

Qualitative Methods for Public Policy

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

Office hours: [...]

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

Winter term 2021-22

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:

- Cresswell, John W. (2007) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design. Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- 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.
- Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy & Leavy, Patricia. (2017). *The Practice of Qualitative Research* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage

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: 15%*
- *1st Take-home essay: 25%*
- *2nd Take-home essay: 25%*
- *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 essay: 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 1000 words (+/- 10%) and should be submitted by the end of the term.

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.

Course rules

Students are expected to attend the seminars regularly, having done the compulsory readings and to participate actively in group activities. In order to create an environment conducive to sharing reflections and learning from them, respectful treatment is required at all times: this includes punctuality and refraining from using distracting technologies and platforms (mobile phones) in class.

Schedule

Session	Date	Topic
1		Introduction; Positivism and Interpretivism
2		Causality and mechanisms
3		Concepts and measurement
4		Case studies (thick description)
		Take home essay 1
5		Interviews
6		Online interviews
7		Focus groups
8		Participant observation
		Take home essay 2
9		Survey questions
10		Evaluation
11		Critical approaches in qualitative research
12		Research ethics
		Take home essay 3

1 Introduction

Group 1: January 11, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: January 12, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: January 13, 10:50-12:30

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. The introduction 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

1. Beach, D., Kaas, J.G. (2020) "The Great Divides: Incommensurability, the Impossibility of Mixed-Methodology, and What to Do about It." *International Studies Review*, 22: 214–235.
2. Maxwell, J.A. (2020) "The Value of qualitative inquiry for public policy." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 26:2, 177-186.

Recommended reading

1. Bonache, Jaime (2020) "The challenge of using a 'non-positivist' paradigm and getting through the peer-review process." *Human Resource Management Journal*. Early Access.
2. Brinkmann, Svend (2014) "Doing Without Data". *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20:6, 720-725.
3. Brinkman, S. (2012) *Qualitative Inquiry in Everyday Life: Working with everyday life materials*. London: Sage. Ch.2
4. Earl Rinehart, Kerry (2020) "Abductive Analysis in Qualitative Inquiry." *Qualitative Inquiry*, early access.
5. Gaus, N. (2017) "Selecting research approaches and research designs: a reflective essay." *Qualitative Research Journal*, 17:2, 99-112.
6. Gherardi, S. (2008). Situated knowledge and situated action: What do practice-based studies promise. *The SAGE handbook of new approaches in management and organization*, 516-525.
7. Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy (2017). *The Practice of Qualitative Research* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage. Chapters 1-2.
8. Lingard, L., Albert, M., & Levinson, W. (2008). "Grounded theory, mixed methods, and action research." *BMJ*, 337, 459.
9. Sword, Helen et al. (2018) "Seven Ways of Looking at a Data Set." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 24:7, 499-508.

Example

Lykes, M. B. (1997). Activist participatory research among the Maya of Guatemala: Constructing meanings from situated knowledge. *Journal of Social Issues*, 53:4, 725-746.

2 Causality and mechanisms

Group 1: January 18, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: January 19, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: January 20, 10:50-12:30

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

1. Astbury, Brad and Leeuw, Frans L. (2010) “Unpacking Black Boxes: Mechanisms and Theory Building in Evaluation.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31:3, 363-381.
2. Falleti, Tulia G. and Lynch, Julia F. (2009) “Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Analysis.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 42:9, 1143-1166.

Recommended reading

Paul Cairney has an excellent blog with a long list of policy concepts (Policy Concepts in 1000 Words): <https://bit.ly/3qX1uf8>

1. Abbott, Andrew (2004) *Methods of Discovery. Heuristics for the Social Sciences*. New York: W.W.Norton&Company. Chs 3, 4.
2. Dalkin, Sonia M. et al. (2015) “What’s in a Mechanism? Development of a Key Concept in Realist Evaluation.” *Implementation Science*, 10:49.
3. Elster, Jon (2007) *Explaining Social Behavior: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Gerring, John (2012) “Mere Description.” *British Journal of Political Science*, 42: 721–746.
5. Maxwell, J.A. (2012) “The importance of qualitative research for causal explanation in education.” *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18: 655–61.
6. Pawson, Ray (1989) *A Measure for Measures: A Manifesto for Empirical Sociology*. London: Routledge. Ch. 6.
7. Schmitt, J. (2020). The causal mechanism claim in evaluation: Does the prophecy fulfill? In:
8. J. Schmitt (Ed.). *Causal Mechanisms in Program Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation*, 167, 11–26.

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.

3 Concepts and Measurement

Group 1: January 25, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: January 26, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: January 27, 10:50-12:30

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

1. 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.
2. Gerring, J. (1999) "What Makes a Concept Good? A Criterial Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences." *Polity*, 31:3, 357-393.

Recommended readings

1. Baker, T., and McGuirk, P. (2017). "Assemblage thinking as methodology: Commitments and practices for critical policy research." *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 5:4, 425-442.
2. Cartwright, Nancy, Bradburn, Norman M. and Fuller, Jonathan (2016) "A theory of measurement.", Working Paper. Centre for Humanities Engaging Science and Society (CHESS), Durham.
3. Sartori, G. (1970) "Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review*, 64:4, 1033–1053.
4. Taylor, S. (1997) "Critical policy analysis: Exploring contexts, texts and consequences." *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 18:1, 23-35.

Example

1. Baldwin, D. A. (1997) "The Concept of Security." *Review of International Studies*, 23: 5-26.
2. Bowman K., Lehoucq F. & Mahoney J. (2005) "Measuring Political Democracy: Case Expertise, Data Adequacy, and Central America." *Comparative Political Studies*, 38: 939-970.

4 Case studies

Group 1: February 1, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: February 2, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: February 3, 10:50-12:30

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

1. Thomas, G. (2011) "A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse, and structure." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17:6, 511-521.
2. Yin, Robert K. (2013) "Validity and Generalization in Future Case Study Evaluations." *Evaluation*, 19:3, 321-332.

Recommended reading

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

2. 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.
3. Bogaards, Matthijs (2019) “Case-Based Research on Democratization.” *Democratization*, 26:1, 61-77.
4. Briggs, Ryan C. (2017) “Explaining Case Selection in African Politics Research.” *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 35:4, 565-572.
5. Collier, D. and Mahoney, J. (1996) “Insights and pitfalls - Selection Bias in Qualitative Research.” *World Politics*, 49:1, 56-91.
6. Geddes, B. (1990) “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics.” *Political Analysis*, 2:1, 131-150.
7. Pepinsky, Thomas B. (2019) “The Return of the Single-Country Study.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22: 187-203.
8. Ponterotto, J. G. (2006). “Brief note on the origins, evolution, and meaning of the qualitative research concept thick description.” *The qualitative report*, 11:3, 538-549.
9. Thomas, Gary (2010) “Doing case study: Abduction not induction, phronesis not theory.” *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16:7, 575-582.
10. Thompson, W. B. (2001). “Policy making through thick and thin: Thick description as a methodology for communications and democracy.” *Policy Sciences*, 34:1, 63-77.
11. Woolcock M (2013) “Using case studies to explore the external validity of ‘complex’ development interventions.” *Evaluation* 19:3, 229–48.
12. Yin, Robert K. (2018) *Case Study Research and Applications. Design and Method*. 6th Edition. London: Sage. Ch. 2

Example

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

5 Interviews

Group 1: February 8, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: February 9, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: February 10, 10:50-12:30

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

1. Harvey, W. S. (2011) “Strategies for conducting elite interviews.” *Qualitative Research*, 11:4, 431-441.
2. Leech, Beth L. (2002) “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 665-668.

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

Recommended reading

1. Berry, Jeffrey M. (2002) “Validity and Reliability Issues in Elite Interviewing: *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 679-682.
2. Brinkmann, Svend (2007) “Could Interviews Be Epistemic? An Alternative to Qualitative Opinion Polling.” *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13:8, 1116-1138.
3. Brinkmann, Svend and Kvale, Steinar (2015) *InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 3rd Edition. London: Sage. Chs 6, 7, 8.
4. Goldstein, Kenneth (2002) “Getting in the Door: Sampling and Completing Elite Interviews.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 669-672.
5. Gubrium, Jaber F. et al. (eds.) (2012) *The SAGE Handbook of Interview Research: The Complexity of the Craft*. 2nd Edition.
6. Keats, D. M. (2001). *Interviewing: a practical guide for students and professionals*. Buckingham – Philadelphia: Open University Press. Chapter 4 and 5.
7. Weiss, Robert (1994) “Preparation for Interviewing” and “Interviewing.” In: *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: The Free Press. pp. 39-59 and 61-119.
8. Woliver, Laura R. (2002) “Ethical Dilemmas in Personal Interviewing.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 677-678.

Example

1. Young, Charlotte, Zubrzycki, Joanna and Plath, Debbie (2020) “The slow interview? Developing key principles and practices.” *Qualitative Research*, early access.
2. Lilleker, Darren (2003). "Interviewing the Political Elite: Navigating a Political Minefield", *Politics* 23(3): 207- 14.
3. Fraser, H., & Taylor, N. (2020). Narrative feminist research interviewing with ‘inconvenient groups’ about sensitive topics: affect, iteration and assemblages. *Qualitative Research*.

6 Online interviews and coding

Group 1: February 15, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: February 16, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: February 17, 10:50-12:30

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? Another important topic is online interviews. On the one hand, online interviews offer us excellent opportunities to expand the circle of our interview partners enormously. On the other hand, there is the risk of losing the authentic voice of our interviewees.

Required reading

1. James, N., and Busher, H. (2006) “Credibility, authenticity and voice: Dilemmas in online interviewing.” *Qualitative Research*, 6:3, 403-420.

2. McCormack, Coralie (2000). "From Interview Transcript to Interpretive Story: Part 1—Viewing the Transcript Through Multiple Lenses". *Field Methods*, 12:4, 282–297.

Recommended reading

1. Aberbach, Joel D. and Rockman, Bert A. (2002) "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 673-676.
2. 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.
3. Brinkmann, Svend and Kvale, Steinar (2015) *InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 3rd Edition. London: Sage. Chs 10, 11, 12.
4. 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.
5. Marland, A., Esselment, A.L. (2019) "Negotiating with gatekeepers to get interviews with politicians: qualitative research recruitment in a digital media environment." *Qualitative Research*, 19:6, 685-702.
6. Opara, V., Spangsdorf, S. and Ryan, M.K. (2021) "Reflecting on the use of Google Docs for online interviews: Innovation in qualitative data collection." *Qualitative Research*, Early Access.
7. Sally Seitz, "Pixilated partnerships, overcoming obstacles in qualitative interviews via Skype: a research note," *Qualitative Research* (2015)

Example

1. Lawrence, Leigh (2020) "Conducting cross-cultural qualitative interviews with mainland Chinese participants during COVID: Lessons from the field." *Qualitative Research*, online first (November)
2. t'Hart, D. (2021) "COVID times make 'deep listening' explicit: changing the space between interviewer and participant." *Qualitative Research*, Early Access.

7 Focus groups

Group 1: February 22, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: February 23, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: February 24, 10:50-12:30

Focus groups are basically interviews 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

1. 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.
2. Belzile, J.A. and Öberg, G. (2012) "Where to begin? Grappling with how to use participant interaction in focus group design." *Qualitative Research*, 12:4, 459-472.

Recommended reading

1. Barbour, Rosaline (2007) *Doing Focus Groups*. London: Sage. Ch. 8.
2. Barbour, Rosalin (2013) “Analysing Focus Groups.” In: Flick, Uwe (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London: Sage.
3. Johnson, A. (1996). “It’s good to talk”: The focus group and the sociological imagination. *The Sociological Review*, 44(3), 517-538.
4. Namey, E., Guest, G., McKenna, K. and Chen, M. (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.
5. Stewart, K., Williams, M. (2005) “Researching online populations: the use of online focus groups for social research.” *Qualitative Research*, 5:4, 395-416.
6. Wilkinson, S. (2006). Analysing interaction in focus groups. In Drew, P., Raymond, G., & Weinberg, D. (Eds.), *Talk and interaction in social research methods* (pp. 72–93). London: Sage.

Example

1. Galport, Nicole and Azzam, Tarek (2017) “Evaluator Training Needs and Competencies: A Gap Analysis.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 38:1, 80-100.
2. MacNamara, N. et al. (2020) “Reflecting on asynchronous internet mediated focus groups for researching culturally sensitive issues.” *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, early access, December.

8 Participant observation

Group 1: March 1, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: March 2, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: March 3, 10:50-12:30

Participant observations are an important tool of qualitative data collection. Especially in the field of public policy, observations can provide insights into group dynamics and decision-making mechanisms and give insight into the argumentative frames of the participants. Participant observation also plays an important role in policy evaluation.

Required reading

1. Marvasti, A. B. (2014). Analysing observations. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis*, 354-367.
2. Adler, P. A. and Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques.

Recommended reading

1. Handley, M., Bunn, F., Lynch, J., & Goodman, C. (2020). Using non-participant observation to uncover mechanisms: Insights from a realist evaluation. *Evaluation*, 26(3), 380-393.
2. Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2020). *Qualitative research methods*. Sage. (Chapter 9: Data preparation and developing codes)

3. Kawulich, B. B. (2005). Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method.
- 4.

Example

1. Kabachnik, P., Regulaska, J., & Mitchneck, B. (2012). Displacing blame: Georgian internally displaced person perspectives of the Georgia–Abkhazia conflict. *Ethnopolitics*, 11:2, 123-140.
2. McDonald, S. (2005). Studying actions in context: a qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. *Qualitative research*, 5(4), 455-473.
3. Brear, M. R., & Tsotetsi, C. T. (2021). (De)colonising outcomes of community participation – a South African ethnography of ‘ethics in practice.’ *Qualitative Research*.
4. Huot, S. (2019). Co-constructing the field for a critical ethnography of immigrants’ experiences in a Canadian Francophone minority community. *Qualitative Research*, 19(3), 340–355.

9 Surveys and survey questions

Group 1: March 8, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: March 9, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: March 10, 10:50-12:30

Surveys are useful and versatile tools of systematic data collection. Despite their popularity and accessibility, they need to be designed and interpreted with caution in order to avoid common pitfalls which can lead to biased observations. How can strategies of survey design, inference and sampling help policy researchers to derive meaningful data from surveys?

Required reading

1. Groves, Robert M. et al. (2009) *Survey Methodology*. 2nd Edition. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Ch. 7 (Questions and Answers in Surveys), 201-241.
2. Bowen, Merle L. and Tillman, Ayesha S. (2015) “Developing Culturally Responsive Surveys: Lessons in Development, Implementation, and Analysis from Brazil’s African Descent Communities.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 36:1, 25-41.

Recommended readings

1. Freedman, D., Pisani, R., and Purves, R. (2007) *Statistics* (4th ed.). New York: Norton Ch. 19 (Sample Surveys), 333-349.
2. Ritchie, J., Louis J. and Elam G. (2003) “Designing and Selecting Samples.” In: Ritchie, J., and Lewis, J. (eds.), *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers* (77-108). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
3. Schusser, C. et al. (2012) “Sequence design of quantitative and qualitative surveys for increasing efficiency in forest policy research.” *Allgemeine Forst und Jagdzeitung (AFJZ)*, 183(3/4), 75-83.
4. Seixas, B. V., Smith, N., and Mitton, C. (2018) “The qualitative descriptive approach in international comparative studies: using online qualitative surveys.” *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 7:9, 778-781.

Example

1. Morris, Michael and Clark, Brittany (2012) “You Want Me to Do What? Evaluators and the Pressure to Misrepresent Findings.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 34:1, 57-70.
2. Woertz, E. (2017) “Food security in Iraq: results from quantitative and qualitative surveys.” *Food Security*, 9:3, 511-522.

10 Evaluation

Group 1: March 15, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: March 16, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: March 17, 10:50-12:30

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

1. Thomas, D.R. (2006) “A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27:2, 237-246.
2. Simons, Helen (2015) “Interpret in context: Generalizing from the single case in evaluation.” *Evaluation*, 21:2, 173-188.

Recommended reading

1. 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.
2. Dart, J., Davies, R. (2003) “A dialogical, story-based evaluation tool: The most significant change technique.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24:2, 137-155.
3. Halpern, David and Mason, Danielle (2015) “Radical incrementalism.” *Evaluation*, 21:2, 143-149.
4. John Mayne, John and Johnson, Nancy (2015) “Using theories of change in the CGIAR Research Program on Agriculture for Nutrition and Health.” *Evaluation*, 21:4, 407-428.
5. Lehmann, Erika R. (2015) “What if ‘What Works’ Doesn’t?” *Evaluation*, 21:2, 167-172.
6. 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.
7. Rowe, Andy (2019) “Rapid impact evaluation.” *Evaluation*, 25:4, 496-513.
8. Wanzer, Dana Linnell (2020) “What Is Evaluation? Perspectives of How Evaluation Differs (or Not) From Research.” *American Journal of Evaluation*, early access.
9. Ziabakhsh, Sabnam (2015) “Reflexivity in evaluating an aboriginal women heart health promotion program.” *Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation*, 30:1,...

Example

1. Biggs, Janice S. et al. (2014) “A practical example of Contribution Analysis to a public health intervention.” *Evaluation*, 20:2, 214-229.
2. Buckley, Anthony P. (2016) “Using Contribution Analysis to evaluate small & medium enterprise support policy.” *Evaluation*, 22:2, 129-148.

11 Critical approaches in qualitative research

Group 1: March 22, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: March 23, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: March 24, 10:50-12:30

Critical approaches such as postcolonialism, feminism and queer studies have strengthened participatory perspectives. One example is the critique of the 'extractivism' of researchers from privileged backgrounds in gaining knowledge in subaltern milieus - a critique that has triggered a discussion about recognition of the researched and their right to re-appropriate the researched. This has led to a deepening of the reflexive and self-critical turn, as well as experimentation with practices such as auto-ethnography and collaborative and activist methods. In this session we will review some of these, drawing on discussions of reflexivity in research.

Required

1. Dvora Yanow (2009) "Ways of Knowing: Passionate Humility and Reflective Practice in Research and Management." *The American Review of Public Administration* 39:6, 579–601.
2. Walter, Maggie and Suina, Michele (2019) "Indigenous data, indigenous methodologies and indigenous data sovereignty." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 22:3, 233-243.

Recommended

1. Shannon Speed (2006). "At the Crossroads of Human Rights and Anthropology: Toward a Critically Engaged Activist Research." *American Anthropologist* 108, no. 1 (: 66–76.
2. Dani Wadada Nabudere (2019). "Research, Activism and Knowledge Production" en Charles Hale (ed.), *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (University of California Press), pp. 62-87.
3. Jennifer Bickham Mendez (2019). "Globalizing Scholar Activism: Opportunities and Dilemmas through a Feminist Lens" in: *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship* (University of California Press), pp. 136-163.
4. Nancy A. Naples (2007), "Feminist Methodology and Its Discontents," in Outhwaite & Turner, *The SAGE Handbook of Social Science Methodology* (London: SAGE), pp. 547–64.
5. Michael Root (2007), "Community Based Research," in *The SAGE Handbook of Social Science Methodology*, (London: SAGE), pp. 565–77.

Example

1. Caretta, M. A. (2015). Situated knowledge in cross-cultural, cross-language research: a collaborative reflexive analysis of researcher, assistant and participant subjectivities. *Qualitative Research*, 15(4), 489–505.
2. Hamilton, P. (2020). 'Now that I know what you're about': black feminist reflections on power in the research relationship. *Qualitative Research*, 20(5), 519–533.

12 Research ethics

Group 1: March 29, 10:50-12:30; Group 3: March 30, 10:50-12:30; Group 2: March 31, 10:50-12:30

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.

CEU's Ethical Research Policy and the Checklist on Ethical Issues in Research, on the moodle and available at <https://acro.ceu.edu/ethical-research>

Required reading

1. Knott, Eleanor (2019) "Beyond the Field: Ethics after Fieldwork in Politically Dynamic Contexts." *Perspectives on Politics*, 17:1, 140-153.
2. Schwandt, Thomas A. (2018) "Acting together in determining value: A professional ethical responsibility of evaluators." *Evaluation*, 24:3, 306-317.

Recommended readings

1. Bhattacharya, Srobana (2014) "Institutional Review Board and International Field Research in Conflict Zones." *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 47:4, 840-844.
2. 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.
3. Elman, Colin and Kapiszewski, Diana (2014) "Data Access and Research Transparency in the Qualitative Tradition." *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 47:1, 43-47.
4. Guillemin, M. and Gillam L (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and "Ethically Important Moments" In *Research. Qualitative Inquiry* 10(2): 261-280.
5. Holmes, A.G.D. (2020) "Researcher Positionality-A Consideration of Its Influence and Place in Qualitative Research-A New Researcher Guide." *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 8:4, 1-10.
6. Humphreys, Macartan (2015) "Reflections on the Ethics of Social Experimentation." *Journal of Globalization and Development*, 6:1, 87-112.
7. Loyle, Cyanne E. and Simoni, Alicia (2017) "Researching Under Fire: Political Science and Researcher Trauma." *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 50:1, 141-145.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Perrin, Burt (2019) "How to Manage Pressure to Change Reports: Should Evaluators Be Above Criticism?" *American Journal of Evaluation*, 40:3, 354-375.
11. Rupp, Leila and Taylor, Verta (2011) "Going Back and Giving Back: The Ethics of Staying in the Field." *Qualitative Sociology*, 34, 483-496.
12. Yanow, Dvora and Schartz-Shea, Peregrine (2016) "Encountering your IRB 2.0: What Political Scientists Need to Know." *PS-Political Science and Politics*, 49:2, 277-286.

Example

1. 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.