

Qualitative Methods for Public Policy

Thilo Bodenstern
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

Office hours: on request, Tuesdays 2-5 .m.

Winter term 2022-23
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 develop case studies. With the focus on case studies, 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, case studies 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/>

Workload

One ECTS credit is defined as 25 hours ‘real work’. The course is worth 4 ECTS credits, which is 100 hours ‘real work’. Our 12 sessions amount to 20 hours. You need appr. 4 hours of preparation for each session, which is 48 hours. The remaining 32 hours is for preparation of class presentations and course assignments.

Course Requirements

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

- *Perusall and participation* 20%
- *Course presentation*: 20%
- *Research notes/Homeworks* 30%
- *Case study outline*: 30%

Perusall and participation (20%): 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. Class participation and Perusall activities are also contribute to the formulation of the final grade.

Course presentation (20%): Each student presents a research paper with regard to its methods (group assignment).

Research notes / Homeworks (30%): The research notes are based on the students' work throughout the course. Students are required to work on their own/ a selected research question, and as we proceed with the course, they could always add one-one paragraph to it. In this way, they would need to think about a practical application of the learned materials.

They would need to add one-one paragraphs about:

- the research question (after the first session, week 1, compulsory for all);
- interview guides (week 6, compulsory for all)

Additionally, they would need to choose one out of the options to add:

- brief discourse analysis (week 7),
- focus group guide (week 8),
- observation guide/observation (week 9).

Case study outline and presentation (30%): In the last two weeks students are required to present their case study outline, and also serve as a discussant for one other presenter. The case study builds on the main submitted research notes (research question, interview guides and chosen option), with adding a general explanation of the case study, chosen methods as well as a research note on positionality/research ethics.

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: case studies
2		Case selection
3		Writing case studies
4		Causality and mechanisms
5		Concepts and measurement
6		Interviews and online interviews
7		Discourse analysis and textual analysis
8		Focus groups
9		Participant observation
10		Research ethics

11	Case study presentations
12	Case study presentations

1 Introduction: Case Studies

Group A: January 11, 10:50-12:30; Group B: January 10, 13.30-15.10; Group C: January 10, 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. Yin, R. (2011). What is qualitative research—and why might you consider doing such research. *Qualitative Research From Start to Finish*. New York: Guilford Press, 3-23.
2. Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy (2017). *The Practice of Qualitative Research* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage. Chapters 1-2.
3. Schwartz-Shea, P & Yanow, D 2012: "Ways of Knowing", pp. 24-44 in: *Interpretive Research Design*. London: Routledge.

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.
10. 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.
11. Maxwell, J.A. (2020) "The Value of qualitative inquiry for public policy." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 26:2, 177-186.

12. 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.

Research note 1 (compulsory for all)

For next week (Monday 8 a.m.) please submit a brief description of a research question, that could be approached through qualitative methods. It could be your MA thesis question, or it could be a question only selected for this course. Throughout the next weeks, you will work with the same question through examples. Upload the homework on Moodle, maximum 250 words.

2 Case studies and case selection

Group A: January 18, 10:50-12:30; Group B: January 17, 13.30-15.10; Group C: January 17, 10:50-12:30

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, R. (2011). How to Start a Research Study. *Qualitative Research From Start to Finish*. New York: Guilford Press, 49-72.
3. Yin, Robert K. (2013) "Validity and Generalization in Future Case Study Evaluations." *Evaluation*, 19:3, 321-332.
4. Mabry, L. (2008). Case study in social research. *The SAGE handbook of social research methods*, 214-227.

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. 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.

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. Van Belle, J. P., & Trusler, J. (2005). An interpretivist case study of a South African rural multi-purpose community centre.

3. Writing case studies and thick description

Group A: January 25, 10:50-12:30; Group B: January 24, 13.30-15.10; Group C: January 24, 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.

Required reading

1. Yin, R. (2011). Equipping Yourself to do Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Research From Start to Finish*. New York: Guilford Press, 25-48.
2. 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.
3. Yin, R. (2011). Choices in Designing Qualitative Research Studies. *Qualitative Research From Start to Finish*. New York: Guilford Press, 75-108.

Recommended reading

1. Geddes, B. (1990) “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics.” *Political Analysis*, 2:1, 131-150.
2. Pepinsky, Thomas B. (2019) “The Return of the Single-Country Study.” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22: 187-203.
3. Thomas, Gary (2010) “Doing case study: Abduction not induction, phronesis not theory.” *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16:7, 575-582.
4. 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.
5. Woolcock M (2013) “Using case studies to explore the external validity of ‘complex’ development interventions.” *Evaluation* 19:3, 229–48.
6. Yin, Robert K. (2018) *Case Study Research and Applications. Design and Method*. 6th Edition. London: Sage. Ch. 2

Example

1. 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.
2. Teixeira, C., Lo, L., & Truelove, M. (2007). Immigrant entrepreneurship, institutional discrimination, and implications for public policy: a case study in Toronto. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 25(2), 176-193.

4. Causality and mechanisms

Group A: February 1, 10:50-12:30; Group B: January 31, 13.30-15.10; Group C: January 31, 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. Falletti, Tulia G. and Lynch, Julia F. (2009) “Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Analysis.” *Comparative Political Studies*, 42:9, 1143-1166.
3. Ruffa, C., & Evangelista, M. (2021). Searching for a middle ground? A spectrum of views of causality in qualitative research. *Italian Political Science Review/Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*, 1-18.

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

1. 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.
2. Goodwin, M., & Grix, J. (2011). Bringing structures back in: The ‘governance narrative’, the ‘decentred approach’ and ‘asymmetrical network governance’ in the education and sport policy communities. *Public administration*, 89(2), 537-556.

5 Concepts and Measurement

Group A: February 8, 10:50-12:30; Group B: February 7, 13.30-15.10; Group C: February 7, 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.
3. Schwartz-Shea, P 2014: “Judging Quality. Evaluative Criteria and Epistemic Communities”, pp. 120-146 in : (ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea) *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Method and the Interpretive Turn*, New York: M.E. Sharpe.

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.

6 Interviews and online interviews

Group A: February 15, 10:50-12:30; Group B: February 14, 13.30-15.10; Group C: February 14, 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. 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. Yin, R. (2011). Data Collection Methods. *Qualitative Research From Start to Finish*. New York: Guilford Press, 129-155.
2. Leech, Beth L. (2002) "Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 665-668.
3. Soss, Joe, 2014: "Talking Our Way to Meaningful Explanations - A Practice Centered View of Interviewing for Interpretive Research", pp. 161-182 in: (ed. Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea) *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Method and the Interpretive Turn*, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
4. James, N., and Busher, H. (2006) "Credibility, authenticity and voice: Dilemmas in online interviewing." *Qualitative Research*, 6:3, 403-420.

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.
9. Aberbach, Joel D. and Rockman, Bert A. (2002) "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews." *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 35:4, 673-676.
10. 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.
11. Brinkmann, Svend and Kvale, Steinar (2015) *InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 3rd Edition. London: Sage. Chs 10, 11, 12.
12. 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.

13. 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.
14. 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.
15. Sally Seitz, “Pixilated partnerships, overcoming obstacles in qualitative interviews via Skype: aresearch note,” *Qualitative Research* (2015)
16. Harvey, W. S. (2011) “Strategies for conducting elite interviews.” *Qualitative Research*, 11:4, 431-441.
17. McCormack, Coralie (2000). “From Interview Transcript to Interpretive Story: Part 1— Viewing the Transcript Through Multiple Lenses”. *Field Methods*, 12:4, 282–297.
- 18.

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*.
4. Lawrence, Leigh (2020) “Conducting cross-cultural qualitative interviews with mainland Chinese participants during COVID: Lessons from the field.” *Qualitative Research*, online first (November)
5. r’Hart, D. (2021) “COVID times make 'deep listening' explicit: changing the space between interviewer and participant.” *Qualitative Research*, Early Access.

Research note 2 (compulsory for all)

For next week (Monday 8 a.m.) please submit an interview guide for your research question. What type of interview would you conduct and why? Upload the homework on Moodle, maximum 500 words.

7 Discourse Analysis and Textual Analysis

Group A: February 22, 10:50-12:30; Group B: February 21, 13.30-15.10; Group C: February 21, 10:50-12:30

Required

1. Stavrakakis, Y., Horwarth, D., & Norval, A., 2000: “Introducing discourse theory and political analysis”, chapter 1 in: *Discourse theory and political analysis. Identities*. Pp. 1-23. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
2. Antaki, C. (2008). Discourse analysis and conversation analysis. *The SAGE handbook of social research methods*, 431-446.
3. Symposium: Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis. 2004. *Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 2, No. 1, pp. 15-39.

4. Saldaña, J. (2021). An Introduction to Codes and Coding. In: The coding manual for qualitative researchers. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Pp. 1-41.

Recommended

1. Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe, 2014: “Beyond the Positivity of the Social: Antagonisms and Hegemony”, Chapter 3, pp. 79-131 in: *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
2. Villadsen, K “Michel Foucault’s Discourse Analysis” in Järvinen, M., & Meyer-Mik, N. (2020). *Qualitative analysis : eight approaches for the social sciences*. Sage Publications.
3. Van Dijk, T “Critical Discourse Analysis” in Järvinen, M., & Meyer-Mik, N. (2020). *Qualitative analysis : eight approaches for the social sciences*. Sage Publications.
4. “Discourse,” in Lilie Chouliaraki and Norman Fairclough (eds.) *Discourse in Late Modernity* (Edinburgh University Press, 1999), pp. 37-74.
5. Ted Hopf. Spring 2004. “Discourse and Content Analysis: Some Fundamental Incompatibilities,” *Qualitative Methods Newsletter*, pp. 31-33.

Example

1. Juraj Medzihorsky, Milos Popovic, and Erin K. Jenne. 2017. “Rhetoric of civil conflict management: United Nations Security Council debates over the Syrian civil war,” *Research & Politics*, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 1–10.
2. George Lakoff. 2001. “Metaphor and War: The Metaphor System Used to Justify War in the Gulf,” *Peace Research*, Vol. 32, pp. 25-32.

Research note 3 (optional, choose one out of the options research note 3; research note 4; research note 5)

For next week (Monday 8 a.m.) please submit a short analysis of a policy document that related to your research question based on the frame analysis methodology introduced by Verloo in the article below, Aim to develop sensitising questions related to your / a research topic. Upload the homework on Moodle, maximum 500 words.

Verloo, M. M. T. (2005). Mainstreaming gender equality in Europe. A critical frame analysis.

8 Focus groups

Group A: March 1, 10:50-12:30; Group B: February 28, 13.30-15.10; Group C: February 28, 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

Research note 4 (optional, choose one out of the options research note 3; research note 4; research note 5)

For next week (Monday 8 a.m.) please submit a focus group session guide for your research question. Upload the homework on Moodle, maximum 500 words.

Homework exercise

As a preparation for the next class, make a 20 minutes observation, and make notes. What have you observed and why? How have you selected your place of observation? What kind of observer role you took? Policy relevant observation (what type of people, how do they use the space, etc)

9 Participant observation, observant participation

Group A: March 8, 10:50-12:30; Group B: March 7, 13.30-15.10; Group C: March 7, 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.
3. Seim, J. (2021). Participant observation, observant participation, and hybrid ethnography. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 0049124120986209.

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., Regulska, 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.

Research note 5 (optional, choose one out of the options research note 3; research note 4; research note 5)

For next week (Monday 8 a.m.) please submit an observation guide for your research (or if you can, make a short, 20 minutes observation). Upload the homework on Moodle, maximum 500 words.

10 Research ethics

Group A: March 15, 10:50-12:30; Group B: March 14, 13.30-15.10; Group C: March 14, 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.
3. Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and "ethically important moments" in research. *Qualitative inquiry*, 10(2), 261-280.

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." *Sbanlax 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.
13. Fujii, L. A. (2012). Research ethics 101: Dilemmas and responsibilities. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 45(4), 717-723.
14. Rupp, Leila and Taylor, Verta. 2011. Going Back and Giving Back: The Ethics of Staying in the Field. *Qualitative Sociology*, 34, 483-496. (E) 5.
15. Sondra Hale, "Feminist Method, Process, and Self-Criticism: Interviewing Sudanese Women", *Women's Words*, chapter 8.

16. Glasius M. et al. (2018). Building and Maintaining Relations. Ch.4 In: Research, Ethics and Risk in the Authoritarian Field. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham
17. Borneman, John and Abdellah Hammoudi, eds., Being There: The Fieldwork Encounter and the Making of Truth (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).
18. Hsueh, R., Jensenius, F., & Newsome, A. (2014). Fieldwork in Political Science: Encountering Challenges and Crafting Solutions: Introduction. PS: Political Science & Politics, 47(2), 391-393. doi:10.1017/S1049096514000262
- 19.

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.
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.
3. Jones-Gailani, N. (2013). Third parties in “third spaces”: Reflecting on the role of the translator in oral history interviews with Iraqi diasporic women. In *Oral History Off the Record* (pp. 169-183). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Research note 6 (compulsory for all as part of the case study submission)

For next week (Monday 8 a.m.) please submit a paragraph of research ethic consideration/positionality note to your fieldwork plan, as part of the submitted case study outline. Maximum 250 words.

11 Class presentations

Group A: March 22, 10:50-12:30; Group B: March 21, 13.30-15.10; Group C: March 21, 10:50-12:30

The case study presentations are based on the research notes you have developed throughout the course. It should include a general explanation of the case study, chosen methods, a research note on positionality/research ethics, as well as the revised research notes:

- the research question
- interview guides

One from the options:

- brief discourse analysis (week 7),
- focus group guide (week 8),
- observation guide/observation (week 9).

You will be required to present the case study plan in 10 mins on one week, and also to serve as a discussant for one other presenter at the other week. We will provide sign-up sheets for both.

12 Class presentations

Group A: March 29, 10:50-12:30; Group B: March 28, 13.30-15.10; Group C: March 28, 10:50-12:30