

Research Design and Methods II

Thilo Bodenstein
Associate Professor
School of Public Policy
Quellenstraße 51
A-1100 Wien
bodensteint@spp.ceu.edu

Office hours: Wednesday, 1.30-3.30pm or by appointment

Kirill Shamiev
Teaching Assistant
Doctoral School of Political Science, Public Policy and International Relations
Central European University
Quellenstraße 51
A-1100 Wien
shamiev_kirill@phd.ceu.edu

Winter term 2020-21
CEU Credits: 2

Aim and structure of the course

The course deals with the philosophy of (social) science, research design and techniques of qualitative data collection and analysis. We examine what social scientists do and how they evaluate their theories and empirical material. In the course we examine research design (research paradigm, theory formation, conceptualisation, case design), qualitative data collection (interviews, focus groups, participant observation) and qualitative techniques of data analysis and evaluation. The course consists of twelve seminars. The format is based on introductions by the lecturer, student presentations and group work exercises.

Learning Outcomes

The general aim of the course is to raise awareness of methodological problems and solutions in qualitative research and to enable students to write methodologically sound term papers and MA theses. The material is based on journal articles, book chapters and a selection of applied studies. As specific learning outcomes, students should be able to independently develop a coherent research design and choose the appropriate method of data collection and data analysis tailored to their research question. In

addition, students should be able to critically review research and policy work with regard to their research design and methodological decisions.

Readings and extra material

This course uses CEU's e-learning platform (ceulearning.ceu.edu). For each seminar there is one required reading, several recommended readings and research examples. Preferably, students should read the required reading, one recommended reading and one journal article from research as an example to illustrate the course topic (research example). The readings comprise a variety of textbook chapters and journal articles. They are selected to constitute basis for the discussions and exercises in the seminars.

For students who want to acquire a general introduction to research design and/or qualitative methods, especially in relation to public policy, we recommend the following:

- Majchrzak, A. & Markus. M., L. (2014). *Methods for policy research: taking socially responsible action*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications.
- Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Yin, R. (2011). *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish*. New York: Guilford Press. Available via the CEU library as e-book.

An excellent source for qualitative research methods is the “SAGE Research Methods” webpage: <https://methods.sagepub.com/>

Another interesting overview of quantitative methods (10 things you need to know...) is ‘Evidence in Governance and Politics (EGAP): <https://egap.org/>

Course Requirements

All written assignments must be submitted on the CEU e-learning platform for the course.

- *Course presentation*: 30%
- *Take-home exam*: 35%
- *Research paper review*: 35%

Participation: Students are expected to attend seminars regularly, to prepare the required readings and to participate in the group activities. Attendance is mandatory. Students must notify the course instructor in advance of their absence, and in the case of overstepping the limit of unexcused absences specified by general SPP guidelines, a written justification of a legitimate reason (e.g. medical note) has to be submitted to the programme coordinator. Please note that in case of absence for any reason, students have to submit a make-up assignment to the course instructor and the teaching assistant. The assignment is a 500-word summary of the required reading for the missed class.

Course presentation: Each student presents a research paper with regard to its methods (group assignment).

Take-home exam: The take-home exam is comprised of a number of questions, each referring to a research paper (to be uploaded on the e-learning) and relating to one methodological issue discussed in class. The answers should be uploaded on e-learning. Deadlines will be announced in due course.

Research paper review: The major requirement of the course is a methodological review of a published or presented scholarly paper. The review should discuss benefits and drawbacks of the applied research design with specific emphasis on the topics discussed in the class. Students should strive to provide a substantiated critique and take a position within a given debate or towards a scholarly contribution. The structure is not pre-set, but students are encouraged to be inspired by the style and structure of reviews published in scholarly journals. Students will be able to choose among a selection of articles posted on the e-learning site. The reviews will be evaluated upon the accuracy with which the research design and methods are summarized, the quality of insight into benefits and drawbacks of the choices the researcher has made, and the clarity with which this is presented. The reviews should be about 1,500 words (+/- 10%) and should be submitted by the end of the term. **The deadline for the take-home exam is [...], the deadline for the methods review is [...].**

Transferable skills

Students are strongly encouraged to consciously apply principles and methods discussed in qualitative methods seminars for the assignments in other courses and in their thesis research. During and after the course (while enrolled in the program) students can also ask for consultations with the course instructor and teaching assistant on general issues related to research design.

Schedule

Session	Date	Topic
1		Introduction to the course
2		Abduction etc. Positivism, constructionism
3		Causality (mechanisms etc.)
4		Concepts
5		Case study
6		Conducting interviews
7		Analysing interviews
8		Focus Groups
9		Observations
10		Evaluation

11	Research ethics
12	Conclusion

1 Introduction

Research methods are our tools to make sense of complex social phenomena and data. Above all, they help to present convincing arguments for us and our listeners and to initiate a rational debate, which is the essence of scientific discourse and scientific investigation. Qualitative methods are an important tool for applied policy analysis and evaluation. Besides the question of what constitutes qualitative methods, the question of what standards apply to qualitative methods is also important.

Required reading

Majchrzak, A. & Markus M. L. (2014) *Methods for policy research: Taking socially responsible action*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publications. Ch. 1.

Wu, S. et al. (2016) “Journal of the society for social work & research: Author guidelines for manuscripts reporting on qualitative research.” *Journal of the Society for Social Work & Research*, 7: 405–425.

Recommended reading

Hyett, N., Kenny, A., and Dickson-Swift, V. (2014) “Methodology or method? A critical review of qualitative case study reports.” *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being*, 9:1, 1-12.

Bianca Montrose-Moorhead and James C. Griffith (2017) “Toward the Development of Reporting Standards for Evaluations.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 38:4, 577-602.

Maxwell JA (2012) “The importance of qualitative research for causal explanation in education.” *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18: 655–61.

Tong, A., Sainsbury, P. Craig, J. (2007) “Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups.” *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 19: 349–357.

2 Paradigms and research styles

This session is theoretically oriented, but it is an important prerequisite for critically analysing research results and their methodological approaches. The question of what constitutes convincing empirical evidence also depends strongly on the paradigm chosen. The same applies to the choice of one's own research question and research designs. As a rough classification, one can distinguish between a positivist and a constructivist (or interpretative) paradigm. Research styles can be deductive, inductive or abductive.

Required reading

Brinkmann, Svend (2014) “Doing Without Data”. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20:6, 720-725.

An interesting paper on induction, deduction and abduction in qualitative research. The author is a psychologist, but the arguments are easily transferable to public policy.

Snape, D. and Spencer, L. (2003) “The Foundations of Qualitative Research.” In: Ritchie, Jane, and Jane Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers* (1-23). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

This chapter provides a good overview of the different research paradigms in the social sciences and thus also in the field of public policy. For the choice of one's own research question and method it is important to understand in which paradigm one fits.

Recommended reading on abductive reasoning

Niiniluoto, I. (1999) “Defending abduction.” *Philosophy of Science*, 66:3, S436-S451.

Rashid, Yasir et al (2019) “Case Study Method: A Step-by-Step Guide for Business Researchers.”

International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 18:1-13.

Shields, Patricia M., Rangarajan, Nandhini and Casula, Mattia (2019) “It is a working hypothesis: Searching for truth in a post-truth world.” *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 10:39-47.

Earl Rinehart, Kerry (2020) “Abductive Analysis in Qualitative Inquiry.” *Qualitative Inquiry*, early access.

Sword, Helen et al. (2018) “Seven Ways of Looking at a Data Set.” *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24:7, 499-508.

Folger, Robert and Stein, Christopher (2017) “Abduction 101: Reasoning processes to aid discovery.”

Human Resource Management Review, 27:2, 306-315.

Example from research

Krupnik, Seweryn (2012) “Evaluating the social mechanism of investment subsidies using an abductive approach.” *Evaluation*, 18:4, 466-476.

Finding a positivist research question

King, G., Keohane R., and Verba S. (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Ch. 1.

Recommended reading on paradigms

Renée Spencer, Julia M. Pryce, and Jill Walsh (2014) “Philosophical approaches to qualitative research.” In: Leavy, Patricia (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. pp. 81-98.

Bonache, Jaime (2020) “The challenge of using a 'non-positivist' paradigm and getting through the peer-review process.” *Human Resource Management Journal*. Early Access.
The paper uses reviewer comments to highlight the different expectations of positivist and interpretative research design.

Example from research

Jarvensivu, Timo; Tornroos, Jan-Ake (2010) “Case study research with moderate constructionism: Conceptualization and practical illustration.” *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39:1, 100-108.

Gaus, N. (2017) “Selecting research approaches and research designs: a reflective essay.” *Qualitative Research Journal*, 17:2, 99-112.

3 Causality

Theories tell us how public policy interventions (should) work. Theories can also be called causal mechanisms. They specify a chain of events leading from a cause to an end result. When we try to understand these chains of causal mechanisms, we are better able to design specific policy interventions and understand events.

Required reading

Astbury, Brad and Leeuw, Frans L. (2010) “Unpacking Black Boxes: Mechanisms and Theory Building in Evaluation.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31:3, 363-381.

Falleti, Tulia G. and Lynch, Julia F. (2009) “Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Analysis.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 42:9, 1143-1166.

Recommended reading

Abbott, Andrew (2004) *Methods of Discovery. Heuristics for the Social Sciences*. New York: W.W.Norton&Company. Chs 3, 4.

Two outstanding essays on causality and heuristics. Very worth reading to develop good research questions and interesting arguments.

Dalkin, Sonia M. et al. (2015) “What’s in a Mechanism? Development of a Key Concept in Realist Evaluation.” *Implementation Science*, 10:49.

Hedström, Peter and Swedberg, Richard (1998) *Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1.

Hirschman, Albert O. (1970) “The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding.” *World Politics*, 22:3, 329-343.

Hirschman, Albert O. (1984) “Against Parsimony: Three Easy Ways of Complicating Some Categories of Economic Discourse.” *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 37: 8, 11-28.

Martin, John Levi (2003) “What is field theory?” *American Journal of Sociology*, 1: 1-49.
Another idea of causality - causality is explained here as position in a field. Especially interesting for policy field analysis.

Maxwell J (2016) “Using theory in qualitative research: A realist perspective.” In: Lipscomb M (ed.) *Social Theory and Nursing*. London: Routledge, 91–103.

Pawson, Ray (1989) *A Measure for Measures: A Manifesto for Empirical Sociology*. London: Routledge. Ch. 6.

Research example:

Mehdipanah, R. et al. (2015) “Exploring Complex Causal Pathways Between Urban Renewal, Health and Health Inequality Using a Theory-driven Realist Approach.” *Social Science and Medicine*, 124: 266-274.

Coldwell, Mike (2019) “Reconsidering context: Six Underlying Features of Context to Improve Learning from Evaluation.” *Evaluation*, 25:1, 99-117.

Sandbakken, Camilla (2006) “The Limits to Democracy Posed by Oil Rentier States: The Cases of Algeria, Nigeria and Libya.” *Democratization*, 13:1, 135–152.

4 Concepts and Measurement

We can only conceive the social world through theoretical constructs, which we also call concepts. Sometimes the conceptual ideas we use do not correspond to any social reality, or they are too vague and encompass too many social phenomena to be useful for research. From a positivist perspective, the concept itself is not enough; we also need to be able to measure it in numbers or words to be meaningful for scientific debate. From an interpretative perspective, a concept consists of subjective meanings that are mutually shared.

Required reading

Adcock, R. and Collier D. (2001) “Measurement Validity: Toward a Shared Framework for Qualitative and Quantitative Research.” *American Political Science Review*, 95: 3, 529–546.

I still find this one of the most useful contributions to positivist conceptualisation. If you choose a positivist research design, you should definitely stick to it.

Brown, Steven R. (1980) *Political Subjectivity. Application of Q Methodology in Political Science*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Ch. 1

One of the most important textbooks for Q-methodology. We will not discuss the method further here, but chapter 1 makes it clear how concepts in the social sciences are subjective in nature. What does this imply for our public policy research questions?

Recommended readings

Cartwright, Nancy, Bradburn, Norman M. and Fuller, Jonathan (2016) “A theory of measurement.”, Working Paper. Centre for Humanities Engaging Science and Society (CHESS), Durham.

Sartori, G. (1970) “Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics.” *American Political Science Review*, 64:4, 1033–1053.

Research examples:

[Concept of social cohesion in Africa – DIE Workshop]

Dryzek, J.S. and Berejikian, J. (1993) “Reconstructive democratic theory.” *American Political Science Review*, 87:1, 48-60.

This paper is a good example of measuring the concept of 'democracy' from a subjectivist perspective.

Zechmeister, Elizabeth (2006) “What's left and who's right? A Q-method study of individual and contextual influences on the meaning of ideological labels.” *Political Behavior*, 28:2, 151-173.

Also an exciting contribution to the concept of 'political left-right' from a subjectivist perspective.

Baldwin, D. A. (1997) “The Concept of Security.” *Review of International Studies*, 23: 5-26.

Bowman K., Lehoucq F. & Mahoney J. (2005) “Measuring Political Democracy: Case Expertise, Data Adequacy, and Central America.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 38:, 939-970.

Carlin, Ryan E. (2018) “Sorting out support for democracy: A Q-method study.” *Political Psychology*, 39:2, 399-422.

A study (based on Q methodology) that examines the subjective dimension of a concept.

Soifer, Hillel (2008) "State Infrastructural Power: Approaches to Conceptualization and Measurement." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 43:3-4, 231-251.

5 Case study

Case studies are widely used in qualitative research. The reason is that they allow qualitative 'thick descriptions' and are therefore rich in data. Another reason is that questions in policy research often refer to concrete cases and are evaluative. In recent years, case studies have been increasingly questioned, as it is not always clear how the results of case studies can be generalised. However, generalisation of results is not necessarily the aim of policy research. But to be convincing, the selection of case studies should be comprehensible.

Required reading

Yin, Robert K. (2018) *Case Study Research and Applications. Design and Method*. 6th Edition. London: Sage. Ch. 2

Yin, Robert K. (2013) "Validity and Generalization in Future Case Study Evaluations." *Evaluation*, 19:3, 321-332.

Recommended reading

Bennett, Andrew (2004) "Case Study Methods: Design, Use, and Comparative Advantages." In: Sprinz, Detlef F., Wolynski-Nahmias, Yael (eds.) *Models, Numbers, and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*. University of Michigan Press.

Bogaards, Matthijs (2019) "Case-Based Research on Democratization." *Democratization*, 26:1, 61-77.

Thomas B. Pepinsky (2019) "The Return of the Single-Country Study." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22: 187-203.

Beach, Derek and Pedersen, Rasmus Brun (2018) "Selecting Appropriate Cases When Tracing Causal Mechanisms." *Sociological Methods and Research*, 47:4, 837-871.

Briggs, Ryan C. (2017) "Explaining Case Selection in African Politics Research." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 35:4, 565-572.

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

Geddes, B. (1990) “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics.” *Political Analysis*, 2:1, 131-150.

Goerres, Achim, Siewert, Markus B., Wagemann, Claudius (2019) “Internationally Comparative Research Designs in the Social Sciences: Fundamental Issues, Case Selection Logics, and Research Limitations.” *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 71: 75-97.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 23, 334–340.

Example from research

Posner, D. (2004) “The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi.” *American Political Science Review*, 98:4, 529-545.

A good example of the case selection process of a positivist case comparison.

Batory, Agnes; Svensson, Sara (2019) “The use and abuse of participatory governance by populist governments.” *Policy and Politics*, 47:2, 227-244.

Gauzente, Claire (2014) “Digging into the Subjectivity of Mobile Apps “Non-Users” – A Single Case Study Approach.” *Operant Subjectivity: The International Journal of Q Methodology*, 37/4: 41–55.

An exciting case study of a single person. This format also has potential in public policy.

6 Conducting interviews

Talking to people is one of the most direct ways to obtain qualitative data. The advantage is that respondents have often participated in the events that interest us and report on details that we would not otherwise know. If we are interested in subjective attitudes, there is no way around interviews. There are different forms of interviews and specific techniques for conducting interviews.

Required reading

Brinkmann, Svend and Kvale, Steinar (2015) *InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 3rd Edition. London: Sage. Chs 6, 7, 8.

Recommended reading

Berry, Jeffrey M. (2002) “Validity and Reliability Issues in Elite Interviewing: *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 679-682.

Fujii, Lee Ann (2017) *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach*. New York: Routledge.

Goldstein, Kenneth (2002) “Getting in the Door: Sampling and Completing Elite Interviews.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 669-672.

Keats, D. M. (2001). *Interviewing: a practical guide for students and professionals*. Buckingham – Philadelphia: Open University Press. Chapter 4 and 5.

Leech, Beth L. (2002) “Interview Methods in Political Science.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 663-664.

Leech, Beth L. (2002) “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 665-668.

Pawson, Ray and Tilley, Nick (1997) *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage. Ch. 6.

Woliver, Laura R. (2002) “Ethical Dilemmas in Personal Interviewing.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 677-678.

Young, Charlotte, Zubrzycki, Joanna and Plath, Debbie (2020) “The slow interview? Developing key principles and practices.” *Qualitative Research*, early access.

Example:

Manzano, Ana (2016) “The Craft of Interviewing in Realist Evaluation.” *Evaluation*, 22:3, 342– 360.

7 Analysing Interviews

Conducting and recording interviews is only the first step. What exactly should we do with the recorded data? How should they be summarised into results and presented in an analytically meaningful way?

Required reading

Brinkmann, Svend and Kvale, Steinar (2015) *InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 3rd Edition. London: Sage. Chs 10, 11, 12.

Recommended reading

Aberbach, Joel D. and Rockman, Bert A. (2002) “Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 673-676.

Bleich, Erik and Pekkanen, Robert (2013) “How to Report Interview Data.” In: Mosley, Layna (ed.) *Interview Research in Political Science*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Ch. 4.

Example:

Jackson, Suzanne F. and Kolla, Gillian (2012) “A New Realistic Evaluation Analysis Method: Linked Coding of Context, Mechanism, and Outcome Relationships.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 33:3, 339-349.

8 Focus groups

Focus groups are nothing more than an interview with a group. But they differ in central parts from individual interviews. First of all, they are the more cost-effective option for many questions. But beyond that they allow to analyse group dynamics and to record forms of knowledge that are group-specific and can only be activated in group situations. Focus groups are therefore an important and effective instrument of policy research.

Required reading

Ryan, Katherine E., Gandha, Tysza, Culbertson, Michael J. and Carlson, Crystal (2014) “Focus Group Evidence: Implications for Design and Analysis.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 35:3, 328-345.

Barbour, Rosaline (2007) *Doing Focus Groups*. London: Sage. Ch. 8.

Recommended reading

Namey, Emily, Guest, Greg, McKenna, Kevin and Chen, Mario (2016) “Evaluating Bang for the Buck: A Cost-Effectiveness Comparison Between Individual Interviews and Focus Groups Based on Thematic Saturation Levels.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 37:3, 425-440.

Belzile, J.A. and Oberg, G. (2012) “Where to begin? Grappling with how to use participant interaction in focus group design.” *Qualitative Research*, 12: 459-472.

Example from research:

Galport, Nicole and Azzam, Tarek (2017) “Evaluator Training Needs and Competencies: A Gap Analysis.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 38:1, 80-100.

Barbour, Rosalin (2013) “Analysing Focus Groups.” In: Flick, Uwe (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.

9 Observations

In policy research and evaluation there are many opportunities for participatory observation, e.g. stakeholder meetings or site visits. Such observations provide important empirical data in group dynamics and interactions that are relevant for policy analysis. Unfortunately, the research potential of observations is often overlooked or the data is considered less relevant. Observations are among the most important qualitative tools of all, even before other methods.

Required reading

Marvasti, Amir (2013) "Analysing Observations." In: Flick, Uwe (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.

Adler, Patricia A., and Peter Adler (1994) *Observation techniques*. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 377-392.

Recommended reading

Gans, Herbert J. (1999) "Participant observation in the era of "ethnography"". *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28:5, 540-548.

Freeman, Melissa and Hall, Jori N. (2012) "The Complexity of Practice: Participant Observation and Values Engagement in a Responsive Evaluation of a Professional Development School Partnership." *American Journal of Evaluation*, 33:4, 483-495.

Example from research:

Handley, Melanie et al. (2020) "Using non-participant observation to uncover mechanisms: Insights from a realist evaluation." *Evaluation*, 26:3, 380-393.

Stoopendaal, Annemiek, de Bree, Martin, Robben, Paul (2016) "Reconceptualizing regulation: Formative evaluation of an experiment with System-Based Regulation in Dutch healthcare." *Evaluation*, 22:4, 394-409.

Williamson, Vanessa, Skocpol, Theda and John Coggin (2011) The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism. *Perspectives on Politics* 9:1 25-43

10 Evaluation

Evaluation is an important part of policy research, if only because public policy is always aimed at improving living conditions and is a practical, not a theoretical discipline. Analyses in the public policy area therefore often have an evaluation component, without having to be an independent evaluation in itself. In this session, we will discuss the purpose of evaluation, how short evaluations can be designed and present contribution analysis as an effective method of qualitative impact evaluation.

Required reading

Rowe, Andy (2019) "Rapid impact evaluation." *Evaluation*, 25:4, 496-513.

Lemire, Sebastian T., Nielsen, Steffen Bohni, Dybdal, Line (2012) "Making contribution analysis work: A practical framework for handling influencing factors and alternative explanations." *Evaluation*, 18:3, 294-309.

Recommended reading

Dart, J., Davies, R. (2003) "A dialogical, story-based evaluation tool: The most significant change technique." *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24:2, 137-155.

Wanzer, Dana Linnell (2020) "What Is Evaluation? Perspectives of How Evaluation Differs (or Not) From Research." *American Journal of Evaluation*, early access.

Adams, Adrienne E., Nnawulezi, Nkiru A., Vandenberg, Lela (2015) "'Expectations to Change' (E2C): A Participatory Method for Facilitating Stakeholder Engagement With Evaluation Findings." *American Journal of Evaluation*, 36:2, 243-255.

Woolcock, M. (2013) "Using case studies to explore the external validity of 'complex' development interventions." *Evaluation*, 19:3, 229-248.

Thomas, D.R. (2006) "A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data." *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27:2, 237-246.

Example

Biggs, Janice S. et al. (2014) "A practical example of Contribution Analysis to a public health intervention." *Evaluation*, 20:2, 214-229.

Sobo, E.J. et al. (2003) “Rapid assessment with qualitative telephone interviews: Lessons from an evaluation of California's Healthy Families program & Medi-Cal for Children.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24:3, 399-408.

Buckley, Anthony P. (2016) “Using Contribution Analysis to evaluate small & medium enterprise support policy.” *Evaluation*, 22:2, 129-148.

11 Research ethics

Questions of research ethics are now part of policy research. This is already evident from the fact that the ethic review board must give its approval as soon as research works with people, e.g. in the form of interviews. Our research is supposed to have effects for better public policy, but it can also lead to negative effects without our intention. Our research must therefore be structured in such a way that it avoids negative effects for individuals and communities and, where possible, is beneficial to them.

Required reading

Knott, Eleanor (2019) “Beyond the Field: Ethics after Fieldwork in Politically Dynamic Contexts.” *Perspectives on Politics*, 17:1, 140-153.

Oliver, Kathryn, Lorenc, Theo, Tinkler, Jane (2020) “Evaluating unintended consequences: New insights into solving practical, ethical and political challenges of evaluation.” *Evaluation*, 26:1, 61-75.

Recommended readings

Bhattacharya, Srobona (2014) “Institutional Review Board and International Field Research in Conflict Zones.” *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 47:4, 840-844.

Brewer, John D. (2016) “The Ethics of Ethical Debates in Peace and Conflict Research: Notes Towards the Development of a Research Covenant.” *Methodological Innovations*, 9: 1-11.

Carsey, Thomas M. (2014) “Making DA-RT a Reality.” *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 47:1, 72-77.

Desposato, Scott (ed.) (2015) *Ethics and Experiments: Problems and Solutions for Social Scientists and Policy Professionals*. New York: Routledge.

Elman, Colin and Kapiszewski, Diana (2014) “Data Access and Research Transparency in the Qualitative Tradition.” *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 47:1, 43-47.

Humphreys, Macartan (2015) “Reflections on the Ethics of Social Experimentation.” *Journal of Globalization and Development*, 6:1, 87-112.

Loyle, Cyanne E. and Simoni, Alicia (2017) “Researching Under Fire: Political Science and Researcher Trauma.” *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 50:1, 141-145.

Perrin, Burt (2019) “How to Manage Pressure to Change Reports: Should Evaluators Be Above Criticism?” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 40:3, 354-375.

Malejacq, Romain and Mukhopadhyay, Dipali (2016) “The 'Tribal Politics' of Field Research: A Reflection on Power and Partiality in 21st-Century Warzones.” *Perspectives on Politics*, 14:4, 1011-1028.

Michelson, Melissa R. (2016) “The Risk of Over-Reliance on the Institutional Review Board: An Approved Project Is Not Always an Ethical Project.” *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 49:2, 299-303.

Schwandt, Thomas A. (2018) “Acting together in determining value: A professional ethical responsibility of evaluators.” *Evaluation*, 24:3, 306-317.

Teele, Dawn Langan (ed.) (2014) *Field Experiments and Their Critics: Essays on the Uses and Abuses of Experimentation in the Social Sciences*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Yanow, Dvora and Scharz-Shea, Peregrine (2016) “Encountering your IRB 2.0: What Political Scientists Need to Know.” *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 49:2, 277-286.

12 Conclusion