

RESEARCH METHODS
API5136B
Srdjan Vucetic
Winter 2011 (Jan 5-Apr 8)

COURSE OUTLINE

Class schedule: R14:30-17:30, DMS 2-175
Professor's office hours: WF 13:30-15:30, DMS 11-164



E-mail: svucetic@uottawa.ca

Website: <http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~svucetic/>

Course website: Virtual Campus/Blackboard

TA: Ms Vivasvat Dadwal, E-mail dadwal@uottawa.ca

OFFICIAL COURSE DESCRIPTION

“Introduction to the various methods used in policy research and to use of multivariate quantitative methods to conduct a research project. Research design, data sources and analysis. The qualitative methods examined include the use of focus groups and interviews; quantitative methods include simple and multiple regression, logistic regression, and factor analysis” (API website, 2010).

GENERAL COURSE DESCRIPTION

There are three parts to this course: Part I (“meta”) briefly covers ontological, epistemological, and methodological questions that keep philosophers and practitioners of social science awake at night, namely the nature of reality and causation, the construction and use of social science concepts, and the quantitative-qualitative-interpretative-mixed method distinctions. Part II (“quant”) begins with an overview of quantitative methods used to analyze large-*N* data and ends with a computer lab assignment in which students will use SPSS to do single-equation regressions. Part III (“qual”) reviews case studies, participatory work and a selection of methods for text analysis. In the final assignment, students will write produce either a 1) research design on a topic of their interest, with concentration on the research question, conceptualization, and case selection; and 2) a methodological critique of one or more studies found in this syllabus or some other mutually agreed-upon source.

Translation: you’ve enrolled in a fast & furious methods course, but do not despair. Most readings and assignments are pitched at the introductory level (I am assuming that some of you have never heard of terms such as epistemology or SPSS). When appropriate, we will discuss additional themes not appearing on the syllabus (e.g., the pragmatics of research, the limits of multi-method approaches), but those aiming at greater methodological breadth and depth are advised to enroll in assorted graduate courses offered in other departments at uOttawa (e.g., formal theory at ECON; maximum likelihood estimation at STAT, logic and philosophy of science at PHI, field research at ADM, archival work at HIS, network analysis at SITE; narrative analysis at POL etc.) or elsewhere (e.g., workshop-style “methods training” takes place annually at Ann Arbor, Essex, Ljubljana, Syracuse, Vienna, etc.).

SPECIFIC COURSE OBJECTIVES

At the end of this course, students will be able to: 1) Recognize the need for, and limits of, designing and doing social science research (for policy); 2) Think critically about social scientific work of different methodological hues, the main social science epistemologies, the tradeoffs involved in following one approach over others, and some problems (“The method risks to fetishize its cause and to become a fetish itself” [Adorno]); 3) Appreciate the differences among causal claims (randomized controlled trials, observational studies and quasi-experiments, constitutive analysis, etc.); 4) Do basic statistical analysis and interpret statistical inferences; 5) Understand the purpose and challenges of conceptualization, operationalization, measurement, case selection, validity and reliability; 6) Communicate social science research results to non-scientists.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS & ASSESSMENT METHODS

This is an interactive course combining lectures, discussions, and assignments. There is no required textbook for this course, but you are encouraged to peruse textbooks on our subjects recently published by Oxford (e.g., Royce Singleton and Bruce Straits, *Approaches to Social Research*), Cambridge (Gary Goertz and Amy Mazur, eds., *Politics, Gender and Concepts*), SAGE (e.g., Neil Salkind, *Statistics for People Who [Think They] Hate Statistics*), Norton (e.g., David Freedman et al, *Statistics*) and Longman (e.g., Jarol Manheim et al, *Empirical Political Analysis*), among other presses.

All readings appearing on this syllabus (15 pages in total) are available through Virtual Campus/Blackboard (uOttawa’s online course management system, also referred to Bb, Bb Vista). **OR** at the GSPIA graduate student reading room at DMS 11-149 **OR** at the uOttawa libraries **OR** through uOttawa’s research databases, i.e., through any campus-networked computer (this variation has to do with copyright laws, to be discussed in Week 1). For off-campus online access to research databases, see www.biblio.uottawa.ca

ASSIGNMENT	RAW SCORE & WEIGHT	DUE
Participation	15%	Every week
Reaction Paper	15%	Week 4
Stats Assignment	35%	Week 10
Research Design	35%	Week 14
FINAL MARKS: 90-100 (A+), 85-89 (A), 80-84 (A-), 75-79 (B+), 70-74 (B), 66-69 (C+), 60-65 (C), 55-59 (D+), 50-54(D), 40-49 (E), 0-39 (F). For graduate students, all marks below the alphanumeric C+ (66%) are failing marks. For substantive meanings behind these symbols: http://www.etudesup.uottawa.ca/Default.aspx?tabid=1807&monControl=Examens		

1. Participation. You are expected to participate in all discussions, implying that attendance & attention are necessary to successfully complete this course (2 non-medical absences from class are OK, thereafter you will be docked 2% per class missed). It helps to bring readings and/or your notes to class (discussing recommended readings will bring you rewards). Those keen to do a short presentation on a topic/theme/readings – 15 min, 1-page hand-out – are encouraged to do so.

2a. Reaction papers (max. 800 words, 2 pages, double-spaced, 12-pt font, 1-inch margins). You have two options here. 1) Read **one** of the following two articles:

David W. Orme-Johnson *et al*, “International Peace Project in the Middle East: The effects of the Maharishi Technology of the Unified Field,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 32: 4 (1988), 776-812.

Max Friedman, “Simulacrobama: The Mediated Election of 2008,” *Journal of American Studies* 43:2 (2009), 341-56.

Then write about (a) what you thought were the specific strengths and weaknesses of the piece; (b) what impact, if any, might it have (had) with what communities (i.e., the “who cares?” question is applicable to any research article); (c) assess the methods used with a reference to the underlying research philosophy or philosophies.

OR, 2b Find **two** social science journal articles on with something in common (journal, disciplinary subfield, citation, topic, concept, keyword etc.) and your own and tell me how you found the articles. Then do the following: (a) summarize the main arguments or findings advanced by their authors and describe the communities impacted by each piece; (b) assess the methods used with a reference to the underlying research philosophy or philosophies, data collection, and analysis; (c) explain, in a paragraph or less, which of the two arguments convinced you more – or less – and why.

3. Stats assignment. A set of take-home exercises testing a range of competencies, including the manipulation of variables, graphing, simple regression analysis and the interpretation of findings. Because we won’t dwell on statistical theory in this course, I strongly advise to start reviewing ideas such as descriptive statistics, sampling distributions, and statistical inference on your own asap (to get you started, I posted excerpts from *The Cartoon Guide to Statistics* [Gonick and Smith, 1993] on Bb). Indeed, if you have never taken a stats class, I urge you to spend quality time with a good intro to stats published by a reputable press (I still use D. Gujarati’s *Basic Econometrics* [McGraw-Hill]); a good stats website (R. Niles’ Statistics Every Writer Should Know, <http://www.robertniles.com/stats/>); a good soc-sci data website (MacroDataGuide, <http://www.nsd.uib.no/macrodataloguide/index.html>); a good online stats tutorial (StatTrek <http://stattrek.com/online-tutorials/tutorial-list.aspx>); and/or, indeed, a full-blown online stats course (<http://onlinestatbook.com/>)

Note also that we will start using SPSS, our point-and-click computer package for statistical analysis, in Week 2. The earlier you start familiarizing yourself with SPSS user interface (settings, menus, toolbars), the better. I strongly recommend sitting through one or more online tutorials (Carl Lee *et al* at SPSSTools.net [General Tutorials], StatProf, Bart Poulson and SPSS Lecture Series on YouTube, etc).

You will be given **7 days** to work on this assignment. **Hard copy** submission is expected on the day of the deadline at the beginning of the class; thereafter, late submission penalty applies. Depending on the number and type of exercises, the length of the printed material will vary between 10 and (max) 20 pages. As with the final assignment (below), your presentation abilities count, so allow time to editing and formatting.

4. Research proposal (max. 3,500 words, double-spaced, 12-pt font, 1-inch margins, including bibliography and notes). The purpose of this assignment is to familiarize you with the process of designing research in social-scientific fashion, broadly understood. Here you will pick a research problem (or question, puzzle, objective, etc.) and then tell me how you would approach it in an MRP (ideally, this assignment will evolve into one over the next twelve or so months).

Before you start drafting your research design, I advise you to consult two or more textbooks and how-to guides (see, esp., recommended readings), but keep in mind that their philosophies might vary. This should not alarm you: unlike the objects of natural science, the objects of social science are also subjects, in the sense that they are conscious and engage in meaningful behaviour (a.k.a., action). Methodologists have debated what

to do with this fact for over a century and this long-standing debate resonates in this and similar syllabi.

For example, in Chapter 4 of their book *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (2005), Alexander George and Andrew Bennett argue that an ideal-typical research design should address the following five tasks: (a) motivation of the research problem (what are the research needs of the relevant research program, related literatures, and alternative explanations?); (b) specification of the independent (X) and dependent (Y) variables (Do they vary? Are Xs independent?); (c) selection of a case, cases, data etc. that are appropriate in light of the first two tasks, and justification of why these were selected and others were not (To what extent are units homogeneous? What about selection bias?); (d) consideration of how variance in the variables can best be described for testing and/or refining existing theories; (e) specification of the data requirements, including measurements of X & Y for the main hypotheses of interest (Operationalizations? Reproducibility? Estimates of uncertainty?).

This type of research design is usually regarded as “(neo)positivist.” In contrast, most of the methodological advice given in the Lebow-Lichbach (2007) or Klotz-Prakash (2008) volumes can be described as “interpretativist.” In general, this type of research begins with the recognition that a) the world is socially constructed (so what historical processes brought it about? How do people make sense of it? Why do some meanings become more legitimate and authoritative than others in a given context? etc.) & b) knowledge is socially constructed (such that even *your* research design is enmeshed in some *pouvoir/savoir* nexus). Like all good scientists, interpretativists approach their research problems systematically by a) clarifying the main concepts, b) differentiating between premises and conclusions; c) controlling for spuriousness and the contestability of findings; d) justifying case selection, source validation and inter-observer reliability; and e) seeking sovereignty over the tensions inherent in the attempts to make - or deny - causal claims.

Fine Print

1. Late submissions of assignments are not tolerated. University regulations require all absences from exams and all late submissions due to illness to be supported by a medical certificate (In the event of an illness or related complications, only the counseling service and the campus clinic (located at 100 Marie-Curie) may issue valid certificates to justify a delay or absence). Exceptions for other “serious situations” are not guaranteed – **notify the professor as soon as possible and in writing** if a religious holiday or some other serious situation forces your absence during an evaluation. Reasons such as travel, work and errors made while reading the exam schedule are not accepted; indeed, if it is not medical, the professor reserves the **right to reject** the reason put forth.
2. There will be a **penalty for** tardiness: **1/3rd** of a letter grade for each day overdue (e.g., an A- work that is one day late will be reduced to a B+; work submitted **4** days after the deadline will not be accepted). This also applies to assignments sent by email, and in this case, the time of receipt of the email by the recipient is guarantor of the time of delivery.
3. You will also be judged on your writing and presentation abilities. It is recommended to take the appropriate measures to avoid mistakes. You will be penalized **up to 15%**.
4. Re-marking requests will be considered for **one week after** the assignment is returned **if and only if** an explanation of why the original mark is not justified is made in writing.
5. New and additional readings might be announced at the end of class and/or through Bb, which are to be read before the subsequent class meeting(s). Changes to the syllabus necessitated by the circumstances of the class may be made **at my discretion**. If/when there are any changes, the professor will make an appropriate announcement in class, on Bb and/or in an email sent to all students’ uOttawa e-mail accounts (as maintained by the registrar’s list) prior to class time.
6. Any questions by email should receive a response within two business days or during the following class if taken place within the 48 hours following receipt of the email. The professor reserves the right not to answer an email if the level of language used is inadequate.

PART I: META

Week 1 (January 6)

- **From Ontology to Epistemology to Methodology to Method**

Patrick T. Jackson, “What the Philosophy of Science is Not Good For,” short editorial for e-ir.com, February 23, 2009, Available at <http://www.e-ir.info/?p=612>

Recommended (a sample from the last decade only):

Patrick T. Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry* (Routledge, 2010).

Paul M. Kellstedt and Guy D. Whitten, *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research* (Cambridge, 2009).

Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, eds., *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Richard New Lebow, “What Can We Know? How Do We Know?” in Richard Ned Lebow and Mark Irving Lichbach, eds., *Theory and Evidence in Comparative Politics and International Relations* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 1-22.

Jonathon Moses and Torbjørn Knutsen, *Ways of Knowing: Competing Methodologies in Social and Political Research* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

Helen Longino, “The Social Dimensions of Scientific Knowledge,” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, last updated August 31, 2006, online.

Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn* (M.E. Sharpe, 2006).

George Steinmetz, ed., *The Politics of Method in the Human Sciences* (Duke, 2005).

Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek E. Masoud, eds., *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics* (Cambridge, 2004).

Cynthia Enloe, “Margins, Silences and Bottom Rungs: How to Overcome the Underestimation of Power in the Study of International Relations” in *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire* (Berkeley, 2004), 19-42.

Peter Hall, “Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics,” in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 2003), Ch. 11.

David Marsh and Paul Furlong, “A Skin not a Sweater: Ontology and Epistemology,” in D. Marsh and Gerry Stoker, eds., *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 17-41.

Colin Wight, “Philosophy of Science and International Relations,” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, Beth Simmons, eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (SAGE, 2002), Ch.2.

- **What, What-if, Why, How, How-possible...**

[skim] Rod Aya, "Theory, Fact, and Logic," in Goodin & Tilly, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis* (Oxford, 2006), 114-30.

John Gerring and Craig Thomas, "Is there More than One Logic of Causal Inquiry? Moving Beyond the Qual/Quant Debate," unpublished ms., available online.

Leanne C. Powner, "Reading and Understanding Political Science," 2007, focus pp. 1-14, skip activities. Available at: <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/scroco/pownerdoc.pdf>

Dvora Yanow, "Policy Implementation and Organizational Actions," *How Does a Policy Mean? Interpreting Policy and Organizational Actions* (Georgetown, 1996), 1-33.

Recommended:

The Quantitative/Qualitative Distinction. *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* 3: 1 (Spring 2005), 2-21. Focus on Kenneth R. Benoit and Bernhard Kittel (pp. 9-19).
<http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter3.1.pdf>

"Papers," NSF Workshop on Interdisciplinary Standards for Systematic Qualitative Research, Available at <http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/nsfqual/papers.htm>

David Collier, Henry E. Brady, and Jason Seawright, "Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology," in Henry Brady and David Collier, eds. *Rethinking Social Inquiry* (Rowman Littlefield, 2005), 229-66.

Henry E. Brady, "Causation and Explanation in Social Sciences," in Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* (Oxford, 2008), 217-70.

Gary Burtless, "The Case for Randomized Field Trials in Economic and Policy Research." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9: 2 (1995), 63-84; and James H. McMillan, "Randomized Field Trials and Internal Validity: Not So Fast My Friend," *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, 12: 15 (2007).

Ted Hopf, "The Limits of Interpreting Evidence," in Richard Ned Lebow and Mark Irving Lichbach, eds., *Theory and Evidence in Comparative Politics and Int'l Relations* (Palgrave, 2007), 55-84.

Alexander Wendt, "Why a World State is Inevitable: Teleology and the Logic of Anarchy." *European Journal of International Relations* 9:4 (2003), 491-542.

Mary Caprioli, "Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis," *International Studies Review* 6: 2 (2004), 253-269.

Steve D, "Science: How to Fake it" (2011), <http://madartlab.com/2011/03/24/faking-it/>

Week 3 (January 20)

- **Concepts & Conceptualization: e.g., Democracy**
GUEST LECTURE BY PROF. C. ZUERCHER, API

Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi, "Modernization: Theory and Facts," *World Politics* 49: 2 (1997): 155-183.

Gerardo Munck and Jay Verkuilen, "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices," *Comparative Political Studies* 35: 1 (2002), 5-34.

Pamela Paxton, "Gendering Democracy," in Gary Goertz and Amy G. Mazur, eds. *Politics, Gender, and Concepts* (Cambridge, 2008), 47-70.

Recommended:

Giovanni Sartori, "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics," *American Political Science Review*, 64:4 (December 1970), 1033-53.

Gary Goertz, *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide* (Princeton, 2006), Ch.1.

Symposium: Conceptualizing Concepts. *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* 3: 2 (Fall 2005), Contributions by Naomi Choi, Michael Freeden, James W. Davis and Mark Bevir.
<http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqm/Newsletter3.2.pdf>

Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes, "Endogenous Democratization," *World Politics* 55 (July 2003): 517-549.

Daron Acemoglu *et al*, "Persistence of Bad governments," Column for Vox, 28 February 2010. Available at <http://voxeu.org/index.php?q=node/4686>

Robert Dahl, *Polyarchy* (Yale, 1971), Ch. 1.

Pamela Paxton, "Women's Suffrage in the Measurement of Democracy: Problems of Operationalization," *Studies in Comparative International Development* 35:3 (2000), 92-111.

Dean E. McHenry, Jr., "The Numeration of Events: Studying Political Protest in India," in , in Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, eds. *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn* (ME Sharpe, 2006), 187-202.

Frederic C. Schaffer, *Democracy in Translation: Understanding Politics in an Unfamiliar Culture* (Cornell, 1998) and *Ibid.*, "Ordinary Language Interviewing," in Yanow and Schwartz-Shea. eds., *Interpretation and method* (M.E. Sharpe, 2006), 150-60.

PART II: QUANT

Week 4 (January 27) **Articles Review Due!**

- **Fun with Numbers!**

Hans Rosling on poverty in Africa (2006-7), YouTube/Ted, 20 min; & Diego Valle, “Statistical Analysis and Visualization of the Drug War in Mexico,” both online.

Jeremy Wilson, “Fun with Numbers (Ch.6)”, *Analyzing Politics: An Introduction to Empirical Methods* (Prentice Hall Canada, 1988), 123-135.

“Stats: The Basic Lingo,” “How to Read a Cross-Tab” (hand-outs), plus Trisha Greenhalgh’s “How to Read a Paper” (1997) series (links through Bb).

Cameron D. Anderson and Laura B. Stephenson, “Reading Political Behaviour Research: A Note on Methodology,” online.

Recommended:

Garnett Picot, “Does Statistical Analysis Matter?” *Horizons* 6 (2003), 6-10, online.

Herb Asher, *Polling and the Public: What Every Citizen Should Know* (CQ Press, 2007).

Statistics Canada (2003). *Survey Methods and Practices*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada. Chapters 1-6, 8, 13, online; & The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, “Methodology” (Sampling, Collecting Survey Data, and Questionnaire Design), online

Scott Keeter et al. “What’s Missing from National RDD Landline Surveys? The Impact of the Growing Cell-Only Population,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71: 5 (2007), 772-792.

Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose, “Do the Social Sciences Create Phenomena: the Case of Public Opinion,” *British Journal of Sociology* 50: 3 (1999), 367-96.

William Easterly “Maybe We Should Put Rats in Charge of Foreign Aid Research,” *Aid Watch*, 7 May 2009, online.

Yoshiko M. Herrera and Daves Kapur, “Improving Data Quality: Actors, Incentives, and Capabilities,” *Political Analysis* 15: 4 (2007), 365 - 386.

Week 5 (February 3)

- **Properties of Estimators, Linearity, Descriptives**

Spend quality time with various sources of statistical knowledge you selected for yourself in Week 2 and compare them to the readings for today. Focus on univariate analysis, confidence intervals, hypothesis tests, measures of association, statistical significance, and the correlation coefficient.

Week 6 (February 10)

- **Bivariate Regression: $I = \alpha + \beta E + \epsilon$, for example**

Alan O. Sykes, "The Inaugural Coase Lecture: An Introduction to Regression Analysis," in E. Posner, ed., *An Introduction to Regression Analysis, in Chicago Lectures in Law & Economics 1* (Foundation Press, 2000).

Week 7 (February 17)

- **Multivariate Regression:** $I = \alpha + \beta E + \gamma X + \epsilon$, for example

Review the seven main assumptions of regression models and read up on the nature of interpretation in multiple regression analysis.

Week 8 (February 24) NO CLASS STUDY WEEK

Review your notes from Weeks 4-7 and start working on the stats assignment – it may not be heroic, but it does take time (as well as 35% of your final mark).

Week 9 (March 7)

- **Finding & Treating (some) Estimation Problems**
(And, if time and class interest allow, the Principles of Maximum Likelihood)

Read up on heteroskedasticity, autocorrelation, collinearity, specification error, measurement error, the analysis of residuals, outliers and influential cases.

Recommended:

Peter Kennedy, "Oh No! I Got the Wrong Sign! What Should I Do?" *Journal of Economic Education* 36: 1 (2005), 77-92 and Ibid. "Sinning in the Basement: What are the Rules? The Ten Commandments of Applied Econometrics," *Journal of Economic Surveys* 16: 4 (2002): 569-589.

Chao-Ying Joann Peng et al. "An Introduction to Logistic Regression Analysis and Reporting," *Journal of Educational Research* 96: 1 (2002), 3-13.

Ted Goertzel, "Capital Punishment and Homicide: Sociological Realities and Econometric Illusions," *Skeptical Inquirer* 28:4 (2004), 23-27.

Chris Achen, "Let's Put Garbage-Can Regressions and Garbage-Can Probits Where They Belong," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22: 4 (2005), 327-39.

Social Science Data Archives; <http://www.sociosite.net/databases.php>

Paul R. Hensel, "Review of Available Data Sets," in R. Denemark, ed. *The International Studies Encyclopedia*. Blackwell Reference Online. Last updated 10 June 2010.

PART III: QUAL

Week 10 (March 10) Stats Assignment Due!

- **Case Studies**

John Gerring, "What is a Case Study and What is it Good For?" *American Political Science Review* 98:2 (2004), 341-54

Symposium on John Gerring's Case Study Research - Principles and Practices." 2007. *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* 5:2 (2007), 2-15. Available at <http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter5.2.pdf>

Bent Flyvbjerg, "Five Misunderstandings about Case Studies," *Qualitative Inquiry* 12:2 (2006), 219-45.

Recommended:

Stanley Lieberman, "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Case Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases," *Social Forces* 70 (1991), 307-20.

Timothy J. McKeown, "Case Studies and the Statistical Worldview," *International Organization* 53: 1 (1999), 161-190.

Symposium: Case Selection, Case Studies, and Causal Inference in *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* 6: 2 (Spring 2004). Read all (pp. 2-16). Available <http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter6.2.pdf>

Alexander L. George and Andrew Bennett, *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences* (MIT, 2005).

Robert VanWynsberghe and Samia Khan, "Redefining Case Studies," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 6: 2 (2007), Article 6. Available at http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/6_2/vanwynsberghe.pdf

Audie Klotz, "Case Selection (Ch.4)," and Jeffrey Checkel, "Process Tracing (Ch. 8)," in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, eds., *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Week 11 (March 17)

- Review, incl. discussion of stats assignment

No readings for today.

Week 12 (March 24)

- **Language, Discourse, Metaphor**

Charles Taylor, "Language and Human Nature," in *Human Agency and Language (Vol.1 of Philosophical Papers)* (Cambridge 1985), 215-47.

Symposium: Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis, *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* 2: 1 (Spring 2004). Contributions by Yoshiko M. Herrera and Bear F. Braumoeller (pp. 15-9) Cynthia Hardy, Bill Harley, and Nelson Phillips (pp. 19-22), Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes (pp. 28-31), Ted Hopf (pp. 31-33) and Karin Fierke (pp. 36-8). Available at <http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter2.1.pdf>

Roland Paris, "Kosovo and the Metaphor War," *Political Science Quarterly* 117:3 (Fall 2002), 423-50. **PRESENTED BY PROF. ROLAND PARIS, API**

Recommended:

Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," *History and Theory* 8:1 (1969), 3-53.

Michel Foucault, "Truth and Power" & "What is an Author?" in Paul Rabinow, ed., *The Foucault Reader* (Pantheon, 1984).

Stuart Hall, "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10:2 (1986), 5-27.

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago, 2003), Chs. 1-3.

Trevor Purvis and Alan Hunt, "Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology, Discourse, Ideology...", *British Journal of Sociology* 44:3 (1993), 473-499.

Symposium, "Discourse Analysis," *European Political Science* 2:1 (2002).

Sara Mills, *Discourse* (Routledge, 2004).

Jan Blommaert, *Discourse* (Cambridge, 2006).

Ruth Wodak et al, eds., (trans. Angelika Hirsch and Richard Mitten), *The Discursive Construction of National Identity* (Edinburgh, 1999), Ch. 2, 4-5.

David Machin and Theo Van Leeuwen, *Global Media Discourse* (Routledge, 2006).

Marc Angenot, "Social Discourse Analysis: Outlines of a Research Project," *Yale Journal of Criticism* 17:2 (2004), 199-215.

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

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago, 2003), Chs. 1-3.

Margaret Hermann, "Content Analysis (Ch.10)," and Iver Neumann, "Discourse Analysis (Ch. 5)," in Audie Klotz and Deepa Prakash, eds., *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

Jean-Philippe Bouilloud, "The Reception of the Sokal Affair in France: "Pomo" Hunting or Intellectual McCarthyism? (A Propos of *Impostures Intellectuelles* by A. Sokal and J. Bricmont)," *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 33: 1 (2003), 122-137.

Week 13 (March 31)

- **Ethnography, Field Work, Interviews**

Christian Leander, *Stuff White People Like* (Random, 2008), various entries.

R.A.W. Rhodes, "Everyday Life in a Ministry: Public Administration as Anthropology," *American Review of Public Administration* 35:1 (March 2005), 3-26.

Carol Cohn, "Motives and Methods: Using Multi-sited Ethnography to Study US National Security Discourses," in Brooke Ackerly, Maria Stern, and Jacquie True, eds., *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations* (Cambridge, 2006), 92-107.

Lee Ann Fujii, "Shades of Truth and Lies: Interpreting Testimonies of War and Violence," *Journal of Peace Research* 47: 2 (2010), 231-41.

Recommended:

Michael Burawoy, *Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis* (University of California Press, 1991).

Edward Schatz, "Introduction: Ethnographic Immersion and the Study of Politics," in Edward Schatz, ed., *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power* (Chicago, 2009), 1-22.

Symposium: Ethnography Meets Rational Choice: David Laitin, For Example. *Qualitative Methods Newsletter* 4:1 (Spring 2004). Read all (pp. 2-28). Available at <http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter4.1.pdf>

Laura Adams, "Techniques for Measuring Identity in Ethnographic Research," in Rawi Abdelal, Yoshiko Herrera, Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott, eds. *Measuring Identity* (Cambridge, 2009), 316-41.

R.A.W. Rhodes, Paul 't Hart and Mirko Noordegraaf, eds. *Observing Government Elites* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

Philip Davies, "Spies as Informants: Triangulation and the Interpretation of Elite Interview Data in the Study of the Intelligence and Security Services," *Politics* 21 (2001), 73-80.

Elisabeth Jean Wood, "Field Research," in Carles Boix and Susan Stokes, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (Oxford, 2008), Ch. 5.

B. Baez, "Confidentiality in Qualitative Research: Reflections on Secrets, Power and Agency," *Qualitative Research* 2 (2002), 35-58.

Beth Leech et al. "Symposium: Interview Methods in Political Science," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35 (2002), 663-88/

Joe Soss, "Talking our Way to Meaningful Explanations: A Practice-Centered View of Interviewing for Interpretive Research," in Yanow and Schwartz-Shea, eds., *Interpretation and Method* (Sharpe, 2006), 127-49.

Week 14 (April 7) **Research Design due!**

- **Visual Analysis, Ethics**

UA Flight 93, a movie by Peter Markle (2006).

Cynthia Weber, "Popular Visual Language as Global Communication: The Remediation of United Airlines Flight 93," *Review of International Studies* 34: 1 (2008), 137-53.

Cameron Fenton, "The Ethnography of an Air-Strike," *The Dominion*, April 12, 2010.
<http://www.dominionpaper.ca/articles/3295>

[skim] Tri-Council Policy Statement: "Ch.1: Ethics Framework," in *Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*, 2nd ed., (2010). Available at:
<http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique/initiatives/tcps2-eptc2/Default/>

Recommended:

Jay Ruby, "Visual Anthropology," in David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds. *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology* (Henry Holt and Co., 1996, Vol.4), 1345-1351.

Luc Pauwels, "Visual Sociology Reframed: An Analytical Synthesis and Discussion of Visual Methods in Social and Cultural Research," *Sociological Methods Research* 38: 4 (2010), 545-581.

James Monaco, *How to Read a Film: The World of Movies, Media and Multimedia: Language, History, Theory* (Oxford, 2000), Ch. 3.

Nicholas Mirzoeff, *The Visual Culture Reader* (Routledge, 2002).

David Machin and Usama Suleiman, "Arab and American Computer War Games," *Critical Discourse Studies* 3:1 (2006), 1-22.

Resources for you:

Mentoring Centre - <http://www.sciencessociales.uottawa.ca/mentor/fra/>

The goal of the Mentoring Centre is to help students with their academic and social well being during their time at the University of Ottawa. Regardless of where a student stands academically, or how far along they are in completing their degree, the mentoring centre is there to help students continue on their path to success.

Academic Writing Help Centre - <http://www.sass.uottawa.ca/writing/>

At the AWHC you will learn how to identify, correct and ultimately avoid errors in your writing and become an autonomous writer. In working with our Writing Advisors, you will be able to acquire the abilities, strategies and writing tools that will enable you to:

Career Services - <http://www.sass.uottawa.ca/careers/>

Career Services offers various services and a career development program to enable you to recognize and enhance the employability skills you need in today's world of work.

Counselling Service - <http://www.sass.uottawa.ca/personal/>

There are many reasons to take advantage of the Counselling Service. We offer:

Access Service - <http://www.sass.uottawa.ca/acces/>

The Access Service contributes to the creation of an inclusive environment by developing strategies and implementing measures that aim to reduce the barriers to learning for students who have learning disabilities, health, psychiatric or physical conditions.

Student Resources Centres - <http://www.communitylife.uottawa.ca/en/resources.php>

The Student Resources Centres aim to fulfill all sorts of students needs.

Beware of Academic Fraud

Academic fraud is an act committed by a student to distort the marking of assignments, tests, examinations, and other forms of academic evaluation. Academic fraud is neither accepted nor tolerated by the University. Anyone found guilty of academic fraud is liable to severe academic sanctions. Here are a few examples of academic fraud:

- engaging in any form of plagiarism or cheating;
- presenting falsified research data;
- handing in an assignment that was not authored, in whole or in part, by the student;
- submitting the same assignment in more than one course, without the written consent of the professors concerned.

In recent years, the development of the Internet has made it much easier to identify academic plagiarism. The tools available to your professors allow them to trace the exact origin of a text on the Web, using just a few words. In cases where students are unsure whether they are at fault, it is their responsibility to consult the University's Web site at the following address:

http://www.socialsciences.uottawa.ca/eng/writing_tools.asp

Persons who have committed or attempted to commit (or have been accomplices to) academic fraud will be penalized. Here are some examples of the academic sanctions, which can be imposed:

- a grade of « F » for the assignment or course in question;
- an additional program requirement of between 3 and 30 credits;
- suspension or expulsion from the Faculty.

In earlier years, most of the students found guilty of fraud were given an « F » for the course and had between three and twelve credits added to their program requirement. For more information, refer to:

http://www.uottawa.ca/academic/info/newsletter/fraud_e.html

The End

