A. Motives:
Beyond the fact that this course may be used to fulfill a methodology requirement for the Department of Political Science, there are several reasons why I have decided to offer it. Two are pedagogical; one is personal. First, after years of reading and commenting on multiple drafts of innumerable dissertation prospectuses I have become convinced that most students, however well grounded they may be in empirical theory, have not adequately thought through a research design before submitting a Ph.D. proposal. Second, rare are students who have devoted the time and thought necessary to how they are going to translate their creative theoretical ideas into successful empirical research at the dissertation stage of their training. Finally, my on-going current research projects on the politics of football (soccer) in Africa, and an historical view of forms of African governance (e.g., states and other polities) have confronted me with several methodological and epistemological problems. I would like to use this course as a vehicle to think them through and, if possible, resolve them.

B. Goals:
The goals of this course are simple to state, difficult to achieve. I hope that students will complete this semester not only with a sense of the rich variety of qualitative research methodologies available to them, but with an appreciation of the strengths and weaknesses of each. Students should also emerge from this course having developed an awareness of which methodologies are likely to be appropriate and useful in which circumstances. They should also be sensitized (or further sensitized, as the case may be) to how the interactions of theory, data, and method form the “tripod” of all successful empirical research. Moreover, although admittedly among the longer-term goals of this course, students should receive an eventual “leg up” both in fashioning their dissertation proposals and in gearing up for their field research, thus eliminating — or at least reducing — the terror of the unknown. Finally, although perhaps more of a possible outcome than a goal, I nevertheless hope that this course will encourage students to read and appreciate social science differently than they have been doing to this point.

C. Requirements:
Since I do not dispense Truth, the course will be run as a seminar. Although I might, occasionally, have something to impart which will require a “mini-lecture,” these will be few and far between. This format obviously places a great burden on the students to attend regularly, read diligently, and participate actively in class discussions.
To facilitate this participation, each week one or two students will act as discussion leaders. Discussion leaders will have two tasks. First, they will present a critical analysis of the week’s required reading (or a portion of it if there is more than one title). In addition, students should also supplement this analysis with an examination of a second piece of research drawn from their own field (book, article, or chapter) that illustrates or complements the main reading. Ideally the second piece of research should employ or comment on the method, approach, or style of analysis under consideration that week. (You are strongly encouraged both to select works which reflect your own substantive interests and to consult with the instructor on your selections.) These presentations should emphasize the authors’ use of methods, while showing us how theory, data, and method interact. If there are two discussants any given week, they will have to coordinate their efforts closely so as not to cover the same ground.

These presentations should be delivered from an outline, not read verbatim, and ought to take from 10 to 15 minutes. Be prepared to field questions from both the instructor and the class during your talk. Under no circumstances, however, will any presentation be allotted more than 15 minutes. (Should there be two discussants on a given week, each will discuss two different pieces of research and each will have 10-15 minutes.) Second, discussion leaders should use their acquired expertise on the method or methodological topic in question to enliven and stimulate our collective deliberations. (It may thus be incumbent upon them to go considerably beyond the required readings.) Part of this latter task will be to suggest how this method or approach might be used in a doctoral dissertation. Indeed, all students should read with this in mind and come to each class armed with concrete suggestions.

In addition, and also with the aim of facilitating our collective deliberations, all students must submit one-page reaction papers throughout the semester. Reaction papers should be just that, and no more. They should indicate your reactions to, questions of, and observations about the week’s major required readings. In them you should feel free to raise points of agreement or disagreement you might have with the various authors. The key to this exercise is coming to class prepared with a reaction to some aspect of the week’s readings. These exercises are required, but will not be graded. They should appear in my North Hall mailbox no later than 9:00 a.m. each Monday. In addition, at the same time all students should post their papers to the class list (polisci816-1-s13@lists.wisc.edu) so that we all have access to them. Note that no reaction paper is required for week one, the week you are a discussion leader, or the weeks that the critiques are due.

Other course requirements include one short (6-8 pages) essay. This essay is to be a methodological critique of substantive conclusions, of at least two pieces of research (books, chapters, or articles) dealing with the same general substantive question in different ways. For example, topics such as the Cuban missile crisis, the causes of war, why peasants revolt, the role of race in Congressional elections, and bureaucratic pathologies would all be fair game. (N.B.: No double dipping. Although you may select neither works examined in your class presentation nor those on the list of required readings, you should feel free to choose works from your own substantive areas of expertise.) Primary emphasis should be on a discussion of the merits and
demerits of fundamentally different research designs (e.g., single case study as opposed to comparison, historical analysis as opposed to interpretive biography, contemporary field research as opposed to archival analysis), rather than on the contributions of two individual authors. For the sake of contrast, one of the pieces of research may be primarily quantitative. This assignment will be due, in class, on 18 March 2013.

In addition, there will be a “final paper” of 16-20 pages which will ask you to submit a complete, detailed, and “do-able” dissertation proposal, for funding, to The Foundation. Since The Foundation will consider only efforts which have been thoroughly vetted, each student will submit a draft proposal, for comments, to both the instructor and one colleague, in class, on 22 April 2013. (Please have three copies: one to retain, one for a colleague, and one for me. In addition, all students should post their proposals to the class list as an email attachment so that all may have access to them.) Constructive comments and criticisms of these drafts will be due, in class, on either 29 April or 6 May 2013. (The specific date for each student’s critique will be determined by chance.) Students will then revise and resubmit their proposals in light of the two sets of comments they have received. The Foundation’s deadline for receiving your revised proposals is 4:00 p.m., Monday, 13 May 2013, but will, of course, welcome them earlier. The finished proposals should be submitted together with both sets of comments. While both the proposal’s substantive subject matter and type of qualitative methodological approaches are up to you, I assume you will use this occasion to elaborate an initial version of a proposal you will actually submit at some point in the not too distant future.

D. Grading Criteria:

- Oral Presentation &
- Overall Class Participation 25%
- Short Essay 25%
- Final, Revised Proposal 50%

Incompletes are the bane of graduate students and will be granted only under the most exceptional circumstances.

E. Readings:
The University Book Store has been asked to order the following books. Please note that in this context required means that you must read them; it does not mean that you must buy them. The list is lengthy, so pick and choose; form anarcho-syndicalist book-buying communes; make use of the reserve reading room; xerox; and scan. Not all will wish to empty bank accounts on titles that are specialized treatments of various subjects.


In the course outline which follows, some readings are required (*); others are recommended (#) for those wishing to pursue a subject further. All required books should be on three-hour reserve in the College Library at Helen C. White Hall [HCW]. Other required titles may be accessed through the following web link: [http://users.polisci.wisc.edu/schatzberg/ps816](http://users.polisci.wisc.edu/schatzberg/ps816). (Throughout the remainder of this syllabus this will be abbreviated as [web].) To facilitate easy access, I will send electronic copies of this syllabus (in WordPerfect, Word, pdf, and htm) to the classlist. A copy of the syllabus will also be on the web. [web].

Note as well that the newsletters of the comparative politics and qualitative methods sections of the APSA are often devoted to methodological issues [http://community.apsanet.org/ComparativePolitics/ComparativePoliticsSectionNewsletter](http://community.apsanet.org/ComparativePolitics/ComparativePoliticsSectionNewsletter) and [http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan_cqrm.aspx](http://www1.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan_cqrm.aspx).

**F. Course Outline:**

**Week 1—Introduction and Organization**

28 January 2013


#Carl Martin Allwood, “The Distinction between Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods is Problematic,” *Quality & Quantity* 46:5 (August 2012), 1417-1429. [web]

**Week 2—The Rhetoric of Research**

4 February 2013


#Stanley Fish, “Normal Circumstances, Literal Language, Direct Speech Acts, the Ordinary, the Everyday, the Obvious, What Goes Without Saying, and Other Special Cases,” in Paul Rabinow and William M. Sullivan, eds., *Interpretive Social Science: A Reader* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 243-65.
Week 3–Research Design, 1a: Validity and Inference 11 February 2013


[web]
Week 4–Research Design, 1b: More on Validity 18 February 2013


Week 5–Research Design, 2a: Case Study Analysis 25 February 2013


AND ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CLASSIC CASE STUDIES:

*Graham T. Allison, Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971).

**OR:**

**ONE CASE STUDY OF YOUR CHOICE IN YOUR OWN FIELD OF INTEREST**

#Jacques Hamel with Stéphane Dufour and Dominic Fortin, *Case Study Methods* (Newbury Park: SAGE, 1993).

---

**Week 6–Research Design, 2b: More Case Study Analysis**

4 March 2013


---

**Week 7–Research Design, 3: Historical Analysis & Comparisons**

11 March 2013


**OR**
*James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003), entire.

**History:**


#Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

**Comparison:**


---

**Week 8–Research Design, 5: Some Considerations Revisited 18 March 2013**

***SHORT ESSAYS DUE***


#Egon G. Guba and Yvonna S. Lincoln, “Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research,” in Denzin and Lincoln, eds., *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 105-17.


#John W. Creswell, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*, 3rd ed. (Los Angeles, SAGE, 2013.)


SPRING BREAK

Week 9--Data Collection, 1: Field Research & Participant Observation 1 April 2013


#David D. Laitin, Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change Among the Yoruba (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1886), entire.

#Katherine Irwin, “Into the Dark Heart of Ethnography: The Lived Ethics and Inequality of Intimate Field Relationshps,” Qualitative Sociology 29:2 (June 2006): 155-175. [web]
#Jane J. Mansbridge, Beyond Adversary Democracy, with a revised preface (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).
#M. G. Schatzberg, “Ethnicity and Class at the Local Level: Bars and Bureaucrats in Lisala, Zaire,” *Comparative Politics* 13:4 (July 1981): 461-78. [web]


#Mikaela J. Dufur & Seth L. Feinberg, “Race and the NFL Draft: Views from the Auction Block” *Qualitative Sociology* 32:1 (March 2009), 53-73. [web]

#Leila J. Rupp and Verta Taylor, “Going Back and Giving Back: The Ethics of Staying in the Field,” *Qualitative Sociology* 43:3 (September 2011), 483-496. [web]


**Gender:**


---

**Week 10–Data Collection, 2: The Spoken Word–Interviews** 8 April 2013


**Week 11–Styles of Analysis: Analysis of Discourse and Language**

15 April 2013


**Week 12–Reflections (and Fulminations?)**

***DRAFT PROPOSALS DUE***


#Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, eds., *Cultural Models in Language and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).


**Week 13–Critiques, 1**

*Read the assigned proposals*
Week 14–Critiques, 2  

6 May 2013

*Read the assigned proposals

***REVISED PROPOSALS DUE 4:00 p.m., MONDAY, 13 MAY 2013***