPT will often need to combine constitutive and causal reasoning. However, explanations, like Wedeen's, that focus exclusively on constitution are different from those generated through IPT.

A key difference between constitutive and causal accounts relates to their temporal character. The fact that many interpretive studies involve a temporal aspect does not necessarily mean they have an explicit interest in process or causality. Constitutive explanations might be situated in one or more particular temporal period, as well as pointing to changes across periods. However, the structures of actual constitutive explanations remain synchronous. As Ylikoski states, "While causal processes take time, constitution does not."[12] There is no temporal separation between a particular system and the component parts that awards it with certain properties. In contrast,

---

[9] In this context it is important to note that the counterfactual structure of explanations implied here is not the same as saying that such explanations derive their explanatory power from more general empirical regularities or covering laws. It only means that our explanation of a particular event is able to answer a what-if-things-had-been-different-question so that a change in the *explanans* produced a particular event rather than some specified alternative. See Woodward 1984 and Ylikoski 2013.

[10] Wedeen 2004.

[11] See Kubik 2009, 40.

[12] Ylikoski 2013, 282.

[6] Guzzini 2012.

[7] Hopf 2012.

[8] Pouliot 2014.

interpretive process tracing understands social systems via a research design that aims to account for causal processes that lead to more clearly defined outcomes. Rather than leaving the causal forces of the argument implicit, or at the meta-theoretical level and beyond the scope of the actual investigation, causality is placed front and center.

Interpretive Process Tracing and Mechanisms

Rather than radically departing from interpretive research, my approach draws out the methodological implications of fundamental assumptions undergirding much interpretivist work. A defining part of the interpretivist meta-theoretical "package" is the premise that identities are malleable and any social agent possesses multiple self-understandings that are actualized in particular situations. This applies to individual agents as well as collective agents, such as social groups, societies, companies, organizations and states. As relational social constructs, identities are activated by the specific dynamics of interaction, and shaped in relation to others. These situational as well as relational aspects of identities, how they are activated and how this shapes social action, can be studied as part and parcel of specific processes. An interpretive form of process tracing can thus help us study situations in which latent identities, institutional roles and practices are activated and also prompt individual or collective action. Specifically, IPT can help address a criticism commonly levelled against both historical institutionalism and constructivist theorization. This criticism focuses on the supposed predisposition in such approaches towards explaining continuity and the self-reinforcing dynamics of patterned social action, while neglecting sudden changes and instances of institutional breakdown.[13] Interpretive process tracing offers opportunities to study multi-faceted processes, including those through which social institutions unravel, and through which conflict emerges from previous stages of peaceful interaction. In sum, it situates meaning making and identity formation in the context of processes that unfold over time to explain how these social dynamics produce specific outcomes.

The argument for interpretive process tracing should not be read as a totalizing move, implying that all interpretivist research should employ this approach, or indeed necessarily be concerned with causality. However, the use of process tracing to produce causal explanations of how social systems change and how such changes shape political outcomes opens up potentially useful avenues of research. It also supplies a much-needed complement to currently dominant styles of process tracing, broadening the range of social mechanisms that are entertained in the study of particular settings.

Causal arguments in process tracing, including interpretive process tracing, are intimately associated with the identification and theorization of social mechanisms. Indeed, their important value added is that the intensive engagement with the dynamics of specific settings allows us to tie the *explanans* to the *explanandum* through an in-depth engagement with patterns of action and interaction. Paraphrasing Jon Elster, the

effort to identify social mechanisms corresponds to the need to supply an answer to the question "Why did s/he/they do that?"[14] Why did French political elites surrender unprecedented levels of sovereignty by agreeing to the Treaty of Rome in 1958? Why did Tunisian citizens suddenly take to the streets in 2010 to engage in massive anti-regime protests? Why did the Russian government under Vladimir Putin decide to invade Ukraine in 2014?

While most attempts to answer such questions have relied on assumptions of methodological individualism, these causal questions can equally be addressed through an interpretivist lens that focuses on the shared understandings that supply meanings to particular phenomena and ways of acting. An interpretive stance is invariably geared towards understanding particular situations from the point of view of those who engaged in them. It prompts a focus on how agents understand themselves and their roles in a particular situation. Rather than beginning with generalized rationality assumptions, it starts from below by learning how agents attribute meanings to specific events, their own actions, and the actions of others.

The identification of the mechanisms operating in a particular case serves several purposes for social scientific explanations. A crucial purpose is that they prompt researchers to make explanations explicit by providing more fine-grained evidence. In Stinchcombe's formulation they make explanation more supple, nuanced and convincing.[15] For interpretive scholars this move entails an effort to ground abstract arguments regarding the workings of social structures at a lower, more concrete level. It prompts an explicit account of how such structures "play out" at the level of agents, how they are reproduced and transformed in specific situations, and how such actions in turn generate particular macro-level outcomes.

The ability of interpretive research to supply contextual richness can thus be put to work in identifying and theorizing not just more precise mechanisms, but also a broader set of mechanisms than those regularly entertained in political science. In particular, interpretive process tracing moves away from standard accounts of social and political action as necessarily intentional, and more specifically, as based on variations of instrumental rationality. Instead, IPT is well positioned to identify mechanisms based on non-intentional, habitual and norm-driven action, mechanisms that help explain how collective self-understandings emerge, under what conditions they are activated, and how they shape preferences, strategies and actions. This also signals an important difference with Schmidt's influential argument for a discursive institutionalism (DI).[16] While the approaches overlap in their effort to place meaning making at the center of causal explanations, Schmidt's argument for bringing "agency back into institutional change"[17] operates on the notion that such change occurs as agents place themselves *outside* the institutions in and through which

---

[13] For a similar argument see Schmidt 2008.

[14] See Elster 1998, 52.

[15] Stinchcombe 1991.

[16] Schmidt 2008.

[17] Schmidt 2008, 316.

they act. For IPT, agency and intentionality are not something that can be assumed but something that needs to be explained. For IPT, to "bring agency back in" also means to account for the processes through which agency emerges in particular settings. The notion in DI that purposive agents can use their communicative abilities to formulate frames to change institutional structures (which incidentally are the same structures that constitute their interests) circumvents the trickier question of why agents would seek institutional change in the first place. IPT takes intersubjective institutions seriously and treats intentionality and agency as emergent properties of agents, properties that need to be explained. IPT thus places agents' intersubjective meanings at the basis of the causal mechanisms that explain continuity and change in social institutions.

Importantly, a focus on mechanisms does not necessarily generate a tension with structure-level theories. As Wight argues, macro-level mechanisms such as those involved in socialization are integral to social explanation and do not necessarily involve intentionality.[18] This does not in any way foreclose investigations at the level of agents. To the contrary, "the effects of macro-level mechanisms are always mediated through individual behaviours and associated micro-level mechanisms."[19] So, while mechanisms answer a call for supplying the micro-foundations of explanations, they do not necessarily, again in contrast to DI, build explanatory power on the intentions of individual agents.[20] Thinking in terms of mechanisms provides a way to structure investigations of the micro-dynamics through which social structures are reproduced and altered. This, I would suggest, points to an important added value of bringing an interpretive perspective to causal process analyses.

The identification of mechanisms also takes the contextually generated findings of particular processes outside their context of discovery. As indicated above, interpretive process tracing tends towards case-level causal explanations. However, the use of the term *mechanism* also implies the possibility that the patterns discerned in a particular setting will have relevance for other settings and for our ability to supply explanations of particular outcomes in those settings. Mechanisms are tools for paring away the particularities of a messy process, its observable and unobservable components, and reformulating it in analytically general terms. This operation makes findings portable to other settings. It also helps dialogue with existing theories during the research process, as well as *ex post*, when the process that produced the particular outcome has been established with reasonable certainty.

The relation between the identification of mechanisms in particular settings and more general social scientific knowledge is primarily one of building a more refined and useful toolbox which we can draw on to enhance our explanation of future problems. Such analytical tools also allow us to highlight how similar mechanisms might be operating in very disparate settings. Following Pouliot, the reformulation of social dynamics in a particular setting in terms of a mechanism is an exercise in conceptual abstraction.[21] This means shedding the particularities of those dynamics and defining in analytically more general terms the essential components that perform the explanatory work. At the same time, the logic by which interpretive researchers generalize is not primarily tied to the probability of the same mechanism operating in a range of similar cases. Problems with strong unit homogeneity assumptions are, or should be, apparent for most strands of process tracing. However, they are particularly acute for interpretive variants that make contextual meanings an intrinsic part of their causal explanations. This means that the primary value of mechanisms from this perspective is not empirical generalization or prediction. Rather, mechanisms play the dual role of making explanations of particular events more precise and of constituting potentially powerful instruments to refine the vocabulary for rethinking future problems and their explanations.

Applying Interpretive Process Tracing: Studying Institutional Conflict in the European Union

To make the argument for interpretive process tracing more concrete, I use an example of my own work where I address questions regarding conflicts over decision-making powers in the European Union (EU). In this study, I used the IPT approach to explain a specific outcome, namely the outbreak of an institutional conflict between the European Council and the European Commission in the policy field of EU criminal law.[22]

This type of conflict has conventionally been understood as resulting from the more or less stable and conflicting preferences regarding supranational decision-making held by the European Council and the European Commission, respectively. Member states represented in the Council, on the one hand, are assumed to prefer legislative solutions that require ceding as little national sovereignty as possible. The Commission, on the other hand, is assumed to favor solutions that imply "More Europe." That is, the Commission is assumed to prefer solutions that strengthen its influence over the policy process and expand its institutional turf. These fundamental assumptions regarding the institutional dynamics of the EU have strongly shaped research on power struggles in this setting. I argue, however, that this perspective supplies a limited and unsatisfactory understanding of the mechanisms generating the Commission's challenges to the Council over the distribution of decision-making competences.

By using an interpretive and largely inductive approach to process tracing, the study demonstrated how emerging

---

[18] Wight 2004.

[19] Wight 2004, 296.

[20] This is not to say that the 'micro-level' is per definition locked at the level of individual agents. Following Ylikoski's (2012) useful discussion in this regard, the micro-level can equally prompt a focus on collective agents such as organizations, firms or even states. Where we locate the micro and the macro depends on the research problem being addressed.

[21] Pouliot 2014.

[22] Norman 2015. The methodological appendix accompanying the article can be found at the journal website at http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/suppl/10.1080/13501763.2014.982155. For a book-length application of the approach, see Norman 2016.

changes in widespread, shared understandings of European criminal law, developing over a period of more than 20 years, gradually led to heightened tensions with the formal rules in place. More particularly, due to a series of institutional macro-level factors, Commission officials changed the way in which they saw themselves and their role in criminal law. These factors included the transformation of the EU from an international organization to a political order with federal characteristics. This brought the issue of effective implementation of EU legislation to the center of policy discussions in this setting. A second, related factor was the transfer of ideas and expertise on European criminal law from other settings into the organizational structure of both the Council and the Commission. These factors together established the widespread notion in EU policy circles that criminal sanctions constituted the most efficient tool to ensure implementation of EU law in national settings. The study traced the process of how these macro changes played out on the level of agents. Specifically, it found, through interview work as well as through the analysis of a broad range of policy documents, how officials in certain parts of the Commission gradually came to perceive themselves as having a legitimate role to play in the field of EU criminal law.

Since the formal rules regulating their activities in this field remained largely unaltered, tensions were increasingly felt by these agents in the Commission. Tensions eventually reached their breaking point with a Council decision in the field of environmental criminal law. The decision was, in contrast to many previous and similar decisions, viewed by Commission officials as an obvious intrusion by the member states and the Council on the institutional turf of the Commission. Why? Because in contrast to previous stages in the process these officials now perceived themselves as unjustifiably excluded from this policy field. At this point the latent but highly institutionalized role of the Commission as "Guardian of the Treaties" was activated. The process analysis thus demonstrated how the Commission's actions in relation to the environmental crimes decision were not the result of general turf-maximizing preferences, but were the product of a set of factors through which the issue of EU criminal law had become tied to the professional identities of agents within the Commission.

Similar to conventional process-tracing procedures, the study used a series of within-case comparisons to identify the central mechanism explaining the final outcome. As I gained familiarity with the process, previous instances where the conditions were seemingly identical but in which no institutional conflict had erupted could be identified and studied in more detail. These comparisons served the purpose of defining the conditions that were present in the final steps of the process but which had been absent in previous steps. By interpreting the meanings Commission officials assigned to themselves in this specific policy field, the link between macro-level factors and dynamics at the agent level could be established and their actions in the final stages of the process leading to institutional conflict could be explained. In sum, the mechanism that produced the final outcome could be identified.

The mechanism emphasized the situational component of identities and focused on the breaking points at which specific institutional identities were activated and became salient. Intersubjective self-understandings and latent but widely shared institutional roles were at the basis of the mechanism, which explained why agents turned from broad agreement to explicit conflict in this particular policy field. On a more abstract level this "rupture mechanism" explains conflicts arising as a result of an increasing discrepancy between professional self-understandings and the formal setting in which agents find themselves. As self-understandings change, new meanings are assigned to the system of formal rules within which agents have to act. The Council decision on environmental criminal law that triggered the institutional conflict did not differ in any important respect from previous decisions. What had changed was how the Commission viewed itself in relation to this policy field. In line with the focus on identities and practices of meaning making, the perspective that I took in this study looked beyond the immediately obvious strategies of the agents involved and instead asked how such strategies were informed by the longer-term dynamics of the social system in which they were articulated.

An interpretive engagement with social identities in this setting was thus crucial for explaining the final outcome. A view of the Commission as the carrier of a stable preference for expanding its institutional turf, while consistent with its actions in the very last steps of the process, provided an incomplete understanding of the logics of action among its officials. Interpretive process tracing helped identify the central mechanism that produced the outcome by remaining sensitive to how intersubjective meanings developed over time among the agents involved.

Conclusion

Interpretive methods can serve to make process tracing explanations more nuanced and more accurate, not least by identifying a range of mechanisms rarely considered in political science. They help capture the micro-dynamics through which social systems change and generate particular political effects by integrating contextually-specific intersubjective meanings into causal accounts.

In political science and IR these interpretive methods are commonly reduced to the "soaking and poking" that help refine hypotheses, to be subsequently tested using procedures that are assumed to be more rigorous and systematic. In contrast, I argue for the distinctive value of interpretive process tracing methods for supplying causal explanations. The epistemological commitments associated with a strong emphasis on deductive procedures common in other process-tracing approaches risks evacuating both interpretive methods and process tracing of their independent significance as tools of inquiry.

Of course interpretive process tracing is not a universal solution, neither for process tracing nor for interpretivist scholarship. Like all social science research tools, it relies on a set of trade-offs among methodological principles. On the one hand,

it sacrifices some of the contextual richness and open-endedness made possible by deep immersion in particular social contexts. It does this by engaging in a more structured way with the causal processes that lead to particular outcomes. On the other hand, it departs from the ideals of deductive variants of process tracing, emphasizing instead inductive and interpretive research techniques to make room for the initially unknown contextual meanings and social practices specific to particular social settings.

References

Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey Checkel, eds. 2014. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytical Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elster, Jon.1998. "A Plea for Mechanisms." In *Social Mechanisms*, edited by Peter Hedström and Richard Swedberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 45–73.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Guzzini, Stefano. 2012. *The Return of Geopolitics in Europe? Social Mechanisms and Foreign Policy Identity Crises*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopf, Ted. 2012. *Reconstructing the Cold War: The Early Years, 1945-58*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kubik, Jan. 2009. "Ethnography of Politics: Foundations, Applications, Prospects." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Ed Schatz. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 25–52.

Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen, eds. 2010. *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency and Power*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Norman, Ludvig. 2015. "When Norms and Rules Collide: The Social Production of Institutional Conflict in the European Union." *Journal of European Public Policy* vol. 22, no. 5: 630–649.

Norman, Ludvig. 2016. *The Mechanisms of Institutional Conflict in the European Union*. Oxon: Routledge, (forthcoming).

Pierson, Paul. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pouliot, Vincent. 2014. "Practice Tracing." In *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytical Tool,* edited by Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey Checkel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 237–259.

Schmidt, Vivien A. 2008. "Discursive Institutionalism: The Explanatory Power of Ideas and Discourse." A*nnual Review of Political Science* vol. 11: 303–326.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1991. "The Conditions of Fruitfulness of Theorizing About Mechanisms in Social Science." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* vol. 21, no. 3: 367–388.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2004. "Concepts and Commitments in the Study of Democracy." In *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*, edited by Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith and Tarek E. Masoud. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 274–306.

Woodward, James. 1984. "A Theory of Singular Causal Explanation." *Erkenntnis* vol. 21, no. 3: 231–262.

Wight, Colin. 2004. "Theorizing the Mechanisms of Conceptual and Semiotic Space." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* vol. 34, no. 2: 283–299.

Ylikoski, Petri. 2012. "Micro, Macro, and Mechanisms." In *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, edited by Harold Kincaid. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 21–45.

Ylikoski, Petri. 2013. "Causal and Constitutive Explanation Compared." *Erkenntnis* vol. 78, no. 2: 277–297.

Structure, Meaning, and Network Causality

Steven Samford
University of Toronto

Political scientists have increasingly turned to formal social network analysis to understand how the webs of personal relations in which all people are embedded are causally related to political phenomena across the subfields. Methodologically speaking, SNA offers a means of *systematically* examining social relations in what have traditionally been qualitative or "analogical" studies of political networks, as well as a means of challenging the assumption of unit independence.[1] The rising availability of network data, notoriously difficult to gather from scratch, has increased the appeal of SNA. Abetted by both motive and opportunity, this turn toward taking socio-political networks seriously is a generally positive development in the discipline.

A complication of this work is that the absence of an ethnographic sensibility, which often accompanies work in sociology, may undercut the ability of SNA to identify causal relationships. Of particular concern is the identification of the specific relationships that inhere in documentable network ties. In other words, the mapping and analysis of the *structure* of politically-oriented networks (i.e. where "edges" exist between "nodes") should come with a careful understanding of what kind of *relational work* is being done within that structure (i.e. the nature of the network ties). Without the latter, causal processes will necessarily remain opaque. Network structure and the relational nature of ties should be inseparable; however, the growing availability of easily documentable but poorly understood network ties threatens to privilege the structure of networks over the specific nature of those ties. I argue simply that ethnographic methods are well suited to examining and understanding the nature of the relations that inhere in particular social ties. Actors' "lived experiences" and perceptions of the social relationships in which they participate are necessarily related to the manner in which those relationships shape social, political, and economic behavior.[2] The first portion of the essay develops this argument for immersion in the study of social networks and the second section provides an illustrative narrative drawn from my own fieldwork in Mexico.

Structure and Meaning in Networks

One promise of SNA is that it allows for an actor's relationships with other actors to be explicitly taken into taken into account when considering their social or political

Steven Samford is a Post-Doctoral Fellow at the Innovation Policy Lab at the Munk School of Global Affair, University of Toronto. He can be found online at s.samford@utoronto.ca and www.stevensamford.com.

[1] Ward et al. 2011.
[2] Wedeen 2010.

behavior.[3] Intuitively, this makes a great deal of sense. After all, whether the actors in question are individual politicians, rebels, voters, or even organizations, decisions are not made in isolation. Being able to disentangle how social relations contribute to a particular political outcome, however, is more complicated than only identifying the structural characteristics of an actor's network. It requires verifying that the associations between particular kinds of network structures/ties operate in the direction predicted and are not simply "homophilic," and identifying the kind of "work" being done by—or the "meaning" of— the network ties.[4] Indeed, even economic sociologists have critiqued the focus on the structures of what Granovetter termed "embeddedness" to the exclusion of the content of the social ties.[5] The presence of a network tie or relationship does not always identify the kind of relational work that occurs. Even where it is possible to establish the presence of a social tie, the nature of that tie and the actor's experience of it can remain opaque.

The nature of the social ties or what relational work they entail—not just their presence—is critically important for assessing causation. To provide an example of the ambiguity that can underlie particular demonstrable social relationships, take a very well-cited 2006 article by James Fowler, a well-known user of network analysis in political science.[6] Fowler generates a measure of the strength of social relations ("connectedness") between congressional representatives by aggregating their co-sponsorship of bills; "connectedness," in turn, is a strong predictor of other legislative behaviors. Repeated (more durable) ties are taken to be indicative of the strength of the relationship between members of Congress. However, Fowler himself recognizes the multiple possible types of relationships embodied in each of the network ties that are folded into his network-based measure of connectedness:

> The sources of these [co-sponsorship] relationships can be divided into four categories: institutional, regional, issue based, and personal. Institutional relationships dominate both chambers. Most of the strongest relationships in the House are between committee chairs and ranking members, whereas in the Senate, they are between majority and minority leaders…. [R]egional relationships also appear to be important despite partisan differences. Not only are many of the most strongly connected legislators from the same state but in the House they are also often from contiguous districts. This suggests that politicians may belong to regional or state organizations or may have roots in local politics that cause them to be more likely to

have made prior social contacts with one another. Alternatively, they may share similar interests because their constituents have similar geographic characteristics. Either way, being from the same place seems to increase the likelihood that legislators will cosponsor one another's legislation…. Some pairs of legislators work closely together because they are drawn to the same issues... It is possible that friendship is at the core of some of these other relationships, but this may be difficult to evaluate if politicians choose to keep this information private.[7]

I quote at length to illustrate the extent to which Fowler relies on the *presence* of documentable network ties (i.e. the shared sponsorships) or structure to generate a predictive measure.[8] Analytically, we might expect the presence of the social ties to be expressive of a social relationship in which a single kind of work is being done, but, in Fowler's study there are four acknowledged mechanisms that shape co-sponsorship rolled into one tie. Two co-sponsorships, then, could plausibly have entirely different underlying social dynamics. What does the repeated presence of these ties mean? Fowler finds it to be predictive of other legislative behaviors, such as roll call votes and the ability to pass amendments. But why these relationships that underlie the measure of connectedness have predictive power for other behaviors remains unclear. As a consequence, the causal mechanism that links this measure of congressional networks to other legislative behaviors is underexamined.

Fowler is correct: it *is* difficult to evaluate the exact relational work that drives each co-sponsorship. It is difficult to understand the nature of relations between individuals or organizations in relatively small numbers, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of observations with which Fowler deals. And yet, I suggest that a full accounting of causal process requires an understanding of the specific character of those ties. To value the structural features of networks to the exclusion of the specific nature of those relationships is troublesome. Ethnographic work is well suited to addressing this concern.

Ethnography and Relational Character

While there is dissent among ethnographers themselves about what ethnography entails and what its goals should be, Schatz writes that "[M]ost scholars equate ethnography with participant observation. That is, immersion in a community, a cohort, a locale, or a cluster of related subject positions is taken to be the *sine qua non* of the approach." [9] Wedeen describes the most basic trappings of ethnography in similar terms: "It requires a commitment—what some call a distinct 'sensibility'— to chronicle aspects of lived experience and to place that experience in conversation with prevailing scholarly themes, prob-

---

[3] I focus here on individual nodes as units of analysis. SNA often treats whole networks as units, examining factors such as density and betweenness as whole network characteristics.

[4] "Homophily" refers to the tendency of actors with like ideas or behaviors to group together, which can lead to the overestimation of the effects of network structure on behavior. There are other variants of this problem, such as "bidirectionality" (see Heaney 2014). On "meaning" see Schatz (2009, 5).

[5] Granovetter 1985; Bandelj 2012.

[6] Fowler 2006.

[7] Fowler 2006, 471–472.

[8] In fact, one of the motivations for Fowler's project is that it relies on documented connections rather than more subjective assessments of their relationships.

[9] Schatz 2009, 5.

lems, and concepts."[10] Many advocate for non-positivist roles for ethnography; Wedeen, for example, advocates for a more interpretivist role for ethnography rather than simply "fold[ing] it into mainstream political science."[11]

What can participant observation or immersion in a research context bring to the study of social networks? Generally speaking, these methods allow for the observation of the form of social interactions, the kind of relational work that is done within those social ties, the participants' own perceptions of those relationships, and, potentially, the influence of these networks. The methods are particularly important for establishing the causal effects of networks if, as described above, the structure of the network itself leaves doubts about the precise mechanisms at work. While participant observation is an inefficient method for systematically collecting data on the formal structure of networks, it does allow for the observation of the kind of interactions that occur within social networks, which is particularly important for grasping the relational nature of particular social ties.

There are a variety of reasons that immersion and participant observation are particularly useful for elucidating the nature of social ties. First, many relationships are not neatly categorized into a single kind of social tie, but have multiple, overlapping parts, which may affect causation. Vaguely-specified relationships can often be documented without a complete understanding of the details of those relationships. For example, much political economy work on industrial clusters relies on network data where producers are asked to identify with whom they share information.[12] But there is much potentially hidden below that informational relationship. Why, for example, would competing businesses share information? Why do they trust or consult some producers to share information and not others? What particular kind of information is passed? Is the informational exchange based on commercial exchange or is it embedded in more personal relationships that provide incentive for collaborating?[13]

Moreover, members of a social network themselves may be unable to articulate the kinds of "work" that a social tie does. For example, in the case study that follows, I observed informal ties of friendship and kinship among small producers to be important conduits for the movement of information about the market for their goods. When asked directly, however, the producers often stated that they did not share information with other workshops at all. The point is that they did not think of themselves as sharing market information (or any other kind of productive information) through these relationships, but their behaviors clearly demonstrate that this was occurring. Ethnographers and field researchers possess a repertoire of methods for making sense of informants' responses: for example, speaking with an informant multiple times, triangulating their responses with other evidence, and observing interac-

tions and behaviors. By immersing oneself in a community, the researcher may not only ask respondents about specific elements of their social ties and be able to assess their response based on observations and the responses of others; she may also evaluate how well the respondents' claims fit with their behaviors.

Ethnographic researchers may develop an understanding of the nature of relationships based on an "informed outside view" that is more theoretically grounded than what the members of the network themselves appreciate.[14] Empirically- or theoretically-motivated observation of those networks is well suited to untangling the underlying features of social relationships. Of course, ethnographic research may not allow the identification of all causal mechanisms related to network structure. But in many cases, immersion is an effective manner of tracing the direction of causation relative to social networks and elucidating the kind of work the interlocutors engage in through these networks and how they see their own role in them.

Illustration: Networks and Regulatory Compliance in Mexico

To offer an illustration of the complementarity of social network and ethnographic methods, I present a fieldwork-based study that I undertook to understand the social and political factors associated with regulatory compliance of ceramics producers in Mexico.[15] Fieldwork for the project amounted to 14 months abroad, the majority of which were spent in a few small communities in Western Mexico. The ceramics producers in question were (and remain) under pressure from regulatory agencies to comply with restrictions against the use of toxic lead oxide glaze, a step designed both to improve labor conditions and to help producers meet foreign quality standards. However, the government's plans to promote compliance ran aground in the context of a conservative and low-capacity industry dominated by small workshops. Instead of opting for punitive approaches, the regulatory agency provided technical information via training workshops, promoting the use of a lead-free glaze with a similar cost profile but which, in production, behaves slightly differently from leaded glaze. But this gentler approach to promoting compliance produced mixed results. What were the determinants of upgrading and individual compliance?

After pilot fieldwork to conduct interviews with government officials and ceramics producers, my original working hypotheses were that (1) a gap in technical understanding was the key barrier to compliance, and (2) government training programs and contact with compliant workshops would eliminate that knowledge gap. I planned to test these hypotheses by undertaking interviews and by observing production, meetings of producers groups, and their interactions with one another in ceramics producing clusters across Mexico. This would

---

[10] Wedeen 2010, 257.
[11] Wedeen 2010, 256.
[12] e.g. Giuliani 2007.
[13] See Heaney in Fowler et al. 2011 for further such examples.

[14] Allina-Pisano 2009.
[15] Findings stemming from this study may be found in Samford (2015a; 2015b).

inform the administration of a survey that would collect network data for workshops in one of the more important ceramics clusters in the region, the ceramics-producing community of Capula, Michoacán.

Over months of visiting and observing workshops and their interactions, however, it became clear to me that the situation was more complicated than originally hypothesized. First, contact with the regulatory agency was uneven across the community in Capula. Indeed, the regulatory agency was using the existing formal organizations in the community as networks for the diffusion of information and for setting up the training courses. So, only members of formal producers' groups actually had access to the training. Second, I came to understand the deep aversion to risk and change that characterized most of the workshops. Third, workshop heads repeatedly stressed that there is little technical information passed between workshops, which was consistent with my observations; however, the manner in which they spoke about other members of the ceramics-producing community made it clear that they were acutely aware of the general activities of their close friends and neighbors (i.e., that there was some effect from informal networks).

The door-to-door workshop survey posed questions to the workshop heads about the adoption of the new glaze and compliance with the law. I asked if the workshop had become compliant and when; which other workshops they had formal and informal relationships with; and which of a battery of characteristics might shape their willingness or ability to adopt the new technology: human capital (education, experience), volume of production, and whether workshop heads had received government training. My goal was to both build a map of network structure, based on self-reported contacts ("ego networks") from all local producers, and to use network ties to predict compliance rates.

The data indeed indicated that those receiving the training were much more likely to belong to the formal producers' groups and that outside those groups, informal networks were far less dense. For informal contacts, I calculated a personal network exposure (PNE) variable for each workshop head, which represents the proportion of their identified informal contacts that had become compliant before them. Statistical analysis made it very clear that these two kinds of network contacts (formal ties through producers' groups and informal friendship/kinship ties) had strong and independent positive effects on the compliance rate. Other predictors, like human capital, mattered very little or not at all. Taken together, the evidence seemed to verify the original hypothesis that access to technical information about the new technology is key to upgrading, and seemed a coherent story with clear policy recommendations: increase access to the training courses and, if possible, promote denser networks of producers.

This causal story, however, did not accord with the exposure I had to the ceramics producers and their community. For example, I had attended meetings of producers' groups, heard producers avoid discussions of their specific production methods, had been told repeatedly and observed how carefully they guarded the detail of how they work. So, while the structure of informal networks had a clear and very strong effect, it seemed inaccurate to conclude that the mechanism behind this influence was the provision of technical information through both formal and informal social networks.

I was able to remain in the community for about three months after I had these initial results, enough time to not only ask producers about their informal relationships but to observe their interactions in their workshops, in meetings, training sessions, and in passing. Focusing on this question of their informal interactions, it became clear that while producers did not share technical information, they did—consciously or not—gather *market* information through their informal contacts. In conversations I observed, producers knew who among their acquaintances had become compliant with regulations, even if they did not know the specifics of production. Moreover, they were aware of how acquaintances were doing financially, which of their associates were having financial difficulties, or which had found a new buyer. In short, it became clear that the information that was moving in these informal networks was market information about demand for lead-free ceramic products and the economic viability of changing production technologies. This did square with the extreme conservatism or risk aversion that I had observed, and with the fact that even those who had been trained often remained noncompliant. Thus, the ethnographic elements of the research—spending time with producers in their workshops, attending meetings, observing their interactions with each other, taking account of their businesses practices—were critical for distinguishing among social ties with distinct informational functions. Surveillance was not the primary reason for these relationships; to the contrary, they were based on friendships formed among neighbors and extended family members. Being attendant to the conditions of friends and kin was natural, and the capacity to monitor their market behaviors was a side effect. So, even though their relationships with other workshop owners were not treated functionally, they clearly played an important economic role.

The findings of the study lay bare the limits of the government's approach to improving compliance through the diffusion of technical information. First, producers who fall outside of the formal producers network are unlikely to have access to the training and the technical information they provide. Second, the study highlights the government's inability to provide market information that is sufficient to convince risk-averse producers. And this all has not only theoretical implications for the behavior of small enterprises, but also policy implications for how government interventions might spur upgrading in very low-tech industries.

Conclusions

I do not propose that explicitly incorporating ethnographic evidence in network studies is always necessary, only that there is a complementarity between the two methods that may serve to clarify causal processes in political networks by elucidating the nature of particular network relationships. There are

cases where data on social ties are complete enough, available over time, and gathered on specific enough a relationship that confounding factors can reasonably be eliminated with quantitative methods.[16] And there are situations in which the immersion among subjects may reveal very little (after all, the dynamics of influence are often not outwardly visible) or where the reliance on "obtrusive" data collection creates measurement errors.[17]

There are, however, many cases where network data are not gathered with the specificity necessary to fully understand the causal processes associated with an actor's social networks; that is, where documentable network relations conceal a variety of relational possibilities. For those who work in areas—the political economy of informal businesses is just one—in which quantitative data are scarce, this situation is likely the norm. In the case discussed above, neither was it clear when network data were gathered how economic and personal relations were intertwined nor, had it been known, would many of those participants have perceived their ceramics-producing friends and extended families as sources of market information. Ethnographic immersion helped to clarify the nature of documented, but more general, ties. Under different circumstances, immersion might be used to collect data on more specific network relations. That said, it is not only in these kinds of research environments that understanding the relational nature of network ties is important. Studies such as those that rely on network ties drawn from digital social networks use easily documentable ties but ties whose meanings to actors themselves are not necessarily well understood. Ultimately, the structure and the nature of social networks are inseparable: we must know something about the relational work that occurs between two (and more) actors to be able to quantify the presence of a social tie. I suggest that immersion among the subjects is important for both defining how those ties are best documented and for clarifying documented but incompletely understood ties, and, hence, can play a critical role in identifying causal processes in webs of socio-political relationships.

References

Allina-Pisano, Jessica. 2009. "How to Tell an Axe Murderer: An Essay on Ethnography, Truth, and Lies." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Edward Schatz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bandelj, Nina. 2012. "Relational Work and Economic Sociology." *Politics and Society* vol. 40, no. 2: 175–201.

Fowler, James H. 2006. "Connecting the Congress: A Study of Co-Sponsorship Networks." *Political Analysis* vol. 14, no. 4: 456–487.

Fowler, James H., Michael T. Heaney, David W. Nickerson, John F. Padgett, and Betsy Sinclair. 2011. "Causality in Political Networks." *American Politics Research* vol. 39, no. 2: 437–480.

Granovetter, Mark. 1985. "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* vol. 91: 481–510.

Guiliani, Elisa. 2007. "The Selective Nature of Knowledge Networks in Clusters: Evidence from the Wine Industry." *Journal of Economic Geography* vol. 7, no. 2: 139–168.

Heaney, Michael T. 2014. "Multiplex Networks and Interest Group Influence Reputation: An Exponential Random Graph Model." *Social Networks* vol. 36: 66–81.

Samford, Steven. 2015a. "Innovation and Public Space: The Developmental Possibilities of Regulation in the Global South." *Regulation and Governance* vol. 9, no. 3: 294–308.

Samford, Steven. 2015b. "Networks, Brokerage, and State-Led Technology Diffusion in Small Industry." Manuscript. <http://www.stevensamford.com/sample-page/papers/355-2>

Schatz, Edward. 2009. "Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*, edited by Edward Schatz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ward, Michael D., Katherine Stovel, and Audrey Sacks. 2011. "Network Analysis and Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* vol. 14: 245–264.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. "Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* vol. 13: 255–272.

The Case for Comparative Ethnography

Erica S. Simmons
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Nicholas Rush Smith
City University of New York-City College

As a number of recent methodological guides and review articles suggest, scholars are increasingly turning to ethnography as a tool for understanding the complexities of political life.[1] Yet even as ethnography becomes more commonplace, scholars often see it as a set of techniques best suited to producing in-depth knowledge about particular cases.[2] There are good practical and epistemological reasons for ethnographers to conduct research on singular cases. However, this article argues that some of the techniques of qualitative comparative methods might prove to be useful tools for ethnographers seeking to make generalizable causal claims and that

---

[1] Auyero 2006; Baiocchi and Connor 2008; Schatz 2009b; Wedeen 2010.

[2] Goertz and Mahoney 2012, 4; King, Keohane, and Verba 1994, 36–41; Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012, 45–53.

---

[16] See Fowler et al. 2011.

[17] See Heaney's introduction in Fowler et al. 2011.

ethnographers should seriously consider when and where comparative methods might make valuable contributions to our analyses.

We make the case for what we call "comparative ethnography," by which we mean ethnographic research that explicitly and intentionally builds an argument through the analysis of two or more cases.[3] We understand "cases" to refer not only to particular geographic places, organizations, or time periods but also to political processes, meaning-making practices, or events. For example, one might compare different labor practices within a field site[4] or different events that produce feelings of national belonging within a particular country.[5] Moreover, we do not assume that the cases must be chosen prior to conducting fieldwork, although in some instances there may be analytic advantages to doing so. Rather, cases that warrant comparison may emerge through research itself as new processes, practices, or events are uncovered during ethnographic immersion.[6]

Ethnographers are, of course, engaged in comparison all the time, whether implicitly or explicitly. If ethnographers are thinking about the similarities in responses from interview respondents or differences in the proceedings at events they attend, for example, comparison influences their insights. Ethnographers are also almost certainly engaged in implicit comparison with other research or life experiences, perhaps thinking about the differences between a political spectacle in their hometown and one at a current research site. In these cases the ethnographer does not explicitly explore these comparisons to build a theoretical argument, instead they use the comparisons to help inform their analysis of the case at hand.

We want to encourage ethnographers to consider the potential benefits of a different (and particular) kind of comparison. By drawing on the strengths of qualitative comparative methods—in particular the conscious tacking back and forth between or among cases to leverage difference and similarity in the service of developing broad theoretical or causal propositions—we argue that comparative ethnography could expand the kinds of insights ethnographers can make. The kind of comparative ethnography we propose would not require ethnographers to abandon the commitment to complexity and contextual meaning that is central to ethnographic inquiry. In fact, as we outline below, comparative ethnography would embrace causal and meaning-making *processes* as the objects of our inquiry, rather than settled *outcomes*. Thus the kind of comparison we propose looks very different from Mill's methods of difference and similarity—an approach that still dominates graduate qualitative methods training;[7] we encourage scholars to leverage complexity, ambiguity, and local-level meaning even as they seek to compare across cases and make arguments that can be generalized to other research contexts.

To be sure, two or more cases are not always better than one. This is particularly true when cases are considered geographically as the time tradeoffs involved in immersing oneself in multiple field sites can create limiting constraints. We do, however, want to argue that comparative ethnography might sharpen a study's theoretical contribution and help ethnographers make causal claims that speak to other cases. Thus, our goal is to make the case for incorporating techniques associated with the comparative method—albeit a reformulated version that focuses on process and meaning rather than outcomes and variables—into ethnographic research.[8]

Conceptualizing the Contribution of Comparative Ethnography

If ethnography's methodological strengths are its focus on context, specific actors and local meanings, comparison—particularly of the controlled variety—would seem anathema to the method. In particular, the idea that we could control for alternative explanations through selecting a variety of cases in advance chafes with interpretive ethnographers' sensibilities.[9] Such an approach precludes incorporating local meanings into explanations—meanings that cannot be identified prior to fieldwork and are therefore difficult to control away. This effort to explore political meanings, however, should be one of the major reasons *for* ethnographers to pursue comparative strategies—but only if we rethink the goals and techniques of case comparisons. Political scientists typically understand the value of comparison to be its ability to help us develop explanations for a given outcome by controlling for differences in some places and looking for similarities in others.[10] Yet, for the ethnographically inclined, the characteristics of a practice must always be studied in close conversation with the context in which that practice takes place.

However, we suggest that, when conditions allow, bringing comparative methodological approaches more centrally into the practice of ethnography adds to the strategies currently available to ethnographers who seek to make broad theoretical or causal arguments that can be generalized to other contexts. Doing so would have two particular advantages. First, ethnographers would no longer have to rely on other scholars to see how well their model "travels" because the goal of developing causal arguments that are portable to other cases would be built into the research design from the beginning. Second,

---

[3] Simmons and Smith 2015.

[4] Pachirat 2011.

[5] Wedeen 2008.

[6] See also Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012.

[7] For a discussion, see Slater and Ziblatt 2013.

[8] Although our perspectives are grounded in our training as scholars of comparative politics, the relevance of the approach outlined here is not limited to a particular disciplinary subfield or even to political science.

[9] Pader 2006; Schatz 2009a.

[10] This kind of comparison, often called "most similar with different outcomes" or "most different with similar outcomes," or the method of agreement and the method of difference, continues to reference Mill (1963), although scholars often fail to acknowledge Mill's own discussion of the limitations of the approach (for an exception, see George and Bennett 2005). Regardless, what are often invoked as Mill's methods of difference and agreement are ubiquitous in qualitative comparative work (for a discussion, see Slater and Ziblatt 2013) and remain central to the ways in which we question and evaluate comparative case research.

utilizing comparative techniques would also bring new causal dynamics to the fore that might be missed by focusing solely on one field site or one practice within a chosen field site. Immersion in multiple field sites might generate novel insights about the practices scholars observe in one field site or push us to theorize those practices in new ways. Moreover, intentionally comparing practices within a single field site may illuminate the political importance of those practices that would have been overlooked were they considered alone.

By comparing two or more cases (keeping in mind that different cases are not limited to geographical or temporal variation but can include practices or events), analysts might see concepts, ideas, or practices that seem coherent when observed in a single case become much less so (and therefore much more interesting politically) when examined comparatively. At the same time, comparison can help ethnographers question existing conceptual categories and generate novel understandings of key political topics as a result. Comparison may even help scholars answer the question, "What category of political phenomena am I observing?"[11] What the events or practices a researcher studies are an instance of may be difficult to discern without comparison to other events or practices.[12] Comparative methods can therefore help an ethnographer shift her analytical lens and challenge existing analytical categories through the process of conducting research, thus opening possibilities for theorizing in ways that are productively different from single-case ethnography.

Case Comparison in Ethnography

We now highlight two examples where explicit ethnographic comparison helped to enhance theoretical claims and efforts to make generalizable arguments. In her ethnographic study of mobilization in response to marketization in Bolivia and Mexico, Erica Simmons is able to expand her category of analysis through comparison, showing that subsistence goods that are at the center of daily life might work to produce similar political effects when threatened by markets.[13] Simmons' claims are only possible because of the ways in which she is able to identify similar processes at work in two different cases when two decidedly different material goods were at stake. By examining mass mobilizations in response to the privatization of water in Bolivia and the rising price of corn in Mexico, she makes the argument that market-driven threats to subsistence goods can help to bridge salient cleavages and forge understandings of common grievances that create the conditions of possibility for broad-based, widespread mobilization. The analysis thus

---

[11] Of course, it is conceivable that a political phenomenon may not be an instance of some larger category of practice and might be *sui generis*. If this is the case, however, comparison would be necessary precisely to identify the incomparable nature of the phenomenon and help identify what about its unique nature makes it politically interesting. We thank Ed Schatz for pushing us on this point.

[12] Yanow (2014, 144) reminds us that positivist modes of inquiry require that researchers make a priori assumptions about what is comparable in their cases as well as what their independent and dependent variables are prior to actually conducting the study.

[13] Simmons 2016.

sheds light on processes of political resistance and on how identifications are mobilized and groups made by theorizing the connections among subsistence, markets, and social mobilization.

The meanings that water took on played a critical role in the ways in which protest events unfolded in Cochabamba, Bolivia. It is impossible to understand the dynamic growth and broad-based composition of the movement that emerged to oppose water privatization in Cochabamba without taking into account the ways in which water worked to symbolize community for Cochabambans across social and economic classes, and how, as a result, privatization could be perceived as a threat to communities as small as neighborhoods and as large as the Bolivian nation. Highly localized perceptions of water intersected with insecurities rooted in marketization to help generate political resistance. To threaten access to water in Cochabamba was to create perceptions that ancestral *usos y costumbres* (widely translated as "customary uses") were at risk. This threat also tapped into a legacy of cultivation and regional scarcity; undermined irrigation and water collection practices as well as the community organizations that had developed to maintain these practices; and challenged a pervasive belief that water belonged to "the people." What water meant to Cochabambans and, in particular, the ways in which it indexed different, sometimes overlapping communities throughout the region, mattered in the mobilization process.[14]

Had the Cochabamba case been the only protest event in the analysis, Simmons could have offered important insights into the potential relationships among water, conceptions of community, and the insecurities produced through privatization. However, she would have been unable to explore the ways in which the processes at work might appear in other times and places, and how they might work similarly when different goods are at stake. As a result, scholars might have understood the analysis as limited to processes of water privatization, and potentially broader patterns in the relationship between subsistence goods and social mobilization would have gone unexplored.

Incorporating a comparison with protests against rising corn prices in Mexico City, Mexico, allows Simmons to develop broader theoretical claims. By examining a case of protest around a different, technically substitutable good, in this case corn, Simmons demonstrates how two materially different goods can actually take on similar meanings and ultimately have similar causal effects when threatened by markets. In Mexico, tortillas (and corn more generally) are a cornerstone of both urban and rural diets; they are included in well-known myths, serve as a centerpiece of daily ritual and social interaction, and are a part of how many citizens conceive of themselves as Mexican. In each of their respective contexts, to threaten water or corn was to threaten not only a material rela-

---

[14] We are using the word "index" methodologically. We intend to invoke the concept of indexicality whereby a sign (image, action, utterance, etc.) is indicative of something not necessarily present in the sign itself.

tionship with a material good, but also perceptions of community.

By comparing the processes she observed in Cochabamba to processes at work in Mexico, as well as how those processes play a role in contentious episodes, Simmons advances our understandings of the relationships among subsistence, markets, and resistance more broadly than she could have by looking at the Bolivian case alone. It was only through the analytic process of tacking back and forth between cases—Bolivia and Mexico, water and corn—that Simmons was able to develop an argument that was not specific to free trade and corn, nor privatization and water, but rather offered broader theoretical insights into the kinds of insecurities produced through marketization, and how those insecurities manifest themselves in social mobilization.[15] The work encourages us to understand the meanings that staple material goods take on in different times and places and to theorize connections among markets, subsistence goods, and social protest.

Nicholas Rush Smith's comparative study of vigilantism in South Africa shows how case comparisons can help anticipate existing explanations, refine categories of analysis, and develop arguments that are generalizable to other cases.[16] Smith seeks to explain why vigilantism is prevalent in post-apartheid South Africa despite a celebrated transition to democracy, a lauded constitution, and massive reforms of the state's legal institutions following democratization. In contrast to standard accounts, which portray vigilantism as a response to state failure or civic breakdown, Smith shows that vigilantism is a response to processes of democratic state formation and is fostered by dense civic ties. A key aspect of democratic state formation that vigilantes contest is the extension of rights, particularly to criminal suspects.[17] Vigilantes argue that rights to due process produce insecurity because alleged criminals may be released into their neighborhoods following arrest and continue to prey on residents. In other words, citizens interpret the technical *success* of legal institutions—the arrest and subsequent release of suspects on bail—as state *failure*. In South Africa's townships, where the suspect may be one's own neighbor,[18] and is therefore a "known" criminal, dense civic ties ramify these meanings and the emotions attached to them. Counterintuitively, Smith argues, in such a setting, a strong rights regime may make vigilantism more likely, as vigilant citizens correct the "failure" of the state's legal procedures.

In developing these insights, Smith deployed at least three types of ethnographically-informed comparisons. The first was a geographic comparison across townships which each experienced vigilantism despite being institutionally, ethnically, and politically different. This allowed Smith to anticipate existing explanations while recognizing how these "control variables" still impacted social practice. For example, that high rates of crime would lead to vigilantism is likely the most common and certainly the most intuitive explanation for vigilantism. Yet crime rates across the townships where Smith conducted his work are dissimilar, suggesting crime alone cannot be a primary cause of vigilantism. Does this mean that crime is irrelevant? No. But what has to be asked is *how* crime matters. By working across field sites, Smith found that infrequent major crime or frequent petty crime carried out by one's neighbors could lead to heightened feelings of insecurity, even within relatively safe areas. In other words, the insecurity produced by crime could be experienced similarly across areas, despite different probabilities that one would be victimized. The effect was that if accused criminals were arrested but released on bail back into the neighborhood, residents would feel insecure. Although the arrests and subsequent legal proceedings may have technically represented success, to residents such releases *meant* that the state was failing and citizen action like vigilantism was necessary to "correct" the state. By comparing geographically across townships, Smith was able to anticipate existing explanations, identify similar social meanings of crime and policing across institutionally different places, and connect such meanings to acts of vigilantism.

Comparison across geographic sites enabled Smith to identify causal processes, while a second comparison, comparing similar responses to different threatening social practices, helped refine conceptual categories. The complicated relationship between crime and vigilante violence suggests how important it is to explore the meanings of the "variables" for which we are trying to "control." This became readily apparent in the case of crime statistics, where comparison across his field sites raised the question of what the statistics were actually representing. At first glance, crime statistics seem to offer an ideal, objective measure of safety or insecurity at the local level. But, because they are tabulated from crimes reported to the police, such statistics fail to capture crimes that are not found in legal statutes but which nevertheless cause similar insecurity as legal crimes. Witchcraft, a common and deeply feared practice in South Africa, is not illegal. However, residents often see it as a mortal threat, and it is therefore often considered socially and morally to be a crime.[19] By comparing how legal crimes and witchcraft accusations could lead to similar responses (stoning, burning, and ostracism), one sees that connecting vigilantism to crime understood in a purely legal sense (as opposed to a social or cultural sense) is problematic.

While a first comparison was geographic and a second comparison was conceptual, a third comparison was about practices. Smith initially aimed to understand why South Africans participated in a wide variety of "protection practices" bypassing the state's legal institutions, including participating in gangs, joining civic associations, and using occult powers. Through ethnographic immersion, however, it became clear that vigilantism had distinct logics from these other practices. In this sense, comparison across practices helped him refine his understanding of the political and social processes at work and of the practices being examined in the first place. Thus, the comparative process was crucial for clarifying what vigilan-

---

[15] See Simmons 2014.
[16] Smith 2013.
[17] See also Smith 2015.
[18] See also Cooper-Knock 2014.

[19] Ashforth 2005.

tism was and how it should be studied as distinct from other practices geared towards protection. In fact, vigilantism may not offer protection at all and may actually create new risks for those practicing it. In other words, the comparison of different practices opened new areas of inquiry, like why one would participate in vigilantism given the high risks of reprisal. The result of these multiple modes of comparison does not only provide an account of the conditions under which vigilantism becomes possible but also questions the analytical categories, particularly state effectiveness and state failure, through which political scientists study politics.

When and Where Should Ethnographers Consider Employing Comparative Research Designs?

This article argues that comparative ethnographic research can be of particular value for scholars looking to make causal arguments that translate across political contexts or to trouble existing analytical categories. Our claim, however, is not that all ethnographic studies can or should employ comparative methods. We now consider what kinds of projects might benefit from comparative ethnography. To be sure, scholars may not know that a comparative approach would be beneficial until they discover through fieldwork that the practices they are observing might fit into a broader category of analysis, which would require comparison to fully explore. While this type of discovery may pose challenges, as researchers will need to adjust projects midstream, this kind of adaptability and improvisation is already a part of some of the best ethnographies.[20]

In other cases, however, particular cues may signal to a researcher well before fieldwork begins that comparison of two or more cases will be valuable. One of these cues might come in the form of preexisting explanations for the object of inquiry. Prior to fieldwork, Simmons could not have known how grievances mattered for social movement mobilization.[21] A large body of literature had argued that while grievances are important in social movements, we could take the presence of a grievance as essentially given and therefore ignore it for explanatory purposes. However, Simmons's prior research told her that grievances could not be dismissed so easily and that the literature had failed to theorize *how* grievances matter. To show that understanding the meaning of grievances is the key to understanding the relationship between grievances and mobilization, Simmons had to do comparative work to observe different sorts of grievances in action. Thus, a good indicator that a comparative approach might be useful is that the literature suggests we should dismiss factors that case research, new data, or emerging political events suggest are important but have not been fully theorized.

Comparative ethnography can also be used to challenge or complicate intuitive explanations. While both intuition and a large body of research suggest that high rates of crime lead to vigilantism, Smith found during initial research that South African townships with widely differing crime rates experienced

vigilantism.[22] This suggested that crime was at best a partial explanation for vigilantism—and potentially a misleading one. The dissimilarity also indicated that something else was at work in South Africa that needed explanation. Yet when Smith began his research, his informants frequently cited crime as a concern. Considering this talk of crime in relation to actual crime rates suggests that something about the social meaning of crime—as opposed to its mere presence or relative intensity—connected crime and vigilantism. In this case, the unanticipated connection was an association between legal rights for accused criminals and local meanings of state failure. The use of comparison allowed Smith to question a common, intuitive explanation that was incomplete and, therefore, needed to be investigated. Thus, comparison may be particularly well positioned to yield new insights when there is a strong prior or alternative explanation that an ethnographic, meaning-centered approach is well suited to complicate or challenge.

Finally, ethnography involving the comparison of two or more cases might be particularly useful for answering "how" questions and illustrating political processes. The approach allows scholars to explore this oft-ignored type of inquiry by emphasizing practices and meanings. Ethnography conducted through a comparative methodological lens might be a powerful approach through which to explore questions such as "how are national attachments produced?,"[23] "how is rebellion sustained?,"[24] or "how are political involvement and welfare programs connected?"[25] By comparing these phenomena across different cases—defined variously in these works as events,[26] neighborhoods,[27] and organizations[28]—the scholars can show that their arguments about the operation of political processes work in different times and/or places. Thus, comparative ethnography offers tools to address crucial "how" questions embedded in long-standing but under-specified theoretical arguments and, in doing so, draws our attention to political processes rather than outcomes.

Conclusions

A comparative methodological sensibility can spark theoretical innovation in ethnographic inquiry by incorporating advantages of both comparative and ethnographic methods. Comparative methods can help ethnographers develop new theoretical arguments and illuminate tensions inherent in categories of political analysis. Comparative ethnographies can uncover new research questions and agendas by helping to expand the possibilities of what can be compared, embrace context instead of trying to control it away, and allow contradictions in social practice to inform our understanding of political phenomena. This article has elaborated an approach to political science research that builds on the strengths of the

---

[20] See Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012.
[21] Simmons 2016.

[22] Smith 2013.
[23] Wedeen 2008.
[24] Parkinson 2013.
[25] Soss 1999.
[26] Wedeen 2008.
[27] Parkinson 2013.
[28] Soss 1999.

ethnographic and comparative traditions. While the utility of this approach is not limited to the types of comparisons that we outline here, they represent key ways for thinking about the types of comparisons ethnographers can utilize to help spur future theoretical and methodological development of the method. Comparative ethnography enhances both the contributions that ethnographers can make to social science and the insights that comparison can bring to scholarly understanding of the political world.

References

Ashforth, Adam. 2005. *Witchcraft, Violence, and Democracy in South Africa*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Auyero, Javier. 2006. "Introductory Note to Politics under the Microscope: Special Issue on Political Ethnography I." *Qualitative Sociology* vol. 29, no. 3: 257–259.

Baiocchi, Gianpaolo and Brian T. Connor. 2008. "The Ethnos in the Polis: Political Ethnography as a Mode of Inquiry." *Sociology Compass* vol. 2, no. 1: 139–155.

Cooper-Knock, Sarah-Jane. 2014. "Policing in Intimate Crowds: Moving beyond 'the Mob' in South Africa." *African Affairs* vol. 113, no. 453: 563–582.

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

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

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

Mill, John Stuart. 1963. "A System of Logic (1843)." *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press..

Pachirat, Timothy. 2011. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pader, Ellen. 2006. "Seeing with an Ethnographic Sensibility." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, edited by Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 161–175.

Parkinson, Sarah Elizabeth. 2013. "Organizing Rebellion: Rethinking High-Risk Mobilization and Social Networks in War." *American Political Science Review* vol. 107, no. 3: 418–432.

Schatz, Edward. 2009a. "Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics." In *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Politics*, edited by Edward Schatz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1–22.

Schatz, Edward, ed. 2009b. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine and Dvora Yanow. 2012. *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. New York: Routledge.

Simmons, Erica S. 2014. "Grievances Do Matter in Mobilization." *Theory and Society* vol. 43, no. 5: 513–546.

———. 2016. *Meaningful Resistance: Market Reforms and the Roots of Social Protest in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Simmons, Erica S. and Nicholas Rush Smith. 2015. "Comparison and Ethnography: What Each Can Learn from the Other." Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Sept. 3-6, San Francisco.

Slater, Dan and Daniel Ziblatt. 2013. "The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Comparison." *Comparative Political Studies* vol. 46, no. 10: 1301–1327.

Smith, Nicholas Rush. 2013. "The Rights of Others: Vigilantism and the Contradictions of Democratic State Formation in Post-Apartheid South Africa." PhD Dissertation, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago.

———. 2015. "Rejecting Rights: Vigilantism and Violence in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *African Affairs* vol. 114, no. 456: 341–360.

Soss, Joe. 1999. "Lessons of Welfare: Policy Design, Political Learning, and Political Action." *American Political Science Review* vol. 93, no. 2: 363–380.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2008. *Peripheral Visions: Publics, Power, and Performance in Yemen*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2010. "Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* vol. 13, no.1: 255–272.

Yanow, Dvora. 2014. "Interpretive Analysis and Comparative Research." In *Comparative Policy Studies: Conceptual and Methodological Challenges*, edited by Isabelle Engeli and Christine Rothmayr Allison. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 131–159.

Making Identity Count: Sequencing Methods in the Study of National Identity

Bentley B. Allan
Johns Hopkins University

Ted Hopf
National University of Singapore

The standard approach to combining quantitative and qualitative measurement in causal inference might be described as an additive or triangulating approach. The basic idea is that the use of multiple methods increases our confidence in our findings because all the methods capture the same phenomenon. Along these lines, Abdelal, Herrera, Johnston, and McDermott advocate an eclectic approach to the study of identity that draws from surveys, demographic data, ethnography, content analysis, discourse analysis, and cognitive mapping.[1] If the results of these methods converge, this should increase our confidence in causal inferences built on these measures. We agree that multiple approaches are useful for the study of national identity, but argue that methods must be sequenced or enfolded in the appropriate way. Inductive, interpretive methods like ethnography and discourse analysis should come first to establish the prevailing categories of national identity in a country, before the use of quantitative methods, to increase the reliability of measurements that underlie good causal inference.

Bentley B. Allan is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. He can be found online at bentley.allan@jhu.edu and http://politicalscience.jhu.edu/directory/bentley-allan/. Ted Hopf is the Provost Professor of Political Science at the National University of Singapore. He can be found online at polhtg@nus.edu.sg and http://profile.nus.edu.sg/fass/polhtg/.

[1] Abdelal, Herrera, Johnston, and McDermott 2009.

In this contribution to the forum, we outline a sequencing approach to the study of national identity that we have developed as part of a project to build a database of national identity variables from 1810 to the present.[2] Our approach, which we call the *Making Identity Count* framework, is built on the interpretive, inductive recovery of identities via discourse analysis of speeches, history textbooks, newspapers, novels, and movies.[3] Analysts allow identity categories to emerge inductively from the texts, but count the number of times a particular category appears in the text. This provides the basis for quantitative identity variables that can be used in large-*n* tests of constructivist International Relations theory. In short, our project is premised on a sequencing approach that uses interpretivist methods to measure social and political reality before enfolding those measurements into causal research designs.

However, in order to achieve this combination of qualitative and quantitative work, some violence is done to the rich data produced by inductive ethnography and discourse analysis. The rich, contextual findings of these methods are abstracted into nominal categories that can be counted. In our project, this is done manually by trained analysts, but it could be done by content analysis or survey methods after the fact. This nominalization process freezes or reifies identity categories and extracts them from their social and political contexts so they can be rendered comparable to identity discourses in other countries. Nonetheless, our approach endogenizes a challenge to reification. Our historical approach allows identities and categories to change over time. Because inductive strategies lead the sequence from measurement through causal analysis, French national identity can change from 1810 to 1820 to 1950 to 2010. Thus, our approach seeks to capture the fluid and historically-constituted character of social and political identities by putting interpretive methods first.

Approaches to National Identity

Existing approaches to the study of national identity in International Relations are plagued by two problems. First, quantitative IR scholars do not let subjects speak for themselves, instead assigning identities to nations and subjects based on some "objective" label they apply before they do their research. Second, they operationalize the concept of identity in ways that make it most easily amenable to measurement, rather than remaining true to the conventional methodological convention of developing measures that faithfully capture how a variable is theorized, conceptualized, and operationalized.[4]

For example, the "ethno-fractionalization index" used in Fearon and Laitin, as well as other studies, is built on demographic data of existing linguistic groups.[5] As such, it ignores the multifarious *content* of national identities. Of course, variables that capture the content and meaning of identities are necessary to test the effects of identity on political outcomes. In addition, an ethno-linguistic fractionalization index does not consider the *intensity* of the cultural identities. That is, theory does not predict that weakly-held or seldom-expressed identities will have the same effect as strongly-held and constantly-expressed identities. As Wedeen points out, "developing a dataset based on an intensity scale accounting for people's experiences of identification would produce a more precise and generalizable explanation of how the lived conditions of ethnic identity-formation might determine conflict when they do."[6]

Errol Henderson, for example, when trying to determine if different religious identities account for more conflict between two states, simply assigns countries religious identities based on whether their populations have been coded for having different religious affiliations.[7] Missing here of course is any concern about whether the people so coded actually understand themselves as Muslims, Catholics, Christians, or Jews, let alone whether it was these identities that caused any conflict.

In the literature on the democratic peace, states are assigned democracy scores based on Polity IV or Freedom House. Then controls for other objectivist variables are included and the regression coefficient emerges that demonstrates a positive association between two democracies and peace between them. The problem here is that scholars who have actually performed case studies to see if it is democracy or democratic identity that stays the hands of democratic leaders when contemplating violence against another democracy, have almost unanimously found that democratic identity has less to do with the outcome than advertised. Both Vucetic and Fanis, for example, have found a racial Anglo-Saxon white identity matters.[8]

Quantitative IR scholars also frequently reduce identity to convenient or available variables that are inconsistent with the intersubjective conceptualization and operationalization of identity. In a work designed to differentiate between cultural difference and geographical contiguity as alternative causes of war between states, Henderson reduces cultural similarity to religious similarity, again objectively assigned, and ethnic similarity to language, again objectively given.[9] Biddle and Long hypothesize that human capital and cultural values explain the military advantage of democracies but their operationalization reduces cultural values to "primary religious affiliations."[10] Goldstein, Rivers, and Tomz attempt to control for the effects of common culture on levels of trade between countries, but operationalize this as "whether [countries] share a common language" as stated in the *CIA World Factbook*.[11]

---

[2] Hopf and Allan 2016.

[3] While our approach is inspired by ethnographic methods, our project is predominantly historical, so it focuses on discourse analysis rather than ethnography.

[4] Sartori 1970.

[5] Fearon and Laitin 2003; Cederman and Girardin 2007; Gartzke and Gleditsch 2006.

[6] Wedeen 2003, 725.

[7] Henderson 1997. Rummel (1997) does the same for religious conflict within states.

[8] Fanis 2011; Vucetic 2011.

[9] Henderson 1997.

[10] Biddle and Long 2004, 536.

[11] Goldstein, Rivers, and Tomz 2007, 51.

In a particularly egregious instance of this problem, Sambanis, in an effort to explain civil wars, reduces identity to a conflation of religion and ethnicity, and then declares that civil wars that he cannot code in terms of religious or ethnic identity are not cases of civil wars based on any identity, as if the only identities that matter to people are the two he has assigned.[12]

More nuanced approaches attempt to capture some of the content of identities. Brady and Kaplan, for example, begin with demographic data and historical analysis, but use text analysis and surveys to introduce content and gradation into their identity measures.[13] However, by starting with demographic data and adding surveys based on that data, Brady and Kaplan pretheorize which identities are likely to matter. Demographic data, such as linguistic group or religious affiliation may or may not structure the central identity categories in a country. Asking individuals which identities they subscribe to also introduces bias because it primes respondents to think in terms of the identities on offer, while ignoring how they experience and constitute their identities on a daily basis. For example, David Laitin reports in *Hegemony and Culture* that the Nigerians he lived with during his fieldwork denied having Muslim or Christian identities, or being motivated by them. Had he asked them in formal surveys, they would not have chosen these identities. But he observed that when it came to daily practices, Muslim and Christian Nigerians regularly differentiated each other on grounds of religious identity.[14]

It is important to try to capture identities inductively as they are expressed in everyday life. Sylvan and Metskas advocate for an approach that combines various methods and concede that experiments and surveys pretheorize identity in a way that biases the results.[15] However, they deny the need to give pride of place to induction because a purely inductive approach is impossible. Of course, even inductive discourse analysis relies on the subjective heuristics and beliefs of the coder. Nonetheless, inductive, interpretivist methods that try to overhear which identities are expressed will perform better in revealing the lived experience and salience of identities than other approaches.

Interpretivist Discourse Analysis

Our approach to discourse analysis is inspired by the ethnographic goal of recovering meanings inductively, if and when they appear, in the everyday lives of both masses and elites. For our project, the ethnographic ideal would be to capture the content of identities as they are actually expressed in social and political situations. Discourse analysis provides a way to approximate the ethnographic ideal in historical investigations. By letting the texts speak, an open-ended discursive approach provides the best chance to uncover identities when and how they are used in social and political discourse.

Advocates and critics of interpretivist discourse analysis seem to agree that it is either anti-scientific or unscientific.[16]

However, our approach is premised on the claim that discourse analysis can be made more reliable, replicable, and transparent. We argue that discourse analysis can recover intersubjective national identities in a way that is reliable and transparent enough to produce a body of comparable reports across time for the same country and across countries as well. In short, the subjective biases of discourse analysis can be mitigated with coding and counting procedures that force analysts to support their intepretations with quantitative evidence. Bringing discourse analysis closer to content analysis can retain the valid inductive recovery of meanings while making the results more reliable.

Striving for reliability may cut against some interpretivist claims. A measure is reliable to the degree that the "measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials."[17] Reliability appears to rest on premises that contradict the interpretivist belief that "there is no outside, detached standpoint from which we gather and present brute data."[18] If reliability is about achieving an outsider standpoint, then it contradicts this tenet. However, our approach is not premised on achieving an outsider standpoint. With interpretivists, we recognize that even the act of interpretion, let alone coding identity categories, does violence to meanings in the text. Interpretation depends on analysts' beliefs, biases, personal history, and unique access to intersubjective background knowledge. Indeed, even if the same person returns to a text, she may bring a different mental state or new experiences that alter interpretation. But such differences within and between readers are not so wide as to undermine the intuition that some readings or renderings of a text are more coherent than others.

We recognize that our approach does violence to webs of meaning by reducing them to a finite number of texts. Moreover, our coding questions exclude certain forms of meaning that may be relevant and the subjectivity of the analyst will remain inscribed in the results. Interpretivists that value the instability of social meanings will reject this compromise. However, we believe the payoffs of the project as a whole justify these acts of simplification and exclusion. Besides, we have a more limited aim. We do not intend to capture all the meanings identities have for authors or subjects. Instead, we aim to recover the categories used by masses and elites to construct ideas about the national self. Of course, we also intend to capture some sense of the meanings attached to those categories, in accordance with the interpretivist project of recovering the meanings attached to social and political life.

Thus, we are aiming to reconstruct intersubjective content in a reliable and comparable way. But we defend a more complex juristic or dialogic concept of reliability.[19] On this logic, the ideal reliability test would not be to force two coders to sit alone replicating the analysis, but to allow them to argue about their coding decisions until they produce an agreed upon list. For us, reliability suggests not the regular capturing of some underlying reality, but the idea that analysts could work to-

---

[12] Sambanis 2001.

[13] Brady and Kaplan 2009.

[14] Laitin 1986.

[15] Sylvan and Metskas 2009.

[16] Rabinow and Sullivan 1987; Neuendorf 2002.

[17] Carmines and Zeller 1979, 11.

[18] Rabinow and Sullivan 1987, 7.

[19] For a similar idea, see Kratochwil 2007.

gether to produce a better list of categories than they could alone. The underlying idea here applies the Popperian claim that theories are not tested against reality but against other theories.[20] On this view of reliability, successful measurement does not objectively capture some segment of reality, but performs consistently with other measures and measurers. Thus, we support the validation of our measurements with multiple methods, although, according to the correct order laid out above: surveys and other measurements should be informed by the results of inductive methods such as discourse analysis and ethnography.

In the end, we retain a commitment to the core of interpretivism: the inductive, interpretive analysis of shared webs of meaning that individuals draw on to create meaning and form their identities. Our claim to validity does not rest on a claim to capture the world as it is from a detached standpoint, but on the claim that analysts can reliably capture similar categories with which identities were formed and constructed in that world. Provided that our analysts do not impose order and coherence on the texts too soon, interpretivist discourse analysis allows the salient identities to emerge in context. Premature closure to new possible identities occurs when one seizes on a few salient identities at first, and then searches for them in subsequent texts, rather than remaining open to new identities emerging from each subsequent text. One guard against this in our method is to begin with a running tally of raw identity counts, as well as to sample across genres of texts first, rather than within any particular one. By sampling across genres, elements that dominate elite newspaper editorials do not crowd out what may appear in a bestselling novel. By separating the generation of a list of raw identity counts from their aggregation into predominant and challenger discourses, we defer the moment of deciding what is salient, and what is not.

The Making Identity Count Approach

We have embarked on a project to build a database of national identity reports that includes quantitative counts of inductively recovered identity categories that can be translated into a dataset compatible with the Correlates of War and other datasets. The goal in the present phase is to produce data for every tenth year from 1810 through the present. For the purposes of this project, we theorize national identity as discursive categories that define the nation or what it means to be a member of the nation. We operationalize discourse as a structured sample of texts meant to capture mass and elite categories. We measure national identity with simple questions posed to the texts: What does it mean to be French? What is France?

The basic unit of our analysis is the *identity category*: the classifications attached to the nation and members of the nation without pretheorizing identity content. These categories could be political, moral, cultural, historical, geopolitical, religious, ethnic, racial, gendered, and so on.

Identity categories aggregate into *discursive formations*: clusters of categories and their associated meanings that order perceptions of the national self. There are always multiple discursive formations in discourses of national identity. By remaining open to the existence of multiple formations, our approach attempts to avoid the crude reduction of national identity to a single set of beliefs. We train our analysts to remain open to the possibility that there are multiple formations, but also ask them to identify predominant or hegemonic formations, if they exist. In our findings thus far, most countries have a predominant formation and at least one prominent challenger formation.

For example, in France 2010, the predominant discursive formation is a cluster of "Republican" categories: secular, democratic, liberal, fraternal, and equal. In Brazil 2010, the predominant formation is the "limited democracy" cluster that portrays Brazil as a corrupt, authoritarian, exclusionary, and young democracy.

In providing both interpretive analysis of the main discursive formations and raw counts of identity categories, our reports do not merely reduce discourse analysis to content analysis. It is important to note that in our approach discourse analysis leads the sequence, followed by aspects of content analysis. These findings could then be corroborated by surveys or experiments before being folded into large-*n* studies of national identity.

Thus, our method relies on inductive discourse analysis performed by human analysts. We train analysts who possess the requisite language skills to code texts using this inductive scheme. Our analysts include undergraduate students, graduate students, and junior faculty that have been trained in discourse analysis. Our training, which happens in both workshops and one-on-one sessions, focuses on two points. First, we emphasize how to leave preconceived notions of national identity aside and allow categories to emerge from the texts themselves. Second, we distinguish identity categories from mere themes in the discourse. Themes such as the virtues of hard work, invocations of the good life, or personal complaints about injustices are not, in our scheme, identity categories. Themes can be coded as identity categories only when explicitly connected to identity statements such as the "French people are …" or "the nation embodies …" and so on.

Text Selection

There are two general principles for document selection. First, we aim to sample documents that circulate widely in society and thus can be expected to reflect the available stock of social knowledge from which identities are assembled. We do not want documents that explicitly or normatively discuss the central identity categories of the country. Rather, we want to overhear discussions about what it means to be Brazilian in the context of everyday life. Second, we seek to sample documents that reflect both the elite political discourses around political institutions and the discourses that structure mass common sense.

To achieve both of these goals, for the year 2010 we asked analysts to sample texts from five genres:

Leadership Speeches: Choose two leadership speeches by the head of government or ruling party on significant

---

[20] Popper 1959.

occasions. These might be the national holiday address or a programmatic or budgetary speech.

Newspapers: Choose two newspapers with the highest national circulation. From these, for the 15th of each month, read all opinion-editorials and letters to the editor.

History Textbooks: Choose two widely read high school history textbooks on your country's national history. Start with the 20th century as your time of origin.

Novels: Choose the top two bestselling novels in the country, by country's authors, in an official language.

Movies: Choose the top two most attended movies in the country, by country's directors/producers, in an official language.

In each report, analysts present the results of their analysis according to the prevalence of a given identity category in each genre. In doing so, each analyst must place these in order along a continuum from elite to mass based on the particular situation in their country. A text is more reflective of "elite" discourse if it is produced and consumed by political and social elites that dominate powerful institutions of a society. A text is more reflective of "mass" discourse if it is *produced* and *consumed* by a large, multiclass, multiethnic, etc., collection of people in the country. This operationalization makes sense for great power states in the year 2010, but as the project is expanded to other country years, the basic sampling strategy will have to be adapted.

Coding Rules

We ask analysts to write down all the possible identity categories invoked in their sample. This can entail from 50 to 100 discrete categories. They are to proceed inductively, using categories in the texts rather than their own pretheorized notions and classifications. We give them one simple question: What does it mean to be China or be Chinese?

Answers to this question are to be coded in three ways:

1. Valence: distinguish between positive, negative, neutral, and ambiguous identities using valence symbols (+, −, /, or ~). Note whether the identity is considered a good or a bad feature of being China or Chinese.

2. Aspirational or Aversive: Is the identity you have found one that China aspires to become, or one it is trying to avoid becoming?

3. Significant Others: These are the countries, historical periods, ideas, etc., with which China compares itself. These can be historical, contemporary, or prospective. They can be positive or negative. They can be aspirational or aversive.

For example:

"To our compatriots overseas, I want to convey my determination to that which the Republic holds to, with regards to their promises of equality and dignity that was not

sufficiently held to in the past."

This sample from the 2010 French report was coded as: EQUALITY+, DIGNITY+, HISTORICAL OTHER−. The term "Republic" here stands in for France (indeed, Republican categories are part of the dominant French discourse) and hails equality and dignity as key components of what it means to be French. The analyst has also highlighted the possibility that this could be linked to representations of the past as regrettable, marking present France as distinct from that past other.

Computerized, quantitative content analysis would be unable to capture the difference between themes and identities or make the judgments and interpretations necessary to move up the ladder from categories to discursive formations. Moreover, our manual approach allows identity categories to emerge even though they rest only implicitly in the meaning of a sentence. Quantitative content analysis would not be able to code HISTORICAL OTHER here because there is not a discrete textual referent for that category. However, word frequency counts and dictionaries could be usefully employed to check the reliability of raw counts once documents have been coded manually and the list of categories has been created. But raw frequencies lists produced by content analysis would still have to be checked by a human coder to ensure that the meaning of the sentence evokes a category of national identity, rather than a mere theme in the discourse.

In this spirit, our method offers checks against the subjective biases of individual coders. The manual counting procedure forces analysts to defend their interpretive impressions with evidence. Thus, our method is both transparent and quantitative: analysts must count coding decisions and justify their judgments about significant identity categories with counts of coding decisions. Moreover, in the future, we hope to incorporate content analysis as a reliability check on our findings—but this should only take place after the category list has been produced inductively and should be checked by human coders to ensure the meaning of every instance.

From Interpretation to Data

Coding produces a long list of categories with raw counts of how many times each category was invoked. Analysts are next asked to perform a series of exercises to help them represent the dominant discourses in a country. First, they produce a raw count table of the top twenty or so categories by frequency, combining positive, negative, neutral, and ambiguous codings. Then analysts are asked to produce a "topographical" table (Table 1) that clusters categories or compares discourses. In the topographical table, raw counts are translated into percentages normalized by genre, and then converted into valence symbols (+, −, /, or ~). Thus, the topographical table represents frequency and valence as well as salience and content.

These tables are arranged from left to right, from texts that reflect elite views to those that reflect mass views. This allows the analysts and readers to see which categories feature in all texts. If a category is distributed from elite to mass, then we can conclude that it is a consensual category and, if quantita-

Categories	Speeches	Newspapers (Op-eds)	Newspapers (Letters)	Textbooks	Movies	Novels
ANTI-BRITAIN						
Contrarian		-	-	-	++	/
MODERN BRITAIN						
Democratic	++	++	++	++		+
Four-National	///	//	~	/		/
Declining	- -	-	~	-	- -	- -
Modern	++	+	+	+	++	++
Orderly	++++	++	+++	++	//	+
Secular		+	++	+		+
Socially Progressive	++	++	+++	+	++++	++++

tively and qualitatively important, that it is likely to be a feature of the dominant discourse.

Building a Quantitative Database

How could these reports be translated into quantitative data? We envision that the topographical tables, because of their basis in raw counts, could be translated by other scholars into a variety of variables with implications for IR. For example, constructivist scholarship hypothesizes that states that share a collective identity, defined as a common understanding of themselves as a "we," are unlikely to go to war with one another.[21] The findings of the long-term project here could be used to test this hypothesis. For example, if "European" emerges as a central identity in German and French discourses after 1945, the data set could provide evidence for the collective identity hypothesis.

Of course, there are other possibilities. For example there is a difference between "collective identity" and "overlapping identity." Overlapping identities are shared in that states understand themselves using the same category. However, overlapping identities are not necessarily collective group identities that posit a "we." For example, China and Brazil both see themselves as "developing" but need not see themselves as part of the same "we," "developing nations." This example shows that within the collective identity-peace hypothesis is the assumption that the "we" has relevant peaceful content—we would not expect an overlapping "developing" status to create peace. Some overlapping identities, however, may lead to peace. For example, if both states see themselves as democratic, this could lead to a preference for settling disputes peacefully. Our approach is an improvement over simpler identity variables because it allows for this differentiation in content. Moreover, our approach could generate hypotheses about cooperation among states with overlapping identities on particular issues. So, "developing" might lead to systematic co-

---

[21] Adler and Barnett 1998; Wendt 1999.

operation among states on a variety of issues that would otherwise be predicted not to manifest so much cooperative behavior.

Collective and overlapping identities can be quantified in a number of ways from our reports. First, a simple present or absent dichotomous variable could be coded based on whether or not a given collective or overlapping identity category was present in the predominant discourse of identity. Second, the quantitative counts could be translated into ordinal variables via a number of transpositions. For example, the number of pluses and minuses in topographical tables could be added together to yield an ordinal variable that codes both presence of a category and its salience in a given country. These could be disaggregated by mass/elite if that is theoretically relevant to the hypothesis at hand. We must do more work in conjunction with quantitative scholars on these issues.

Conclusion

The *Making Identity Count* approach advocates the sequencing of qualitative and quantitative approaches in mixed methods designs. In the case of an intersubjective variable like identity, the first form of analysis must also be intersubjective. Moreover, following interpretivist tenets, the recovery of intersubjective identity should proceed as inductively as possible. Only once the intersubjective meanings of identity have been recovered by appropriate qualitative methods can the process of building quantitative variables proceed. In our approach, quantitative variables for identity rest on inductive discourse analysis that does not pretheorize the content of identity.

This approach aims to maximize the validity of intersubjective variables, without sacrificing the reliability and transparency necessary to produce quantitative data. Certainly, some interpretivists would dismiss the scientific pretensions of an attempt to construct quantitative data on interpretivist methods. Likewise, some positivists would dismiss the reliability of an approach that relies on human coders set to work

with only an inductive coding scheme. Nonetheless, other quantitative approaches to the study of identity fail to capture the meaning and salience of identity in any sense, and a small sacrifice in reliability is necessary to achieve a major increase in validity.

References

Abdelal, Rawi, Yoshiko Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott, eds. 2009. *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adler, Emanuel and Michael Barnett, eds. 1998. *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biddle, Steven and Stephen Long. 2004. "Democracy and Military Effectiveness." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* vol. 48, no. 4: 525–546.

Brady, Henry E. and Cynthia S. Kaplan. 2009. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Ethnic Identity." In *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists*, edited by Rawi Abdelal, Yoshiko Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 33–71.

Carmines, Edward G. and Richard Zeller. 1979. *Reliability and Validity Assessment*. London: Sage University Press.

Cederman, Lars-Erik and Luc Girardin. 2007. "Beyond Fractionalization: Mapping Ethnicity onto Nationalist Insurgencies." *American Political Science Review* vol. 101, no. 1: 173–185.

Fanis, Maria. 2011. *Secular Morality and International Security: American and British Decisions about War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* vol. 97, no. 1: 75–90.

Gartzke, Erik and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2006. "Identity and Conflict: Ties that Bind and Differences that Divide." *Journal of International Relations* vol. 12, no. 1: 53–87.

Goldstein, Judith, Douglas Rivers, and Michael Tomz. 2007. "Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade." *International Organization* vol. 61, no. 1: 37–67.

Henderson, Errol A. 1997. "Ethnic Conflict, the Similarity of States, and the Onset of War, 1820-1989." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* vol. 41, no. 5: 649–668.

Hopf, Ted and Bentley B. Allan, eds. 2016. *Making Identity Count: Building a National Identity Database*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kratochwil, Friedrich. 2007. "Evidence, Inference, and Truth as Problems of Theory Building in the Social Sciences," In *Theory and Evidence in Comparative Politics and International Relations*, edited by Richard Ned Lebow and Mark Lichbach. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 25–54.

Laitin, David. 1986. *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Neuendorf, Kimberley. 2002. *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. London: Sage.

Popper, Karl. 1959. *The Logic of Discovery*. London: Routledge.

Rabinow, Paul and William M. Sullivan, eds. 1987. *Interpretive Social Science: A Second Look*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Rummel, Rudolph. 1997. "Is Collective Violence Correlated with Social Pluralism?" *Journal of Peace Research* vol. 34, no. 2: 163–175.

Sambanis, Nicholas. 2001. "Do Ethnic and Nonethnic Civil Wars Have the Same Causes?: A Theoretical and Empirical Inquiry." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* vol. 45, no. 3: 259–282.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* vol. 64, no. 4: 1033–1053.

Sylvan, David and Amanda Metskas. 2009. "Trade-offs in Measuring Identities: A Comparison of Five Approaches." In *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists*, edited by Rawi Abdelal, Yoshiko Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 71–111.

Vucetic, Srdjan. 2011. *The Anglosphere: A Genealogy of a Racialized Identity in International Relations*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Wedeen, Lisa. 2003. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science." *American Political Science Review* vol. 96, no. 4: 713–728.

Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Interpretation, Causality, and Family Resemblances

Edward Schatz
University of Toronto

How might we link interpretation and causal inference? Our symposium contributors all agree that interpretivist and causality-oriented approaches can be selectively and productively combined. Yet if we are generally bullish on these prospects, our optimism is built on a strong desire to steer clear of what we see in many quarters—namely, the deep subordination of interpretivist approaches to causality-oriented ones. We do not view interpretive methods as the "summer intern" to the supposedly more serious work performed by non-interpretivist tools of inquiry.[1]

We all agree that, because meaning making is not a marginal part of the human experience, any account that assumes that humans' interpretations are irrelevant, epiphenomenal, or just so much "noise" will not convince. Likewise, accounts that "pretheorize" (to use Allan and Hopf's apt term) by unthinkingly accepting categories contained in readily available datasets, will not make for persuasive research. Thus, we are convinced that causality-oriented work in the social sciences simply must attend to meaning-making processes if it is to be credible.

[1] Nor do we suffer from a numbers allergy. To the contrary, as Allan and Hopf underscore in this symposium, quantitative data suitable for statistical analysis can be built from well-grounded, carefully considered, and inductively produced interpretations of texts. On the "summer intern" problem in a slightly different context, see Hopf (2006).

But how far does this basic intuition take us? In this concluding commentary, I contend that if we want to pursue this bridge-building effort further, we should pay close attention to the multiple meanings that undergird our efforts.

Three Family Resemblances

Given our discipline's great variety of intellectual interests, epistemological inclinations, and ontological starting points, are scholars even speaking the same language? Certainly, it can seem that positivists are from Mars and interpretivists from Venus, but what about us interplanetary travelers? Do we mean even roughly similar things when we invoke "interpretation," "causation," and the like?

Interpretation

Consider "interpretation." In a sense, all scholars interpret— whether p-values or speeches from the President of Sri Lanka or testimonies and behaviors of villagers in rural Bolivia. In each case, the researcher demonstrates her/his understanding of the data's significance and conveys that understanding to others. Like a professional interpreter working in multiple languages, she re-renders the original information in a form that will be appreciated by the intended audience.

But these forms of interpretation are also dissimilar, and so the meaning of "interpretation" must be understood as polyvalent. Consider the kinds of interpretation surrounding p-values in statistical research on causation. The front-end of such research proceeds on a series of core assumptions (that are themselves interpretations), including that causality is additive and causal effects homogeneous.[2] Further, those working with p-values agree that a value of, say, 0.05 has a uniform statistical meaning. In these senses, interpretive judgments are basically outsourced to community standards and applied mechanically. Interpretation by prior consensus is still an interpretation. The back-end of such research is more explicit about interpretation. For instance, should we take seriously only results that reach the $p < 0.05$ threshold? What about $p < 0.1$? But, even here there are conventions that tend to constrain claims about which significance levels "matter."[3] The contrast with ethnographic and discourse-analytic work could not be starker. In the latter cases, interpretation is improvisational, in the sense that Dvora Yanow uses the term. It entails a systematic-ness and requires training, but it is not reducible to decision rules invariably applied.[4] Instead, interpretation relies heavily on the credibility and training of the interpreter herself.

Even in this collection of symposium essays, a smaller slice of the epistemological spectrum, there is still notable variety in the meaning and form of interpretation. Allan and Hopf engage in the interpretation of texts produced at a great temporal and geographic distance from the researcher. This dis-

tance implies a particular kind of interpretation. First, it is an interpretation that lends itself to quasi-replication. After all, their texts (whose content does not change) and their interpretations can be easily shared with a broader community of scholars. While much depends on the interpreter and her/his training, background, and sensibilities (hence, the "quasi" in "quasi-replication"), in theory this opens up the process at multiple points for constructive scholarly scrutiny. Second, this kind of interpretation rarely involves the thicket of ethical considerations more typical of research involving live interlocutors. In a sense, the researcher enjoys a freer hand since the actors involved cannot "talk back," but there is also a downside: she cannot ask questions, follow up on leads, generate new topics, and so on.[5]

Ethnographic forms of interpretation speak with a different accent. For Simmons and Smith, interpretation occurs during and after encounters conducted at close range with interlocutors in the field. In this sense, interpretation is the product of iterated interactions, and it is not only potentially much richer than other forms of interpretive work; it is also more likely—because of complex connections in changing situations—to generate surprising research findings. But Simmons and Smith are not content to let the surprise of a case amount to the totality of their intellectual contribution; they seek to refine and improve interpretations via comparison with additional cases. A hallmark of their approach is in fact that what constitutes a "case" is inductively derived and therefore itself changeable.[6]

Samford's ethnographic interpretation broadly shares this intellectual instinct. Also taking a participant-observation approach, he considers ethnography to be particularly suited to interpreting a possible link between variables that co-vary in statistical work. Thus, one of the differences in his approach is that it is oriented toward a larger array of cases, even if only to problematize (as he does) the apparent link among variables. If his form of interpretation is in principle broadly consistent with Laitin's tripartite approach,[7] the relative inclination of each to problematize (rather than validate) apparent causal links emerging through statistical analysis likely differs.

Norman's approach adds yet another dimension. His version of interpretation requires attention to how meanings crystallize and shift over time and how these meanings enable certain kinds of political possibilities while foreclosing others. If, for all of the symposium contributors, meaning-making work is the stuff of human (including political) communities, Norman is unique in claiming that the role it plays is best viewed diachronically.

In "interpretation" we thus see Wittgenstein's famous "family resemblance," in which family members may not share a single, common feature (except, and this is debatable, at a very high level of abstraction); instead, they display a series of overlapping qualities. When we invoke "interpretation," such overlapping connotations put us into conversation with one

---

[2] All research proceeds on ontological assumptions. The difference is that scholars working in the mainstream often need not defend their assumptions.

[3] Thanks to Alan Jacobs for helping to clarify this point.

[4] See Yanow 2006, 70.

[5] This is the takeaway in Pachirat (2009).

[6] See also Ragin and Becker 1992.

[7] Laitin 2003.

another, but they do not prevent us from speaking past each other.

Causation

Scratch the surface of "cause" and "causation" and a second family resemblance reveals itself. Again, on an abstract dimension, this family has common traits. It would be hard, for example, to use the term "cause" without some notion of temporal antecedence and some (whether strong or weak) notion of the counterfactual.

Yet, there is variety. Can causes rise to a standard of necessity and sufficiency, or are they better viewed via Mackie's INUS conditions and Ragin's causal heterogeneity and limited diversity?[8] Is it more useful to view causes as probabilistic or as deterministic? Alternatively, is it preferable to posit causality in a diffuse sense, as producing "conditions of possibility" (Norman, this symposium), for particular outcomes to emerge?

For some, establishing causality and generalizing go hand in hand. This is especially true for Allan and Hopf who equate quantitative (and therefore large-N) with "good causal inference." Although much will depend on how scholars ultimately use the dataset that Allan and Hopf produce, this type of data lends itself to work that views causality in Humean "constant conjunction" fashion. Something can be established as a cause only if it repeats itself across many cases.

Not all of the contributors are interested in establishing causal relationships across a broad range of cases or events; some prefer to focus on causes in heavily time- and space-delimited contexts. Norman's emphasis on mechanisms, consistent with other work invoking that term, implies that he eschews general claims about causal effects that would exceed the boundaries of a single place or time. He proposes that insights can be portable to other contexts, since causal patterns or elements of causation can and do reappear in other places and times. But, he insists that contextual meanings weigh heavily on how these patterns or elements play out in social and political processes.

Thus, a sometimes unstated but important dimension along which notions of "cause" vary is from abstract to context-dependent. Does one's ontology allow factors to have an independent causal valence in the abstract, or does it require that context weigh heavily on how and whether any given factor in fact becomes causal? How complex do we assume context to be, and what weight do we assign it for shaping causal processes or effects?

As with the symposium contributions, our understandings of these matters are often implicit. But they nonetheless structure the conversation we are having (or not, on those occasions when we talk past each other).

Generalization

In "generalization," we see a third family with a series of overlapping qualities. Some researchers harbor an ontology of cau-

sation in which a factor becomes causal only if it plays the same role repeatedly across a variety of circumstances. Strong versions include Hempel's famous "covering law" model.[9] We lack among our symposium participants a proponent of such versions, but Allan and Hopf's approach—which has no *a priori* scope conditions and could apply to all cases where the nation is a meaningful socio-political category—does nothing to preclude it.

For others, to generalize means simply to make more general, even if modestly so. In practice, this could mean extending outward—even by adding a single case—the validity of a claim. Simmons and Smith's proposal to fold additional cases for comparison into the analysis runs along these lines; they strongly imply a preference for inductively derived, mid-level theory building and view their comparative ethnography as taking steps in that direction. While ethnography has come to be known for its context-sensitivity more than its generalizing ambitions, Simmons and Smith make clear that they are open to the inductive discovery that similar processes may unfold across cases.[10]

If generalization simply meant to make claims about causal effects across cases, then Norman's interpretive process tracing and Samford's ethnographic approach to network analysis would not qualify as engaging in it. After all, both promise faithful and theoretically grounded accounts of particular time- and space-bound cases, but they do not offer strong claims about the applicability of their empirical findings to external cases.

But there are different types of generalization. For example, we might distinguish the empirical from the analytic variety. Empirical generalization implies that all cases under given scope conditions display the same dynamics and generate the same causal effects. By contrast, analytic generalization[11] implies that versions of the same process or the same factor are *at play* across a variety of cases. How precisely they play out, however, may easily be a function of contextual factors. If empirical generalization implies a clear prediction about dependent-variable values across cases, analytic generalization gives strong guidance about factors and processes to consider as one moves from the original set of cases to additional ones.

Norman makes this point in a way that Samford would likely find congenial: one might reasonably seek to have her study's findings "speak to" other cases outside the study's original empirical scope without claiming that empirical patterns in other cases will mirror those found in the original ones. In this sense, all of our authors seek to generalize *analytically* by developing insights that are, in essence, *portable*—i.e., that can be brought to bear in efforts to refine our understanding of a broader range of cases. Norman does so by considering mechanisms, which in some proportion and in some fash-

---

[8] INUS conditions are "insufficient but necessary parts of a condition which is itself unnecessary but sufficient" (Mackie 1965, 245). See also Ragin (2000).

[9] Hempel 1965.

[10] Thanks to Alan Jacobs for suggesting this point. On ethnographic approaches to the study of politics, see Schatz (2009).

[11] Becker's (1990) "theoretical generalization" comes close to what I have in mind.

ion may be operating in a variety of times and places.

There are still other forms of generalization. One might—as in versions of rational-actor theory—generalize by assuming that human beings make choices in essentially the same way. Or one might—as in much large-N statistical work in our discipline—generalize by assuming causal homogeneity (rather than multiple causal paths). The list could go on, but I do not have to. The key point is that we may mean different things when we invoke the term "generalization" or its cognates.

Finally, our words do not just have polyvalent meanings; their meanings may have normative valences. In some interpretivist circles, "to generalize" carries a negative connotation roughly equivalent to: *to seek to elide important nuances and distinctions that constitute the human experience*. Likewise, in some positivist circles, "interpretivism" carries a negative connotation, implying something like: *work that properly belongs in the humanities because it cannot be adequately scientific*. Being aware of such valences strikes me as prior to having productive conversations across traditions.

Write out, Write Down, or Write in?

My invitation to be explicit about the meanings that lie behind our words extends to one final area—an area largely absent from our symposium contributions: the interchangeability of researchers. One of the principal premises of interpretivist work is that research scholars are not identical. Yes, it is true that we tend to have roughly similar disciplinary training, but that is not enough to stamp out the individuality that characterizes our scholarly choices. As a result, in some significant part the insights generated during the research process are a function of the person doing the research. By degree, all essays above downplay this point. Allan and Hopf hint at it via Kratochwil's dialogic notion of reliability in which coders should discuss their different interpretations and come to a consensus position.[12] But the non-interchangeability of scholars is a much larger matter. How do the initial positionality, learning strategies, mid-course corrections, and forms of improvisation engaged in by researcher and researched alike produce particular forms of understanding?

I see three major options regarding what are sometimes called "researcher effects." They might be called *write out*, *write down*, and *write in*.

In *writing out*, a researcher constructs her account with little or no reference to her choices, instead proceeding on the assumption that the research would have unfolded in essentially the same way had another scholar conducted it. This can leave traces in our written accounts. For example, when we use the passive voice or transform verbs into nouns we write *out* the choices that individuals, including us as scholars, make.[13] While such an approach is unlikely to find broad resonance among those whose ontology is based on humans as meaning-making creatures, writing the first-person "I" *out* of the research account is common in our discipline.

In *writing down*, a researcher lays bare—to whatever degree she views as appropriate—her research strategies and choices. While there is considerable variety, in recent years this often has taken the form of an appendix on methods. The idea is that by writing down her choices, justifying them as defensible, she nods to transparency while keeping these choices essentially segregated from the claims to knowledge that she advances.

In *writing in*, a researcher integrates the choices made in the research process into the research account itself, charting out how her evolving vantage point conditions the claims that she advances. She does so in order to persuade, believing that analytic leverage is produced precisely when specific individuals make very particular choices in specific situations. Based on a notion of transparency different from what we have seen in recent disciplinary initiatives,[14] she hopes to increase her credibility as an interpreter of the social and political by revealing (rather than concealing) how her interactions developed and observations occurred.

Writing in is sometimes assumed to be a move that is fundamentally opposed to building knowledge. I do not share this assumption. As Pachirat reminds us, rather than seeing "researcher effects" as evidence that an account is partial in the sense of being biased, we might view them as an indication that an account is partial in the sense of being incomplete.[15] All accounts are incomplete, and it takes a cumulative and collective effort of scholars to make it less so.

This final matter—different perspectives on the interchangeability of research scholars—has long been viewed as creating a firewall between interpretivists and those who would make causal inferences. I suspect that in some quarters it may continue to be so viewed. After all, if the knowledge we claim rests not only on contextual complexity but also on very specific interactions between the researcher and the researched, then very little can be said that might transcend particulars. In such a view, while other elements of interpretivism can be integrated into causal inference, the principle of non-interchangeability (a core interpretivist intervention) cannot.

Yet, in our everyday lives, we regularly advance claims designed to transcend the particulars of place and time. Put differently, we leverage our own selves—our background, our training, our proclivities, our relationships, and our knowledge—to offer a sense of the world around us and share that sense with others. In our scholarship, we of course have higher standards for creating, sharing, and evaluating claims, but the essential elements—individuals doing their best to make judgments about the world, sharing those judgments with others, and refining their judgments in the course of things—remain the same. If research is an intersubjective, social exercise, then there is no compelling reason why researcher singularity would be an obstacle to the collective construction of knowledge claims, including those about causality.

---

[12] Kratochwil 2007, as cited in Allan and Hopf, this symposium.

[13] On how turning verbs into nouns obfuscates, see Billig (2013, 95–114).

[14] See the various contributions to *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* (2015).

[15] Pachirat 2009.

References

Becker, Howard S. 1990. "Generalizing from Case Studies." In *Qualitative Inquiry in Education*, edited by Elliott W. Eisner and Alan Peshkin. New York: Teachers College Press, 233–242.

Billig, Michael. 2013. *Learn to Write Badly: How to Succeed in the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hempel, Carl G. 1965. *Aspects of Scientific Explanation and Other Essays in the Philosophy of Science*. New York: The Free Press.

Hopf, Ted. 2006. "Ethnography and Rational Choice in David Laitin: From Equality to Subordination to Absence." *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section* vol. 4, no. 1: 17–20.

Laitin, David D. 2003. "The Perestroikan Challenge to Social Science." *Politics & Society* vol. 31, no. 1: 163–184.

Mackie, John L. 1965. "Causes and Conditions." *American Philosophical Quarterly* vol. 12: 245–265.

"Symposium: Transparency in Qualitative and Multi-Method Research." 2015. *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* vol. 13, no. 1: 2–64.

Ragin, Charles C. 2000. *Fuzzy-Set Social Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ragin, Charles C. and Howard S. Becker, eds. 1992. *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schatz, Edward, ed. 2009. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pachirat, Timothy. 2009. "Shouts and Murmurs: The Ethnographer's Potion." *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section* vol. 7, no. 2: 41–44.

Yanow, Dvora. 2006. "Neither Rigorous Nor Objective? Interrogating Criteria for Knowledge Claims in Interpretive Science." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, edited by Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. Armonk and London: M.E. Sharpe, 67–88.

2015 QMMR Section Awards

Giovanni Sartori QMMR Book Award

This award recognizes the best book, published in the calendar prior to the year in which the award is presented, that makes an original contribution to qualitative or multi-method methodology per se, synthesizes or integrates methodological ideas in a way that is itself a methodological contribution, or provides an exemplary application of qualitative methods to a substantive issue. The selection committee consisted of Audie Klotz (Syracuse), chair; Claudio Radaelli (University of Exeter, UK); and Guillermo Trejo (Notre Dame).

Winner of the 2015 Award: Melanie Cammett, *Compassionate Communalism: Welfare and Sectarianism in Lebanon*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014.

Prize citation, written for the committee by Guillermo Trejo:

The committee received 43 nominations for the Sartori Book Award. We were impressed by the quality of several books, but the committee unanimously agreed that Melani Cammett's book, *Compassionate Communalism*, truly stood out. The book deals with a new and compelling substantive topic (the distribution of social services by sectarian political parties in Lebanon) that has important theoretical and practical implications for the developing world. The outline and execution of the book's research design are exemplary, as is the use of multiple units of analysis (districts and individuals), multiple sources of evidence (qualitative and quantitative) and multiple methods.

Very much in Sartori fashion, Cammett is remarkably clear in defining every concept she uses throughout the book and the two dimensions she uses to derive behavioral expectations about the different modes of social service provision—political mobilization strategies and intrasect competition—yield insightful theoretical propositions. Cammett's discussion of the empirical implications of her theoretical arguments pro-

vides a nice transition to the book's empirical section. The spatial analysis of welfare distribution centers by district is quite effective and is carefully complemented with the unique use of three types of individual-level data on access to welfare: 183 interviews with elites; extensive interviews with non-elites conducted by "proxies" (Lebanese graduate students); and a national survey. In analyzing individual-level data, the book carefully draws on a wide variety of quantitative and qualitative methods to test its main propositions. At the end, the book's explicit discussion of external validity by looking at cases beyond Lebanon adds much value to Cammett's central and important findings.

Alexander George Article/Chapter Award

This award recognizes the journal article or book chapter, published in the calendar prior to the year in which the award is presented, that—on its own—makes the greatest methodological contribution to qualitative research and/or provides the most exemplary application of qualitative research methods. The selection committee consisted of Taylor Boas (Boston University), chair; Jeffrey Checkel (Simon Fraser); and Candelaria Garay (Harvard).

Winner of the 2015 Award: Noam Lupu, "Brand Dilution and the Breakdown of Political Parties in Latin America." *World Politics* vol.66 no.4 (October 2014): 561–602.

Prize citation, written for the committee by Taylor Boas:

Noam Lupu's article addresses the important question of why some longstanding political parties in Latin America experience sudden breakdown, or a dramatic loss of electoral support. Lupu rejects existing arguments that focus entirely on poor governing performance or structural challenges to parties, arguing that they cannot explain anomalies or variation within countries. Instead, he develops an individual-level ex-

planation, rooted in social identity theory, for why voters might abandon parties that they had long supported in the past. Lupu argues that departing from traditional programmatic positions weakens a party's brand—the degree to which the party serves as a meaningful group identity to its supporters. Parties with weakened brands have fewer committed partisans, leaving them vulnerable to a dramatic loss of support after poor governing performance.

Lupu's article uses process tracing to test the aggregate-level implications of this theory of individual voting behavior—a rarity in qualitative research. Examining multiple elections in Argentina and Venezuela over several decades, he shows that neither poor governing performance nor brand dilution alone can account for party breakdown. Rather, established parties collapsed only once they had shifted to the center enough to be seen as indistinguishable from their rivals, *and* they presided over economic disaster.

Lupu's article serves as an exemplar of qualitative and multi-method research in several respects. It pays close attention to conceptualization and measurement, establishing clear definitions and criteria for operationalizing established party, party breakdown, and poor economic performance. Lupu carefully selects cases encompassing the full range of variation on the joint distribution of his two key independent variables, allowing him to demonstrate that they are both necessary for party breakdown. He is also able to rule out country- and party-specific explanations for breakdown by comparing the same party over time as well as multiple parties within each country. He triangulates among an impressive array of data sources, including historical opinion polls, elite interviews, and newspaper coverage. The theoretical insights and analytical rigor of Lupu's research on brand dilution have already had an impact on the field and will continue to do so in the future.

Sage Best Paper Award

This award recognizes the best paper on qualitative and multi-methods research presented at the previous year's meeting of the American Political Science Association. The selection committee consisted of Maryam Deloffre (Arcadia); Zachary S. Elkins (University of Texas-Austin); and Calvert W. Jones (Maryland).

Winner of the 2015 Award: Markus Kreuzer, "The Structure of Description: Elements of Analyzing and Criteria for Evaluating Historical Evidence." Paper presented on panel: "Is All Evidence Created Equal? Available online at http://ssrn.com/abstract=2455371.

Honorable Mention: Chris Krogslund and Katherine E. Michel, "Can QCA Do Causal Inference? An Assessment and Proposed Alternative." Paper presented on panel: "Methodological Innovations in Qualitative Comparative Analysis"

Prize citation, written for the committee by Zach Elkins:

Our committee was fortunate enough to read some very high quality papers nominated for the Sage paper award in multi-methods, but two in particular caught our attention.

We awarded the top honor to Markus Kreuzer for his paper, "The Structure of Description," which impressed us for its originality and importance. Kreuzer's paper explores the criteria by which we evaluate historical evidence, in particular *descriptive* historical evidence. Kreuzer reminds us of the importance of descriptive inquiry and enumerates the structural elements of a typical such study. In the process, he also identifies a set of criteria by which to evaluate historical description. He illustrates his approach with a reappraisal of the dueling accounts of the Holocaust by Goldhagen and Browning. Kreuzer's systematic comparison offers a vivid and enlightening evaluation of this controversy, which was a pleasure to read.

We were also very impressed with a paper by Chris Krogslund and Katherine Michel, entitled "Can QCA Do Causal Inference?" We found their paper to be a particularly clear and thoughtful evaluation of the analytic potential of set-theoretic methods. Their simulations suggest that QCA has a difficult time recovering causal processes given data in various stages of "imperfection," compared to their benchmark, a Random Forest Approach, a rather inductive approach. We found the paper to be quite clever and instructive. It will certainly not be the last word on these methods, but it will be something that those in that discussion will have to contend with.

Best Qualitative Submission to the APSR

This award recognizes the best paper, submitted to the APSR during the previous calendar year, that makes an original contribution to qualitative and/or multi-method research methods or provides an exemplarily application of such methods. The selection committee consisted of John Gerring (Boston University), chair; Andrew Bennett (Georgetown), and James Mahoney (Northwestern).

Winner of the 2015 Award: Macartan Humphreys and Alan Jacobs, "Mixing Methods: A Bayesian Approach." *American Political Science Review* vol.109 no.4 (November 2015): 653–673.

Prize citation, written for the committee by James Mahoney:

We selected this paper for the 2015 award for its stunning contributions to both qualitative and multimethod research. At the level of qualitative research, the paper offers a fresh new vision of process tracing and process tracing tests. The authors developed a beautiful graphical illustration of how the Bayesian likelihood ratio determines the strength and approximate form of different process tracing tests. It is an elegant presentation of an x-y scatterplot in which the x-axis is simply the probability of observing some piece of evidence if the hypothesis is false, and the y-axis is the probability of observing the same piece of evidence if the hypothesis is true. For me, this diagram helped me see how we can think about process tracing tests as zones in a continuous space whose dimensions reflect changes in the size of set membership.

At the level of mixed methods, the paper offers an original framework for integrating causal insights derived from both

qualitative and quantitative analyses. Both cross-case quantitative methods and within-case process tracing findings are combined into the same overarching Bayesian approach. The authors neatly show how a Bayesian approach can serve as a kind of superstructure from which findings from diverse approaches are compiled and used to assess the validity of a hypothesis. The framework is conceptually simple, but incredibly powerful. And while it does not integrate all aspects of quantitative and qualitative work, it takes a big step forward toward offering a new method of combining cross-case and within-case methods that remains true to the distinctive nature and strengths of these two approaches.

David Collier Mid-Career Achievement Award

This award recognizes distinction in methodological publications, innovative application of qualitative and multi-method approaches to substantive research, and/or institutional contributions to this area of methodology. The selection committee consisted of Colin Elman (Syracuse), chair; John Gerring (Boston University); and James Mahoney (Northwestern).

Winner of the 2015 Award: Thad Dunning, University of California, Berkeley

Prize citation, written for the committee by Colin Elman:

The committee unanimously selected Thad Dunning for his outstanding contributions on each aspect of the Collier Award: research methodology, research, and institution-building in the qualitative and multi-method field.

Among Dunning's considerable methodological writings, perhaps his most notable achievement is his 2012 Cambridge University Press volume, *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences: A Design-Based Approach*. Aptly described by James

Robinson as "a remarkable synthesis not just of how to do empirical work, but how to do social science," the book is notable for its rigor, its clarity, and its inclusive approach to multi-method research. When viewed as a whole, Dunning's methodological writings exhibit a similar eclecticism, with contributions across a wide range of traditions and techniques.

Dunning's substantive research is similarly impressive. A major strand of his work investigates natural resources politics. One notable contribution is Dunning's 2008 Cambridge University Press book, *Crude Democracy: Natural Resource Wealth and Political Regimes*. Questioning the then standard view that natural resource wealth leads to autocracy, Dunning suggests that both democracy and authoritarianism can be promoted, depending on which mechanisms are in play. In keeping with the methodological heterogeneity mentioned above, the book is a tour de force of multi-methodological scholarship. Dunning has also published on a range of topics in comparative politics and political economy more broadly, including articles in the *American Political Science Review*, *International Organization*, and elsewhere. Dunning's 2013 book, *Brokers, Voters, and Clientelism: The Puzzle of Distributive Politics* (co-authored with Susan Stokes, Marcelo Nazareno, and Valeria Brusco) won both the Luebbert Book Award for the best book in comparative politics offered by the Comparative Politics section of APSA, and the best book award of the Comparative Democratization section of APSA.

Dunning's contributions to institution building include serving as a module leader for several years at the Institute for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research, twice serving on the section's Nominating Committee (2010, 2014), serving on the Alexander George article/book chapter award committee, and co-leading short courses at the APSA annual meeting.

Qualitative and Multi-Method Research Book Scan: 2014 and 2015

In this Book Scan, we provide citations and descriptions of books that have been published in 2014 or 2015 and which address some facet of qualitative methodology or multi-method research. The Book Scan's focus is on works that develop or teach a methodological approach; it does not seek to encompass substantive applications of qualitative or multiple methods.

Analysis of Text

Bischoping, Katherine and Amber Gazso. *Analyzing Talk in the Social Sciences: Narrative, Conversation and Discourse Strategies*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2015.

Talk offers rich, meaningful data that can provide real insights and new perspectives to qualitative researchers. But once you have the data how do you select an appropriate means of analysis? How do you ensure that the approach you adopt is the best for your project and your data? This book walks the reader through key decisions, provides actionable game plans and highlights the advantages and challenges of the main approaches. It includes numerous real examples designed to showcase the different tools. Each section of the book focuses on one popular strategy for analyzing talk-based data: Narrative Analysis, Conversation Analysis, and Discourse Analysis.

Drisko, James and Tina Maschi. *Content Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

This book offers a comprehensive overview of content analysis, an inclusive and carefully differentiated examination of research purposes and methods of contemporary content analysis, and detailed descriptions of the three main approaches found in the contemporary literature: basic content analysis, interpretive content analysis and qualitative content analysis. Chapter 5 examines rigor in content analysis and highlights steps to ensure internal coherence. The book concludes with an exploration of the use of content analysis for advocacy and building public awareness to promote human rights and social justice, and a review of a full-length study of older adults in prison to detail how content analysis is completed and how different approaches may be usefully combined.

Kim, Jeong-Hee. *Understanding Narrative Inquiry: The Crafting and Analysis of Stories as Research*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2015.

This comprehensive introduction to narrative inquiry in the social and human sciences seeks to guide readers through the entire narrative inquiry process—from locating narrative inquiry in the interdisciplinary context, through the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings, to narrative research design, data collection (excavating stories), data analysis and interpretation, and theorizing narrative meaning. Six extracts from exemplary studies, together with questions for discussion, are provided to show how to put theory into practice.

Rich in stories from the author's own research endeavors and incorporating chapter-opening vignettes that illustrate a graduate student's research dilemma, the book not only accompanies readers through the complex process of narrative inquiry with ample examples, but also helps raise their consciousness about what it means to be a qualitative researcher and a narrative inquirer in particular.

Kuckartz, Udo. *Qualitative Text Analysis: A Guide to Methods, Practice and Using Software*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2014.

How can you analyse narratives, interviews, field notes, or focus group data? *Qualitative Text Analysis* provides a hands-on introduction and step-by-step instructions for implementing the three principal types of qualitative text analysis: thematic, evaluative, and type-building. Special attention is paid to how to present results and the use qualitative data analysis software packages, which are highly recommended for use in combination with qualitative text analysis since they allow for faster, more reliable, and more accurate analysis. The book shows in detail how to use software, from transcribing the verbal data to presenting and visualizing the results. It also introduces the theoretical underpinnings of qualitative text analysis.

Livholts, Mona and Maria Tamboukou. *Discourse and Narrative Methods: Theoretical Departures, Analytical Strategies and Situated Writings*. London: Sage, 2015.

Discourses and narratives are crucial in how we understand a world of rapid changes. This textbook constitutes a unique introduction to two major influential theoretical and methodological fields—discourse and narrative methods—and examines them in their interrelation. It offers readers an orientation within the broad and contested area of discourse and narrative methods and develops concrete analytical strategies for those who wish to explore both or one of these fields as well as their overlaps. With examples from real life and real research, the book maps the theoretical influence from poststructuralist, postmodern, postcolonial and feminist ideas on the field of discourse and narrative; presents a variety of oral, textual, visual and other 'data' for the purpose of analyzing discourse and narrative; and offers deeper insight into discourse and narrative methods with a focus on: media and society, gender and space, and autobiography and life writing.

Shenhav, Shaul R. *Analyzing Social Narratives*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Interpreting human stories, whether those told by individuals, groups, organizations, nations, or even civilizations, opens a wide scope of research options for understanding how people construct, shape, and reshape their perceptions, identities, and beliefs. Such narrative research is a rapidly growing field in the social sciences, as well as in the societally oriented humanities, such as cultural studies. This methodologically framed book offers conceptual directions for the study of social narrative, guiding readers through the means of narrative research and raising important ethical and value-related dilemmas. The aim of the book is to create an easy, clear, and welcoming introduction to narratology as a mode of analysis, especially for students of the social sciences to provide the basics of a narratological approach, and to help make research and writing in this tradition more systematic.

Silver, Christina and Ann Lewins. *Using Software in Qualitative Research: A Step-by-Step Guide*. 2nd edition. Los Angeles: Sage, 2014.

This introduction to the practice and principles of Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis (CAQDAS) seeks to help readers choose the most appropriate software package for their needs and then get the most out of the software. It considers a wide range of tasks and processes in the data management and analysis process, showing how software can help at each stage. In the new edition, the authors present three case studies with different forms of data (text, video and mixed data) and show how each step in the analysis process for each project could be supported by software. An extensive companion website provides step-by-step instructions produced by the software developers themselves. Software programmes covered in the second edition include the latest versions of: ATLAS.ti, DEDOOSE, HyperRESEARCH, MAXQDA, Nvivo, QDAMiner, and TRANSANA.

Sutherland, Sean. *A Beginner's Guide to Discourse Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

This practical textbook introduces the tools and techniques that explain how language is used in different situations, and how it can be analyzed using discourse analysis. Author Sean Sutherland has years of experience in teaching the topic to his own undergraduate and graduate students, and the book provides numerous colourful examples from novels, songs, newspaper articles and more.

Zafarani, Reza, Mohammad Ali Abbasi, and Huan Liu. *Social Media Mining: An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

The growth of social media over the last decade has revolutionized the way individuals interact and industries conduct business. Individuals produce data at an unprecedented rate by interacting, sharing, and consuming content through social media. Understanding and processing this new type of data to glean actionable patterns presents challenges and opportunities for interdisciplinary research, novel algorithms, and tool development. *Social Media Mining* integrates social media, social network analysis, and data mining to provide a convenient and coherent platform for students, practitioners, researchers, and project managers to understand the basics and potentials of social media mining. It introduces the unique problems arising from social media data and presents fundamental concepts, emerging issues, and effective algorithms for network analysis and data mining. The text contains exercises of different degrees of difficulty that improve understanding and help apply concepts, principles, and methods in various scenarios of social media mining.

Causality

Illari, Phyllis and Federica Russo. *Causality: Philosophical Theory Meets Scientific Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Head hits cause brain damage—but not always. Should we ban sport to protect athletes? Exposure to electromagnetic fields is strongly associated with cancer development—does that mean exposure causes cancer? Should we encourage old fashioned communication instead of mobile phones to reduce cancer rates? According to popular wisdom, the Mediterranean diet keeps you healthy. Is this belief scientifically sound? Should public health bodies encourage consumption of fresh fruit and vegetables? Severe financial constraints on research and public policy, media pressure, and public anxiety make such questions—addressed in this book—of immense current concern not just to philosophers but to scientists, governments, public bodies, and the general public.

Kutach, Douglas. *Causation*. Cambridge: John Wiley & Sons, 2014.

In most academic and non-academic circles throughout history, the world and its operation have been viewed in terms of cause and effect. The principles of causation have been applied, fruitfully, across the sciences, law, medicine, and in everyday life, despite the lack of any agreed-upon framework for understanding what causation ultimately amounts to. In this accessible introduction to the topic, Douglas Kutach explains and analyses the most prominent theories and examples in the philosophy of causation. The book is organized so as to respect the various cross-cutting and interdisciplinary concerns about causation, such as the reducibility of causation, its application to scientific modeling, its connection to influence and laws of nature, and its role in causal explanation. Kutach begins by presenting the four recurring distinctions in the literature on causation, proceeding through an exploration of various accounts of causation including determination, difference making and probability-raising. He concludes by carefully considering their application to the mind-body problem.

Case Studies, Comparative Method, and Process Tracing

Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey T. Checkel, eds. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Advances in qualitative methods and recent developments in the philosophy of science have led to an emphasis on explanation via reference to causal mechanisms. This book argues that the method known as process tracing is particularly well suited to developing and assessing theories about such mechanisms. The editors begin by establishing a philosophical basis for process tracing—one that captures mainstream uses while simultaneously being open to applications by interpretive scholars. Equally important, they go on to establish best practices for individual process-tracing accounts—how micro to go, when to start (and stop), and how to deal with the problem of equifinality. The contributors then explore the application of process tracing across a range of subfields and theories in political science. This is an applied methods book which seeks to shrink the gap between the broad assertion that "process tracing is good" and the precise claim "this is an instance of good process tracing."

Engeli, Isabelle and Christine R. Allison, eds. *Comparative Policy Studies: Conceptual and Methodological Challenges*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

The role of comparative analysis in policy studies has gained increasing importance in recent years. Comparative policy studies aims at comparing and contrasting public policy making across sectoral, regional and national boundaries in order to overcome challenges in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policy. This book seeks to provide scholars and policy-makers with both compelling comparative research design and methodology in one place. It specifically addresses key research design and methodological challenges that comparative policy studies typically faces and draws on rich empirical illustrations.

Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen, eds. *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Against the backdrop of an explosion of interest in new techniques for data collection and theory testing, this volume provides a fresh programmatic statement about comparative-historical analysis. It examines the advances and distinctive contributions that CHA has made to theory generation and the explanation of large-scale outcomes that newer approaches often regard as empirically intractable. An introductory essay locates the sources of CHA's enduring influence in core characteristics that distinguish this approach, such as its attention to process and its commitment to empirically grounded, deep case-based research. Subsequent chapters explore broad re-

search programs inspired by CHA work, new analytic tools for studying temporal processes and institutional dynamics, and recent methodological tools for analyzing sequences and for combining CHA work with other approaches. This volume is essential reading for scholars seeking to learn about the sources of CHA's enduring influence and its contemporary analytical and methodological techniques.

Thomas, Gary and Kevin Myers. *The Anatomy of the Case Study*. London: Sage, 2015.

This book seeks to provide a structure for thinking about, analyzing and designing case studies. It explores the historical, theoretical and practical bones of modern case study research, offering to social scientists a framework for understanding and working with this form of inquiry. Using detailed examples taken from across the social sciences, Thomas and Myers set out, and then work through, an intricate typology of case study design to ground complex theoretical insights in real world research. The book includes an extended example that has been annotated line by line to take the reader through each step of understanding and conducting case study research.

Concepts and Measurement

Schaffer, Frederic Charles. *Elucidating Social Science Concepts: An Interpretivist Guide*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Concepts have always been foundational to the social science enterprise. This book is a guide to working with them. Against the positivist project of concept "reconstruction"—the formulation of a technical, purportedly neutral vocabulary for measuring, comparing, and generalizing—Schaffer adopts an interpretivist approach that he calls "elucidation." Elucidation includes both a reflexive examination of social science technical language and an investigation into the language of daily life. It is intended to produce a clear view of both types of language, the relationship between them, and the practices of life and power that they evoke and sustain. After an initial chapter explaining what elucidation is and how it differs from reconstruction, the book lays out practical elucidative strategies—grounding, locating, and exposing—that help situate concepts in particular language games, times and tongues, and structures of power. It also explores the uses to which elucidation can be put and the moral dilemmas that attend such uses. By illustrating his arguments with lively analyses of such concepts as "person," "family," and "democracy," Schaffer shows rather than tells.

Spanakos, Anthony Petros and Francisco Panizza, eds. *Conceptualising Comparative Politics*. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Comparative politics often involves testing hypotheses using new methodological approaches without giving sufficient at-

tention to the concepts that are fundamental to the hypotheses, particularly to the ability of these concepts to "travel." Proper operationalizing requires deep reflection on the concept, not simply establishing how it should be measured. *Conceptualising Comparative Politics* examines—and seeks to illustrate—the gains from thoroughly thinking through concepts and deep familiarity with the case that inform the conceptual reflection. The book posits that concepts may be used comparatively as lenses, building blocks, and scripts. And the contributors, including established academics as well as emerging scholars in the field, show how these conceptual tools can be employed in original comparative research. The chapters included in this volume address some of the most contentious issues in comparative politics (populism, state capacity, governance, institutions, elections, secularism, among others) from various geographic regions and model how scholars doing comparative politics might approach such subjects.

Critical Theory as Empirical Method

Aradau, Claudia, Jef Huysmans, Andrew Neal, and Nadine Voelkner, eds. *Critical Security Methods: New Frameworks for Analysis*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2014.

Critical Security Methods offers a new approach to research methods in critical security studies. It argues that methods are not simply tools to bridge the gap between security theory and security practice. Rather, to practise methods critically means engaging in a more free and experimental interplay between theory, methods and practice. This recognises that the security practices we research are often methods in their own right, as forms of surveillance, data mining, visualisation, and so on, and that our own research methods are themselves practices that intervene and interfere in those sites of security and insecurity. The chapters offer a series of methodological experimentations that assemble concepts, theory and empirical cases into new frameworks for critical security research. They show how critical engagement and methodological innovation can be practiced as interventions into diverse instances of insecurity and securitisation, including airports, drug trafficking, peasant struggles, biometrics and police kettling.

Dixit, Priya and Jacob L Stump. *Critical Methods in Terrorism Studies*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.

Featuring the work of researchers who have already utilized critical methods to study terrorism, this book includes a diverse range of critical methodological approaches – including discourse analysis, feminist, postcolonial, ethnographic, critical theory, and visual analysis of terrorism. The main objectives of the book are to assist researchers in adopting and applying various critical approaches. The authors of each chapter discuss (1) why they chose their specific critical method; (2) how they justified their methodological stance; (3) how they conduct their research; (4) and, finally, an example of the research.

Waller, Vivienne, Karen Farquharson, and Deborah Dempsey. *Qualitative Social Research: Contemporary Methods for the Digital Age*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2015.

Qualitative Social Research employs an accessible approach to present the multiple ways in which criticism enhances research practice. Using numerous "real world" examples, it showcases the strengths and pitfalls of each research method, integrating the philosophical groundings of qualitative research with overviews of a range of commonly used methods, explaining what makes qualitative sociological research practical, useful and ethical. It includes discussions of new technologies in each chapter, as well as explanations of how to integrate online and visual methods with traditional data collection methods.

Ethnographic and Field Research

Aldridge, Jo. *Participatory Research: Working with Vulnerable Groups in Research and Practice*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2015.

Drawing on in-depth case studies written by women who are survivors of interpersonal violence, this book examines the nature of participatory research in the social sciences and its role in increasing research participation among vulnerable or marginalized populations. In so doing, *Participatory Research* details how inclusion and collaboration can be enhanced among vulnerable research participants—such as those with profound learning difficulties, victims of abuse and trauma, and children and young people—and shows how useful the approach can be with these groups. Also exploring important ethical issues and challenges associated with participatory research, this book seeks to help students, researchers, and academics put participatory research methods into practice.

Bednarek-Gilland, Antje. *Researching Values with Qualitative Methods: Empathy, Moral Boundaries and the Politics of Research*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015.

In several branches of social science, interest in values and moral evaluations has increased in recent years, with group values taking centre-stage. Engaging with theories of value formation and the role of values in everyday life found in ethics, classical sociology and contemporary social theory and their implications for empirical work, *Researching Values with Qualitative Methods* argues for a pragmatist approach both to understanding values and the manner in which they are formed, as well as exploring the ways in which they can be studied empirically, using qualitative research methods. In this way, this book promises to resolve many of the practical problems involved in fieldwork with political groups, including the prominent question of how to account for the researcher's own values. Illustrated with examples from published as well as new research, this book provides the foundation for the theoretical understanding of values and their empirical investigation, thus

strengthening the connection between social theory and the development of research methods.

Beuving, Joost and Geert de Vries. *Doing Qualitative Research: The Craft of Naturalistic Inquiry*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2015.

Naturalistic inquiry is about studying people in everyday circumstances using ordinary means. It strives to blend in—respecting people in their daily lives, taking their actions and experiences seriously while not interfering—in order to come to theoretical understanding. This textbook for undergraduate and graduate students in social science offers guidance, combining thoughtful reflection with practical tips.

Czarniawska, Barbara. *Social Science Research: From Field to Desk*. London: Sage, 2014.

Barbara Czarniawska takes us on a master class through the research process, encouraging us to revisit the various facets of the fieldwork research and helping us to reframe our own experiences. Combining a conversational style of writing with an impressive range of empirical examples, she takes the reader from planning and designing research to collecting and analyzing data all the way to writing up and disseminating findings. This sophisticated introduction embraces the practical reality of actually doing fieldwork. It tackles the common problems faced by new researchers head on, offering sensible advice and instructive case studies from the author's own experience.

Fitzgerald, Richard and William Housley. *Advances in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. London: Sage, 2015.

This is an exciting addition to the dynamic, multidisciplinary field of membership categorization analysis. Bringing together the biggest names in MCA this book provides a contemporary analysis of the field and a platform for emerging researchers and students to build upon. The book sets out the current methodological developments of MCA highlighting its analytic strength—particularly when examining social identity and social knowledge. It provides a sophisticated tool of qualitative analysis and draws from a wide range of empirical studies provided by global scholars. The culmination of years of international research this agenda-setting text will be essential reading for academics and advanced students using membership categorization across the social sciences; particularly in media and communication studies, sociology, psychology, education, political science and linguistics.

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. *Field Research in Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Field research—leaving one's home institution in order to acquire data, information or insights that significantly inform one's research—remains indispensable, even in a digitally networked era. This book reconsiders the design and execution of field research and explores its role in producing knowledge. First, it offers an empirical overview of fieldwork in the discipline based on a large-scale survey and extensive interviews. Good fieldwork takes diverse forms yet follows a set of common practices and principles. Second, the book demonstrates the analytic benefits of fieldwork, showing how it contributes to our understanding of politics. Finally, it provides intellectual and practical guidance, with chapters on preparing for field research, operating in the field and making analytic progress while collecting data, and on data collection techniques including archival research, interviewing, ethnography and participant observation, surveys, and field experiments.

Hermeneutic and Interpretive Approaches

Brincat, Shannon, ed. *Dialectics in World Politics*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2015.

This volume explores the conceptual, methodological and praxeological aspects of dialectical analysis in world politics. As dialectics has remained an under-theorised analytical tool in international relations, this volume provides a critical resource for those seeking to deploy dialectics in their own research by showcasing its effectiveness for understanding and transforming world politics. Contributions demonstrate a number of innovative ways in which dialectical thinking can be of benefit to the study of world politics by covering three thematic concerns: (i) conceptual or meta-theoretical dimensions of dialectics; (ii) methodological features and general principles of dialectical approaches; and (iii) applications and/or case studies that deploy a dialectical approach to world politics. Canvassing a diverse range of dialectical approaches on key issues in world politics—from global security to postcolonial resistances, from the theoretical problems of reification and complexity, to the study of the global futures and the intercultural historical expressions of dialectics—*Dialectics and World Politics* offers key insights into the social forces and contradictions that are generative of transformation in world politics and yet routinely downplayed in orthodox approaches to international relations. Each chapter demonstrates how dialectics can be utilized more broadly in the discipline and deployed in a critical fashion as part of an emancipatory project.

Jacobsen, Michael Hviid, Anders Petersen, Michael S. Drake, and Kieran Keohane, eds. *Imaginative Methodologies in the Social Sciences: Creativity, Poetics and Rhetoric in Social Research*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2014.

This book develops, expands and challenges conventional social scientific methodology and language by way of literary, poetic and other alternative sources of inspiration, as sociologists, social workers, anthropologists, criminologists and psychologists all rethink, provoke and reignite social scientific methodology. Challenging the mainstream orthodoxy of social scientific methodology, which closely guards the boundaries between the social sciences and the arts and humanities, this volume reveals that authors and artists are often engaged in projects parallel to those of the social sciences and vice versa, thus demonstrating that artistic and cultural production does not necessarily constitute a specialist field, but is in fact integral to social reality.

Interview and Survey Methods

Gobo, Giampietro and Sergio Mauceri. *Constructing Survey Data: An Interactional Approach*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2014.

This book provides students and researchers with a pragmatic, new perspective on the process of collecting survey data. By proposing a post-positivist, interviewee-centred approach, it improves the quality and impact of survey data by emphasising the interaction between interviewer and interviewee. Extending the conventional methodology with contributions from linguistics, anthropology, cognitive studies and ethnomethodology, Gobo and Mauceri analyse the answering process in structured interviews built around questionnaires. The following key areas are explored in detail: an historical overview of survey research, the process of preparing the survey and designing data collection, the methods of detecting bias and improving data quality, the strategies for combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, and the survey within global and local contexts. Incorporating the work of experts in interpersonal and intercultural relations, this book offers readers a critical perspective on survey research.

Magnusson, Eva and Jeanne Marecek. *Doing Interview-Based Qualitative Research: A Learner's Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

This book is an accessible step-by-step guide to conducting interview-based qualitative research projects. The authors discuss the "hows" and "whys" of qualitative research, showing readers the practices as well as the principles behind them. The book first describes how to formulate research questions suited to qualitative inquiry. It then discusses in detail how to select and invite research participants into a study and how to design and carry out good interviews. It next presents several ways to analyze interviews and provides readers with many examples. It also discusses how to synthesize findings and how to present them.

Morris, Alan. *A Practical Introduction to In-Depth Interviewing*. London: Sage, 2015.

A nuts and bolts introduction to interviewing. With coverage of ethics, preparation strategies and advice for handling the unexpected in the field, this guidebook seeks to help readers get to grips with the basics of interviewing before embarking on their own research. The book seeks to provide interview methods-specific practical advice often skipped in traditional methods textbooks.

Saris, Willem E. and Irmtraud N. Gallhofer. *Design, Evaluation, and Analysis of Questionnaires for Survey Research*. 2nd ed. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2014.

Reflecting modern developments in the field of survey research, *Design, Evaluation, and Analysis of Questionnaires for Survey Research* provides analysis of the important decisions researchers make throughout the survey design process. The new edition covers the essential methodologies and statistical tools utilized to create reliable and accurate survey questionnaires, which unveils the relationship between individual question characteristics and overall question quality. The computer program Survey Quality Prediction (SQP) has been updated to include new predictions of the quality of survey questions on the basis of analyses of Multi-Trait Multi-Method experiments. The improved program contains over 60,000 questions, with translations in most European languages. Featuring an expanded explanation of the usage and limitations of SQP 2.0, the second edition also includes: new practice problems to provide readers with real-world experience in survey research and questionnaire design, a comprehensive outline of the steps for creating and testing survey questionnaires, and contemporary examples that demonstrate the many pitfalls of questionnaire design and ways to avoid similar decisions.

Multi-Method Research

Domínguez, Silvia and Betina Hollstein, eds. *Mixed Methods Social Networks Research: Design and Applications*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

This volume demonstrates the potential of mixed-methods designs for research on social networks, as well as for the utilization of social networks for other research. *Mixed Methods* applies to the combination and integration of qualitative and quantitative methods. In social network research, mixing methods also applies to the combination of structural and actor-oriented approaches. The volume provides readers with methodological concepts to guide mixed-method network studies with precise research designs and methods to investigate social networks of various sorts. Each chapter describes the research design used and discusses the strengths of the methods for that particular field and for specific outcomes.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy, and R. Burke Johnson, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Multimethod and Mixed Methods Research Inquiry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Offering a variety of innovative methods and tools, *The Oxford Handbook of Multimethod and Mixed Methods Research Inquiry* provides a comprehensive and up-to-date presentation of multi- and mixed-methods research. Written concisely by leading scholars in the field, it enhances and disrupts traditional ways of asking and addressing complex research questions. Topics include an overview of theory, paradigms, and scientific inquiry; a guide to conducting a multi- and mixed-methods research study from start to finish; current uses of multi- and mixed-methods research across academic disciplines and research fields; the latest technologies and how they can be incorporated into study design; and a presentation of multiple perspectives on the key remaining debates. Each chapter includes state-of-the-art examples.

Kara, Helen. *Creative Research Methods in the Social Sciences: A Practical Guide*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2015.

Creative research methods can help answer complex contemporary questions that traditional methods alone cannot; they can also be more ethical, helping researchers to address social injustice in new ways. This accessible book identifies and examines the four pillars of creative research methods: arts-based research, research using technology, mixed-method research, and transformative research frameworks. It offers numerous examples from around the world of creative methods in practice in the social sciences, arts, and humanities. It seeks to demonstrate why, when, and how to use creative methods.

Qualitative and Multi-Method Approaches: General

Anfara Jr, Vincent A. and Norma T. Mertz, eds. *Theoretical Frameworks in Qualitative Research*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles: Sage, 2014.

The second edition of *Theoretical Frameworks in Qualitative Research* brings together some of today's leading qualitative researchers to discuss the frameworks behind their published qualitative studies. They share how they found and chose a theoretical framework, from what discipline the framework was drawn, what the framework posits, and how it influenced their study. Both novice and experienced qualitative researchers are able to learn first-hand from various contributors as they reflect on the process and decisions involved in completing their study. The book also provides background for beginning researchers about the nature of theoretical frameworks and their importance in qualitative research; about differences in perspective about the role of theoretical frameworks; and about how to find and use a theoretical framework.

Birks, Melanie and Jane Mills. *Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide*. Los Angeles: Sage, 2015.

This book introduces the whole range of grounded theory approaches, providing a comprehensive description of the strategies and techniques employed in this methodology. It is not written from a particular philosophical standpoint, but as a first introduction for students or researchers looking to use grounded theory in their analysis. Birks and Mills' accessible text is driven by practical case examples throughout to help the reader get to grips with the process of doing grounded theory analysis for themselves. The book deploys a variety of educational activities to guide readers through both the principles and the application of grounded theory, making this an ideal starter text for those new to the approach.

Camfield, Laura, ed. *Methodological Challenges and New Approaches to Research in International Development*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Development researchers face many challenges in producing robust and persuasive analyses, often within a short timeframe. This edited volume tackles these challenges head-on, using examples and drawing on best practice from other fields. It provides a fresh perspective on perennial debates such as how to integrate qualitative and quantitative approaches and the relationship between data and theory.

Creswell, John W. *30 Essential Skills for the Qualitative Researcher*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2015.

30 Essential Skills for the Qualitative Researcher seeks to fill a gap in introductory literature on qualitative inquiry by providing practical "how-to" information for beginning researchers in the social, behavioral, and health sciences. John W. Creswell draws on years of teaching, writing, and conducting his own projects to offer techniques and procedures with many applied examples from research design, qualitative inquiry, and mixed methods. Creswell defines what a skill is, and acknowledges that while there may be more than 30 that an individual will use and perfect, the skills presented in this book are crucial for a new qualitative researcher starting a qualitative project.

Della Porta, Donatella, ed. *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Social movement studies have grown enormously in the last few decades. With the growing interest in the field, there has been also an increasing need for methodological guidance for empirical research. This volume addresses this need by introducing the main methods of data collection and data analysis as they have been used in past research on social movements. The book offers a practical, how-to approach and not simply a review of the methodological literature. Each author writes on a method they are very familiar with, having used it extensively in their own work. And each chapter presents specific discus-

sions on every stage of research: from research design to data collection and the use of the information gathered. Throughout, research dilemmas and choices are presented, illustrated, and discussed. The volume offers an essential point of references for anyone undertaking research on social movements.

Dowding, Keith. *The Philosophy and Methods of Political Science*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

This short book addresses the question of what constitutes good practice in a variety of political science methods and examines the philosophy that underpins them. It argues for a pluralistic approach that will deliver effective analysis and an in-depth understanding of political events.

Leavy, Patricia, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

The *Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research* presents a comprehensive overview of the field of qualitative research across the social sciences. The contributors represent some of the most influential and innovative researchers in the field as well as emerging scholars. The handbook seek to provide a broad introduction to qualitative research for those with little to no background in the subject, offering both a retrospective and prospective view of the field, while simultaneously providing substantive contributions to the field that will be of interest to even the most experienced researchers. The first two sections explore the history of the field, ethics and philosophical/theoretical approaches. The next three sections focus on the major methods of qualitative practice as well as newer approaches (such as arts-based research and internet research); area studies often excluded (such as museum studies and disaster studies); and mixed methods and participatory methods (such as community-based research). The next section covers key issues including data analysis, interpretation, writing and assessment. The final section offers a commentary about politics and research and the move towards public scholarship.

Lynggaard, Kennet, Ian Manners, and Karl Löfgren, eds. *Research Methods in European Union Studies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

The crises that currently grip Europe imply a failure to ask the pertinent questions as well as a perceived weakness in the methods and evidence used by researchers. This volume acknowledges the weaknesses of the past but seeks to move beyond them and towards EU research strategies that go beyond the dichotomies of the past towards a new agenda for research on Europe through problem-solving based research. The 20 chapters in this collection range from micro-level analyses of identities, single policy studies and European discourse, through meso-level analysis of agenda setting, bargaining, implementation and Europeanization, to macro-level analyses of the EU as a global actor, European integration and global-

isation as well as hard and soft governance, elections and party groups, attitude formation, and new-regionalism. The book thus provides a comprehensive and accessible guide to conducting research on the European Union today.

Roller, Margaret R. and Paul J. Lavrakas. *Applied Qualitative Research Design: A Total Quality Framework Approach*. New York: Guilford Press, 2015.

This textbook provides a comprehensive framework for creating, managing, and interpreting qualitative research studies that yield valid and useful information. Examples of studies from a wide range of disciplines illustrate the strengths, limitations, and applications of the primary qualitative methods: in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, ethnography, content analysis, and case study and narrative research. Chapters show how to implement each method within a paradigm-neutral and flexible Total Quality Framework (TQF) comprising four interrelated components: Credibility, Analyzability, Transparency, and Usefulness. Detailed discussions of such crucial topics as construct validity, inter-researcher reliability, researcher bias, and verification strategies are featured throughout to address the quality issue. The book also addresses applications of the TQF to the writing, review, and evaluation of qualitative research proposals and manuscripts.

Snee, Helene, Christine Hine, Yvette Morey, Steven Roberts, and Hayley Watson, eds. *Digital Methods for Social Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Guide to Research Innovation*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Digital technologies present a challenge to social researchers, and in turn offer the chance to access, generate and analyse new information in new ways and address new research questions. In response to this challenge, this interdisciplinary collection considers the quantitative and qualitative analysis of social media, addressing the contemporary concern with "big data" but also the rich or "thick data" available. It provides examples of research that has sought to explore digital methods through comparing and combining these with 'offline' or traditional approaches, and presents case studies that are both innovative in their use of new, existing and combined methods but also question the nature of innovation. It also develops some of the key challenges in mainstreaming digital methods, including debates in educational research, research with young people, and the ethical issues that digital and social researchers face.

Tavory, Iddo, and Stefan Timmermans. *Abductive Analysis: Theorizing Qualitative Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014.

Abductive Analysis provides a new navigational map for theorizing qualitative research. The authors outline a way to think about observations, methods, and theories that nurtures theory formation without locking it into predefined conceptual boxes.

The book provides novel ways to approach the challenges that plague qualitative researchers across the social sciences—how to conceptualize causality, how to manage the variation of observations, and how to leverage the researcher's community of inquiry.

Van Thiel, Sandra. *Research Methods in Public Administration and Public Management: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2014.

Research in public administration and public management has distinctive features that influence the choices and application of research methods. Periods of change and upheaval in the public sector provide ample opportunities and cases for research, but the standard methodologies for researching in the social sciences can be difficult to follow in the complex world of the public sector. In a dynamic political environment, the focus lies on solving social problems whilst also using methodological principles needed for doing scientifically sound research. *Research Methods in Public Administration and Public Management* represents a comprehensive guide to doing and using research in public management and administration. It is succinct but covers a wide variety of research strategies including among others: action research, hypotheses, sampling, case selection, questionnaires, interviewing, desk research, prescription and research ethics.

Research Ethics and Research Transparency

Jolivette, Andrew J., ed. *Research Justice: Methodologies for Social Change*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2015.

Challenging traditional models for conducting social science research within marginalized populations, "research justice" is a strategic framework and methodological intervention that aims to transform structural inequalities in research. This book is the first to offer a close analysis of that framework and present a radical approach to socially just, community-centered research. It is built around a vision of equal political power and legitimacy for different forms of knowledge, including the cultural, spiritual, and experiential, with the goal of greater equality in public policies and laws that rely on data and research to produce social change.

Textbooks: New Editions

Adler, Emily and Roger Clark. *An Invitation to Social Research: How It's Done*. 5th edition. Stamford: Cengage Learning, 2015.

Babbie, Earl R. and Lucia Benaquisto. *Fundamentals of Social Research*. 3rd Canadian Edition. Toronto: Nelson Education, 2014.

Banks, Marcus and David Zeitlyn. *Visual Methods in Social Research*. 2nd edition. London: Sage, 2015.

Bloomberg, Linda Dale and Marie Volpe. *Completing your Qualitative Dissertation: A Road Map from Beginning to End*. 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2015.

Bradbury, Hilary. *The SAGE Handbook of Action Research*. 3rd edition. London: Sage, 2015.

Brinkmann, Svend and Steinar Kvale. *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 3rd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2015.

Bryman, Alan. *Social Research Methods*. 5th edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Corbin, Juliet and Anselm Strauss. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. 4th edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2014.

Donovan, Todd and Kenneth Hoover. *The Elements of Social Scientific Thinking*. 11th edition. Boston: Cengage Learning, 2015.

Friese, Susanne. *Qualitative Data Analysis with ATLAS.ti*. 2nd edition. London: Sage, 2014.

Merriam, Sharan B. and Elizabeth J. Tisdell. *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. 4th edition. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass, 2015.

Orcher, Lawrence. *Conducting Research: Social and Behavioral Science Methods*. 2nd edition. Glendale: Pyrczak, 2014.

Patten, Mildred L. and Randall R Bruce. *Understanding Research Methods: An Overview of the Essentials*. 9th edition. Glendale: Pyrczak, 2014.

Salmons, Janet. *Qualitative Online Interviews: Strategies, Design, and Skills*. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2014.

Taylor, Steven J., Robert Bogdan, and Marjorie DeVault. *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods: A Guidebook and Resource*. 4th edition. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2015.

Thomas, Gary. *How to Do Your Case Study: A Guide for Students and Researchers*. 2nd edition. Los Angeles: Sage, 2015.

Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer. *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*. 3rd edition. Los Angeles: Sage, 2015.

Yin, Robert K. *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish*. 2nd edition. New York: Guilford Press, 2015.

Qualitative and Multi-Method Research
Department of Political Science
140 Science Drive (Gross Hall), 2nd Floor
Duke University, Box 90204
Durham, NC 27708
United States of America