

POLI 709:

Qualitative Methods of Political Analysis

University of South Carolina
Tuesdays 2:50 PM – 5:35 PM
Gambrell (GAMBRL) 325
Fall 2026



The National Capitol of Cuba, home to the National Assembly and the site of an interview I conducted during my fieldwork (photo taken by me on January 6, 2025).

Contact information

Instructor: Matthew Martin, PhD (he/him)

Email: mattmartin@sc.edu

Office location: Gambrell Hall (GAMBRL)

Office hours: Thursdays, 11:30 AM–1:30 PM (schedule via [Bookings](#))

I strongly encourage you to come by my office hours. I want to get to know our department's graduate students! I am happy to discuss course material, questions, your research ideas, or life in general. If you are busy during my office hours, we can find another time. If you would prefer to meet over Zoom, we can make that work, too.

Outside of office hours, the best way to contact me is via email. During the week, I will respond to your message within 24 hours. During the weekend, I may take longer to respond. I usually respond to messages during normal business hours between 8:00 AM and 5:00 PM, Monday through Friday.

Course description

This course prepares graduate students to design, conduct, and evaluate qualitative research in political science. What, then, is qualitative research? It helps to begin with what it is *not* — neither a junior partner to quantitative research nor merely the “qual” component of multimethod designs. Rather, it is a coequal approach encompassing epistemologies from positivism to interpretivism and methodologies from process tracing to ethnography. Precisely because of this diversity, consensus eludes scholars on how to define qualitative research vis-à-vis its counterparts. For our purposes, a practical definition will guide us as we navigate these debates, grounded in what qualitative researchers tend to do. This includes engaging closely with cases, attending to context, and using non-numerical evidence to develop and test claims. These are, presumably, things you want to do in your own research.

I have designed the course to be methodologically pluralist while taking clear stances on what makes good qualitative research. In practice, this means addressing questions of evidentiary quality, transparency, and judgment. Throughout the semester, we ask both how such research is done and how it is evaluated by readers, reviewers, and researchers themselves. These discussions are meant to inform your own approach to qualitative research, with the goal of making progress toward a research project — preferably one you can develop beyond this semester. We also address the elephant in the room, also known as artificial intelligence, in a way that reflects the real, heated, and generative (sorry, had to) methodological debates underway. This terrain is where the standards of qualitative inquiry are now freshly contested, and the course engages them alongside older debates that continue to shape our field.

On a more personal note, this course responds to a gap in our methodological training as political scientists that I experienced firsthand. I did not take a qualitative methods course in graduate school because none was offered. This is not the fault of any single institution but reflects a disciplinary culture that has long treated qualitative research as an afterthought. My hope is that this course helps us apply these methodologies in grounded, rigorous ways to the research questions that animate us. Rather than learn these methods on the fly as I did, you will encounter them here systematically, and before you need them. For those drawn to this work, I encourage you to seek out further training at venues such as the Institute for Qualitative and Multi-Method Research (IQMR). This is my best attempt at the course I wish I had taken.

Learning Objectives

1. Engage the range of qualitative approaches in political science with informed judgment about their strengths, limits, and appropriate uses.
2. Evaluate qualitative claims against standards of evidence, transparency, and rigor.
3. Design, conduct, and evaluate qualitative research, with substantive progress on a project of your own.
4. Evaluate when AI tools are appropriate in qualitative research, and when they are, use them productively in research and writing without outsourcing your own reasoning.

Required materials

You are not required to purchase any textbooks for this course. All required readings on the course schedule have been uploaded to Blackboard. You can find them under the learning module for the corresponding week. If you have any issues accessing files, please let me know.

Assignments and grading

Assignments	Due date	Percent of grade
Class citizenship	Every class	20%
Weekly response papers	Every Monday	20%
Research design (proposal)	October 2	10%
Research design (draft)	November 20	10%
Research presentation	December 1	10%
Research design (final)	December 8	30%

Class citizenship (20%)

Class citizenship includes: (1) civility; (2) participation; and (3) the discussant role. First, I expect you to treat me and your colleagues with respect. You should express your ideas and views without reservation, and listen to others' perspectives, in a way that fosters dialogue (i.e., no insults, interruptions, etc.). Second, I expect you to do the assigned readings before class and arrive ready to discuss them. You cannot participate in discussions you are not present for, so consistent attendance matters, even though I do not grade attendance directly (see "Absences" section). Third, each student will serve as the designated discussant twice during the semester. As discussant, you will open the seminar with a brief synthesis of the week's readings (5–10 minutes), identify key arguments and tensions across the texts, and pose 2–3 discussion questions to guide our conversation. The discussant role is an opportunity to practice framing scholarly debate and facilitating discussion. I will circulate a sign-up sheet during the first week of class.

Weekly response papers (20%)

Each week, you will complete a short response paper (2 pages max, double-spaced) based on that week's readings. Each response paper offers two options: you may either apply the week's method to your own research using the assigned readings as your framework, or critically assess how the assigned readings collectively handle the method(s) under discussion. Choose whichever option is more productive for you each week. Response papers are due on Blackboard by Monday at 11:59 PM, the evening before our Tuesday seminar, and will be visible to your classmates so that everyone can see how their peers are engaging with the material. You may skip two response papers of your choosing during the semester, no questions asked. Response papers are graded on a four-point scale: check-plus (100), check (90), check-minus (80), or incomplete (0).

Research proposal (10%)

By Friday, October 2 at 11:59 PM, you will submit a proposal (2–3 pages, double-spaced) for the research project you will develop over the course of the semester. The proposal should identify research questions, situate them briefly in the relevant literature, specify the qualitative method(s) you plan to use, and offer a tentative argument. The proposal is an opportunity to commit to a direction and receive feedback early enough to adjust course. You are welcome to draw on a project related to your dissertation or other ongoing research, but the methodological component must be original work developed for this course. The proposal will be graded based on the clarity of your research question(s), the appropriateness of your proposed methodology, and the quality of your initial engagement with the literature.

Research design draft (10%)

By Friday, November 20 at 11:59 PM, you will submit a full draft of your research design. The draft should contain all the elements of the final research design — research question(s), literature review, theoretical argument(s), methodology, case selection, and data collection plan — even if some sections are more developed than others. This is a working draft, not a polished product, but it must be complete enough for your classmates to read and engage with during presentations. Drafts will be circulated to all seminar participants so that everyone arrives at the December 1 session prepared to offer feedback. The draft will be graded based on effort and completeness over polish.

Research presentation (10%)

On December 1, you will present your research design in a conference-style format. Each presentation will last approximately 30 minutes: a 10-minute presentation (with a hard cutoff), a 5-minute response from a designated discussant, and 10–15 minutes of open Q&A. You should present your research question, theoretical argument, methodological approach, and case selection strategy, focusing on the choices you made and why. You are welcome to preview any preliminary findings. Slides are expected. I will assign discussants in advance; as discussant, your job is to engage constructively with the substance and methodology of the project, not simply to summarize it. Presentations will be graded based on clarity, organization, and your ability to defend your methodological choices.

Final research design (30%)

Your final research design is due by Monday, December 8 at 11:59 PM. The paper should be a minimum of 5,000 words (approximately 18–20 pages double-spaced), plus a reference list. It should include a research question, literature review, theoretical argument, qualitative methodology, case selection strategy, data collection plan, and a discussion of the project's significance. This is a research design, not a completed study. You are not expected to carry out the research, though you can conduct a preliminary analysis if your project is further along. You are expected to have a specific and defensible plan for how you would do so. Incorporate feedback from the proposal, the draft, and your presentation. The final research design will be graded based on the clarity and significance of your research question(s), the quality of your theoretical argument(s), the rigor and appropriateness of your methodology, and your ability to incorporate feedback.

Final grades

Percentage Range	Grade
90.0% - 100%	A
87.0% - 89.9%	B+
80.0% - 86.9%	B
77.0% - 79.9%	C+
70.0% - 76.9%	C
67.0% - 69.9%	D+
60.0% - 66.9%	D
0% - 59.9%	F

Note: Final course grades are calculated based on a percentage rounded to the nearest tenth of a percent. For example, a final score of 89.95% is rounded to 90.0% and is an A. 86.94% is rounded to 86.9% and is a B. This grading policy is not subject to appeal.

Late submissions

Late assignments will be accepted, with a penalty of five points per day late, until graded assignments have been returned to the class. After that point, late work cannot be accepted. Late weekly response papers will not be accepted. If you are physically able, please contact me before the due date to request an extension, and complete the assignment as soon as possible thereafter. Any exceptions to this policy are subject to my discretion.

Grade appeals

After the return of a graded work, you must wait three (3) days before contacting me about an appeal. After the waiting period, you have eleven (11) days to appeal a grade. Appeals must be made in writing via email or Blackboard and provide specific evidence for the change. In total, the time frame for an appeal is fourteen (14) days from the day the graded assignment is returned.

Absences

I do not grade attendance mechanically, and I do not deduct points for individual absences. However, participation is a component of class citizenship (20% of your final grade), and you cannot participate in discussions you are not present for, so chronic absence will be reflected in your class citizenship grade. Therefore, I strongly encourage you to come to every class session unless you are sick or have an emergency. If you anticipate needing to arrive late or leave early for any reason over the course of the semester, please talk to me, and we can find a solution.

Illness

You should not come to class if you are sick. You will have the opportunity to make up any missed work without penalty. Missing class due to illness will not affect your class citizenship grade. If you have to miss class, please notify me as soon as possible. Your health should always come first.

Religious holidays

If you plan to miss class to observe a religious holiday, please notify me at least one week prior to the date of observance. If you miss an assignment, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

Disabilities

If you have a disability or other condition that may affect your attendance or academic performance, you may request relevant accommodations from the [Student Disability Resource Center](#). Please make sure the relevant documentation is on file, and come to me as soon as possible to discuss your specific accommodation needs.

Use of AI Tools

Generative AI tools such as ChatGPT and Claude, otherwise known as Large Language Models (LLMs), are increasingly part of the research landscape, and this course takes them seriously — both as potential tools for qualitative research and as objects of methodological scrutiny. We will engage with these questions directly during our Week 14 session. My goal is not to police your use of them,

but to ensure you exercise professional judgment if, when, and how AI supports (or undermines) your intellectual work as researchers in training.

The core principle of the present policy is straightforward: the ideas, arguments, and analytical choices in your work *must be your own*. [Research](#) on learning suggests that the struggle to articulate your ideas — even (or especially) when frustrating — is often where genuine understanding develops. When you offload that struggle to AI, you may get a finished product, but you risk missing the cognitive work that builds on your prior knowledge as well as your capacity for independent thought. If your chatbot of choice produces an argument, a framework, or a case selection strategy that you adopt uncritically, that is not your work. Humans have a tendency to [over-trust](#) the quality of LLM outputs, despite persistent issues with [hallucinations](#) and [sycophancy](#). For these reasons, you may use AI tools to refine your thinking — for example, to stress-test an argument, get feedback on the clarity of a draft, or check grammar — but not to generate the thinking itself.

Weekly response papers do not require AI documentation. Use your best judgment. For the research design assignments (proposal, draft, final), you are required to document any substantive use of AI in a brief statement (see appendix for an example). By “substantive” I mean any use beyond resolving grammar and spelling mistakes, such as using AI to get feedback on your argument or to explore alternative methodological approaches. In general, the appendix should describe what you used, how you used it, and what you did with the output. This documentation is not a “gotcha.” Rather, it is practice in the kind of research transparency we discuss throughout this course and the standard to which I hold myself when using these tools. If you are unsure whether a particular use is appropriate, ask me. These are genuinely new questions for the discipline, and uncertainty is normal.

Additional Information

Academic honesty

All written work must be your own. I will bring any incident of academic dishonesty to the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, which can result in severe [penalties](#) such as a failing grade in this course.

Examples of academic dishonesty include copying someone else’s work, copying and pasting text without attribution, fabricating citations, and submitting AI-generated text as your own. You can be held responsible and penalized even if you commit a violation accidentally. For more information on academic honesty, visit the [Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity](#).

Additional resources

The [Student Gateway](#) offers a list of various resources that are important for students as you engage with your course and the university, including [disability services](#), [mental health support](#), and [emergency services](#).

Syllabus changes

This syllabus is only a guide for the course and is subject to change with advanced notice. I will notify you of any changes as soon as possible by making an announcement via Blackboard.

Course schedule and readings

The one area of this course where I ask you to never use AI is when doing the assigned reading. The point of reading is to struggle — to push yourself beyond what you currently know. It is better to come to class with one well-developed idea, thought, or reflection after speed-reading an article than to come with a surface-level summary that adds next to nothing to the discussion.

Week 1: Introduction to Qualitative Research

Tuesday, August 18:

- Course syllabus
- Cyr, Jennifer, and Sara Wallace Goodman. 2024. “Introduction.” In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., edited by Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman. Oxford University Press New York. 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.003.0001>.
- Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. “A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research.” *Political Analysis* 14 (3): 227–49. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpj017>.
- Gerring, John. 2017. “Qualitative Methods.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20 (1): 15–36. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-092415-024158>.

Week 2: Research Design for Qualitative Inquiry

Tuesday, August 25:

- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. First edition. Princeton University Press. 1–33.
- Mahoney, James. 2010. “After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research.” *World Politics* 62 (1): 120–47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887109990220>.
- Lynch, Julia. 2024. “Choosing a Research Question.” In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., edited by Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman. Oxford University Press New York. 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.003.0002>.

For further reading:

- Collier, David, Jason Seawright, and Gerardo L. Munck. 2010. “The Quest For Standards: King, Keohane, And Verba’s Designing Social Inquiry.” In *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, 2nd ed., edited by Henry E. Brady and David Collier. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. 33–64. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9798216385530>.

Week 3: Interpretivism

Tuesday, September 1:

- Yanow, Dvora, and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. 2014. "Wherefore 'Interpretive'? An Introduction." xxi–xxx. In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, 2nd ed, edited by Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. Routledge.
- Bevir, Mark, and R. A. W. Rhodes. 2015. "Interpretive Political Science: Mapping the Field." In *Routledge Handbook of Interpretive Political Science*. Routledge. 3–27.
- Schwartz-Shea, Peregrine. 2014. "Judging Quality: Evaluative Criteria and Epistemic Communities." In *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn*, 2nd ed, edited by Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea. Routledge. 120–46.
- Wedeen, Lisa. 2002. "Conceptualizing Culture: Possibilities for Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 96 (4): 713–28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055402000400>.

For further reading:

- Bevir, Mark, and Asaf Kedar. 2008. "Concept Formation in Political Science: An Anti-Naturalist Critique of Qualitative Methodology." *Perspectives on Politics* 6 (3): 503–17. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592708081255>.
- Lin, Ann Chih. 1998. "Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches to Qualitative Methods." *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 162–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.1998.tb01931.x>.

Week 4: Concepts and Measurement

Tuesday, September 8:

- Adcock, Robert, and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research." *American Political Science Review* 95 (3): 529–46. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055401003100>.
- Collier, David, and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49 (3): 430–51. <https://doi.org/10.1353/wp.1997.0009>.
- Gerring, John. 2011. "Concepts." In *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139022224>. 104–40.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64 (4): 1033–53. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1958356>.

For further reading:

- Collier, David, Fernando Daniel Hidalgo, and Andra Olivia Maciuceanu. 2006. "Essentially Contested Concepts: Debates and Applications." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11 (3): 211–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600923782>.
- Collier, David, and James E. Mahon. 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *The American Political Science Review* 87 (4): 845–55.
- Elkins, Zachary. 2026. "Digital Semantics: Formal Methods of Concept Mapping." In *Working with Concepts: Foundational Essays by David Collier, with Research Notes on Innovation in the*

Field, 1st ed., edited by Zachary Elkins. Cambridge University Press. 411–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009551250>.

Week 5: Case Studies and Selection

Tuesday, September 15:

- Bennett, Andrew, and Colin Elman. 2006. “Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 9: 455–76.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.8.082103.104918>.
- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. “How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics.” *Political Analysis* 2: 131–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/2.1.131>.
- Auerbach, Adam Michael, and Tariq Thachil. 2020. “Cultivating Clients: Reputation, Responsiveness, and Ethnic Indifference in India’s Slums.” *American Journal of Political Science* 64 (3): 471–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12468>.
- Wallace Goodman, Sara. 2024. “Case Study and Selection.” In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., edited by Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman. Oxford University Press New York. 61–71. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.001.0001>.

For further reading:

- Seawright, Jason, and John Gerring. 2008. “Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options.” *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (2): 294–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912907313077>.
- Gerring, John. 2016. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316848593>.
- George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. BCSIA Studies in International Security. MIT Press.
- Collier, David, James Mahoney, and Jason Seawright. 2004. “Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias.” In *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*, 1st ed., edited by Henry E. Brady and David Collier. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. 85–102.

Week 6: Process Tracing

Tuesday, September 22:

- Bennett, Andrew, and Jeffrey T. Checkel. 2015. “Process Tracing: From Philosophical Roots to Best Practices.” In *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*, edited by Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel. Strategies for Social Inquiry. Cambridge University Press. 3–37.
- Fairfield, Tasha. 2013. “Going Where the Money Is: Strategies for Taxing Economic Elites in Unequal Democracies.” *World Development* 47 (July): 42–57.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.02.011>.

- Falleti, Tulia G., and Julia F. Lynch. 2009. "Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Analysis." *Comparative Political Studies* 42 (9): 1143–66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414009331724>.
- Liu, Amy H. 2024. "Process Tracing." In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., edited by Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman. Oxford University Press New York. 386–96. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.001.0001>.

For further reading:

- Waldner, David. 2014. "What Makes Process Tracing Good?: Causal Mechanisms, Causal Inference, and the Completeness Standard in Comparative Politics." In *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*, edited by Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey T. Checkel. Strategies for Social Inquiry. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge Core. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858472.008>.
- Collier, David. 2011. "Understanding Process Tracing." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 44 (4): 823–30. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511001429>.

Week 7: Comparative Historical Analysis

Tuesday, September 29:

- Skocpol, Theda, and Margaret Somers. 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22 (2): 174–97. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0010417500009282>.
- Paglayan, Agustina S. 2021. "The Non-Democratic Roots of Mass Education: Evidence from 200 Years." *American Political Science Review* 115 (1): 179–98. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055420000647>.
- Mahoney, James, and Kathleen Thelen. 2015. *Advances in Comparative-Historical Analysis*. Edited by James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen. Cambridge University Press. 3–36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316273104>.
- Singh, Prerna. 2024. "Comparative Historical Analysis." In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., edited by Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman. Oxford University Press New York. 397–409. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.003.0034>.

For further reading:

- Lieberman, Stanley. 1991. "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." *Social Forces* (Chapel Hill, N.C) 70 (2): 307–20. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/70.2.307>.

Week 8: Interviews

Tuesday, October 6:

- Mosley, Layna. 2013. “‘Just Talk to People’? Interviews in Contemporary Political Science.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*, edited by Layna Mosley. Cornell University Press. 1–28.
- Bleich, Erik, and Robert Pekkanen. 2013. “How to Report Interview Data.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*, edited by Layna Mosley. Cornell University Press. 84–105.
- Mikecz, Robert. 2012. “Interviewing Elites: Addressing Methodological Issues.” *Qualitative Inquiry* 18 (6): 482–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800412442818>.
- Leech, Beth L. 2002. “Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews.” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35 (4): 665–68. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001129>.
- Reinhardt, Gina Yannitell. 2009. “I Don’t Know Monica Lewinsky, and I’m Not in the CIA. Now How about That Interview?” *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 295–98. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096509090593>.
- Martin, Matthew. 2026. “From Citizen Input to Elite Legitimation: The Logic of Will-Confirmation in Constitution-Making.” *Comparative Politics* 59 (1): 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.5129/001041526X17731675177333>.

For further reading:

- Walsh, Katherine Cramer. 2012. “Putting Inequality in Its Place: Rural Consciousness and the Power of Perspective.” *American Political Science Review* 106 (3): 517–32. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055412000305>.
- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2018. *Interviewing in Social Science Research: A Relational Approach*. 1 Edition. Routledge Series on Interpretive Methods. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- MacLean, Lauren M. 2013. “The Power of the Interviewer.” In *Interview Research in Political Science*, edited by Layna Mosley. Cornell University Press.
- Li, Lantian. 2024. “Interviewing Elites.” In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., edited by Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman. Oxford University Press New York. 183–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.003.0016>.

Week 9: Fieldwork and Ethnography

Tuesday, October 13:

- Wedeen, Lisa. 2010. “Reflections on Ethnographic Work in Political Science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 13 (1): 255–72. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.052706.123951>.
- Simmons, Erica S., and Nicholas Rush Smith. 2019. “The Case for Comparative Ethnography.” *Comparative Politics* 51 (3): 341–59. <https://doi.org/10.5129/001041519X15647434969920>.
- Lebovits, Hannah. 2024. “Preparing for the Field: The Nuts and Bolts.” In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., edited by Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman. Oxford University Press New York. 111–21. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.001.0001>.
- Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2009. “Field Research.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, edited by Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.003.0005>.

- Stroup, David R., and J. Paul Goode. 2023. "On the Outside Looking In: Ethnography and Authoritarianism." *Perspectives on Politics* 21 (4): 1162–77. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592722004182>.

For further reading:

- Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles*. 1st ed. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511794551>.
- Schatz, Edward, ed. 2009. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Irgil, Ezgi, Anne-Kathrin Kreft, Myunghee Lee, Charmaine N. Willis, and Kelebogile Zvobgo. 2021. "Field Research: A Graduate Student's Guide." *International Studies Review* 23 (4): 1495–517. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viab023>.

Week 10: Archival Research

Tuesday, October 20:

- Trachtenberg, Marc. 2006. "Working With Documents." In *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method*. Princeton University Press. 140–68.
- Lustick, Ian S. 1996. "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 90 (3): 605–18.
- Kim, Diana S. 2022. "Taming Abundance: Doing Digital Archival Research (as Political Scientists)." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 55 (3): 530–38. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909652100192X>.
- Carpenter, Daniel, and Colin D. Moore. 2014. "When Canvassers Became Activists: Antislavery Petitioning and the Political Mobilization of American Women." *American Political Science Review* 108 (3): 479–98. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S000305541400029X>.

For further reading:

- Kim, Diana S. 2024. "Locating and Working with Historical Data." In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, 1st ed., edited by Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman. Oxford University Press New York. 255–264. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.003.0022>.
- Lee, Alexander. 2022. "The Library of Babel: How (and How Not) to Use Archival Sources in Political Science." *Journal of Historical Political Economy* 2 (3): 499–526. <https://doi.org/10.1561/115.00000038>.

Week 11: Text-as-Data

Tuesday, October 27:

- Wilkerson, John, and Andreu Casas. 2017. “Large-Scale Computerized Text Analysis in Political Science: Opportunities and Challenges.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20 (1): 529–44. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-052615-025542>.
- Nelson, Laura K. 2020. “Computational Grounded Theory: A Methodological Framework.” *Sociological Methods & Research* 49 (1): 3–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124117729703>.
- Benoit, Kenneth, Scott De Marchi, Conor Laver, Michael Laver, and Jinshuai Ma. 2026. “Using Large Language Models to Analyze Political Texts through Natural Language Understanding.” *American Journal of Political Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.70050>.
- Martin, Matthew. 2026. “Constitutional Cherry-Picking: Constructing ‘The People’ in Participatory Constitution-Making.” [Working paper](#).

For further reading:

- Grimmer, Justin, and Brandon M. Stewart. 2013. “Text as Data: The Promise and Pitfalls of Automatic Content Analysis Methods for Political Texts.” *Political Analysis* 21 (3): 267–97. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mps028>.
- Grimmer, Justin, Margaret E. Roberts, and Brandon M. Stewart. 2022. *Text as Data: A New Framework for Machine Learning and the Social Sciences*. Princeton University Press.
- Lucas, Christopher, Richard A. Nielsen, Margaret E. Roberts, Brandon M. Stewart, Alex Storer, and Dustin Tingley. 2015. “Computer-Assisted Text Analysis for Comparative Politics.” *Political Analysis* 23 (2): 254–77. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpu019>.
- Pan, Jennifer, and Kaiping Chen. 2018. “Concealing Corruption: How Chinese Officials Distort Upward Reporting of Online Grievances.” *American Political Science Review* 112 (3): 602–20. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055418000205>.

Week 12: Election Day

Tuesday, November 3:

- No class on Election Day.

Week 13: Research Ethics and Transparency

Tuesday, November 10:

- Jacobs, Alan M., Tim Büthe, Ana Arjona, et al. 2021. “The Qualitative Transparency Deliberations: Insights and Implications.” *Perspectives on Politics* 19 (1): 171–208. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001164>.
- Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2006. “The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones.” *Qualitative Sociology* 29 (3): 373–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-006-9027-8>.
- Human Subjects Research ad hoc Committee. 2020. [*Principles and Guidance for Human Subjects Research*](#). American Political Science Association.
- Elman, Colin, Diana Kapiszewski, and Arthur Lupia. 2018. “Transparent Social Inquiry: Implications for Political Science.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 21 (1): 29–47. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-091515-025429>.

- Fujii, Lee Ann. 2012. "Research Ethics 101: Dilemmas and Responsibilities." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 45 (4): 717–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096512000819>.

For further reading:

- Glasius, Marlies, Meta De Lange, Jos Bartman, et al. 2018. *Research, Ethics and Risk in the Authoritarian Field*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-68966-1>.
- Hesse, Arielle, Leland Glenna, Clare Hinrichs, Robert Chiles, and Carolyn Sachs. 2019. "Qualitative Research Ethics in the Big Data Era." *American Behavioral Scientist* 63 (5): 560–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218805806>.
- ["Symposium: Varieties of Transparency in Qualitative Research."](#) 2021. *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 19 (1).

Week 14: Generative Artificial Intelligence

Tuesday, November 17:

- Jowsey, Tanisha, Virginia Braun, Victoria Clarke, Deborah Lupton, and Michelle Fine. 2025. "We Reject the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Reflexive Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Inquiry*: 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004251401851>.
- De Paoli, Stefano. 2026. "Why We Should Reject to Reject the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Qualitative Analysis: A Response to Jowsey, Braun, Clarke, Lupton, and Fine (2025)." *Qualitative Inquiry*, February 18, 10778004261425137. 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004261425137>.
- Friese, Susanne, Kien Nguyen-Trung, Steve Powell, and David L. Morgan. 2026. "Beyond Binary Positions: Making Space for Critical and Reflexive GenAI Integration in Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Inquiry*: 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778004261429393>.
- Morgan, David L. 2023. "Exploring the Use of Artificial Intelligence for Qualitative Data Analysis: The Case of ChatGPT." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 22: 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231211248>.
- Halterman, Andrew, and Katherine A. Keith. 2026. "Codebook LLMs: Evaluating LLMs as Measurement Tools for Political Science Concepts." *Political Analysis* 34 (2): 188–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2025.10017>.
- Argyle, Lisa P., Ethan C. Busby, Nancy Fulda, Joshua R. Gubler, Christopher Rytting, and David Wingate. 2023. "Out of One, Many: Using Language Models to Simulate Human Samples." *Political Analysis* 31 (3): 337–51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2023.2>.
- Bisbee, James, Joshua D. Clinton, Cassy Dorff, Brenton Kenkel, and Jennifer M. Larson. 2024. "Synthetic Replacements for Human Survey Data? The Perils of Large Language Models." *Political Analysis* 32 (4): 401–16. <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2024.5>.

For further reading:

- Cantwell-Chavez, Devon, and Jourdan Davis. 2025. "Navigating Generative AI Tools in the Classroom Through a Lens of Equity and Accessibility." *Journal of Political Science Education* 21 (2): 277–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15512169.2024.2426153>.
- Nicmanis, Mitchell, and Harry Spurrier. 2025. "Getting Started with Artificial Intelligence Assisted Qualitative Analysis: An Introductory Guide to Qualitative Research Approaches with Exploratory Examples from Reflexive Content Analysis." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 24: 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251354863>.
- Marshall, David T., and David B. Naff. 2024. "The Ethics of Using Artificial Intelligence in Qualitative Research." *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics* 19 (3): 92–102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15562646241262659>.
- Chatzichristos, Georgios. 2025. "Qualitative Research in the Era of AI: A Return to Positivism or a New Paradigm?" *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 24: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069251337583>.
- Abramson, Corey M., Tara Prendergast, Zhuofan Li, and Daniel Dohan. 2026. "Qualitative Research in an Era of Artificial Intelligence: A Pragmatic Approach to Data Analysis, Workflow, and Computation." *Annual Review of Sociology*, ahead of print, May 11. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-011824-104836>.

Week 15: Thanksgiving

Sunday, November 22 – Sunday, November 29:

- No class

Week 16: Research Presentations

Tuesday, December 1:

- No reading

Appendix

Below is a real example of an AI use statement that I wrote for my working paper [“Constitutional Cherry-Picking: Constructing ‘The People’ in Participatory Constitution-Making”](#) (week 11). The structure and contents of such statements will vary depending on the submission venue.

AI Use Statement

This article uses a Large Language Model as a text classifier. Anthropic’s Claude Opus 4.6 (model identifier `claude-opus-4-6`, version released February 2026; accessed via the Anthropic API at `api.anthropic.com`) was used between April 14 and April 16, 2026 to classify speaker turns from the Chilean and Cuban plenary transcripts at temperature 0; 17 classifications (roughly 2.3% of 729 invocations) were hand-corrected by the author and folded into the analytic dataset, with each correction documented in Appendix A.4. The model’s role, the validation protocol, and all materials needed to reproduce the classifications — including the full prompt, codebook, inter-coder reliability statistics, and error analysis — are documented in Section 4.3 and Appendix A.1–A.4, and released with the replication materials. Known limitations of LLM-based classification, including sensitivity to prompt phrasing and potential biases inherited from training data, are addressed by the validation protocol described in Appendix A.

Claude Code (same model, accessed via the Claude Code CLI between April 21 and May 6, 2026) was used to generate portions of the analysis scripts — including the classification pipeline, tabulation and figure code, and LaTeX table generation — all of which were reviewed, tested, and verified by the author against the underlying data; the full code is included in the replication materials. Claude (Opus 4.6, accessed via `claude.ai` during the same period) was additionally used for minor prose editing. Beyond these uses, AI was not *used* to generate analytic interpretation, theoretical claims, or argumentative content; all ideas, arguments, analytic decisions, and final wording are the author’s own, for which the author assumes full responsibility.