

# Research Design and Methods in International Relations

---

## Course Syllabus: Michaelmas 2016

### Time and Location:

Mondays, 11:00-1:00pm (Group A); 2:00-4:00pm (Group B)  
Eleanor Rathbone Room,  
Somerville College.

### Overview

This course is the first part of a year-long introduction to research design and methods culminating in the writing of the students' research design proposals (RDP). The course provides an overview of the mainstream approaches to research in international relations and familiarises students with debates and controversies in the field. It provides students with the ability and skills to undertake research projects, including research design, theory building, derivation of hypotheses, choosing appropriate methods to test hypotheses, and different ways of gathering empirical material.

## Topics and Core Questions

### Week 1: Questions in International Relations

*What questions do we pose in IR? Do they imply different epistemologies? Do we explain or understand IR?*

### Week 2: Theories, Mechanisms, and Explanations in IR

*How do we answer our questions? How do we make sense of IR puzzles? How do we build our theories?*

### Week 3: Concepts and Measurements

*Why and how do we elaborate concepts in IR? Do we need to measure them? And how?*

### Week 4: Causality, Causal Inference, Process Tracing

*Do we look for causality? What is a counterfactual? What do we mean for process-tracing?*

### Week 5: Bias in Case and Variable Selection

*How do we select cases? What is omitted variable bias? Why endogeneity is a problem?*

### Week 6: Single and Comparative Case Studies

*How do we study case studies? How comparing them?*

### Week 7: Quantitative Methods Opportunities, Challenges and Limits

*Why using statistics in IR? What are conditional effects? Do past and nearby events matter?*

### Week 8: Mixed Methods

*Can we use quantitative and qualitative methods? How? Are there limitations?*

## Course Requirements and Assessment

- **Assessment:** This class will be examined as part of a three hour exam in Trinity Term on research design, methods, and statistics. This test will be graded on the 50 pass scale and you must pass this exam to proceed to the second year to the MPhil. You will be notified as to whether you have to re-sit the test by the MPhil Coordinator.
- **Attendance & participation:** It is expected that all students will attend all seminar sessions and actively contribute to class discussions. Attendance/participation and non-attendance/non-participation will be noted. All required readings must be done prior to the relevant class. The seminar is meant to be an interactive class with room for discussion of the assigned readings. A good grasp of the weekly reading and active participation in class will be vital to the success of the seminar.
- **One group presentations:** The second hour of each session is devoted to student presentations.
  - Format
    - The first half of the presentation should focus on critiquing or applying the approach to the example article or your own research.
    - The second half of the presentation will involve a Q&A session and a general class discussion on the presentation and the topic in general.
  - Students will do 1 presentation in groups of 2 or 3.
  - Presentation topics will be assigned during induction week.
  - Presentations should be accompanied by PowerPoint slides.
    - **These slides should be send to [ir.rdm@politics.ox.ac.uk](mailto:ir.rdm@politics.ox.ac.uk) by Friday at 3:00pm at the latest.**
    - If necessary will provide comments by 5pm Saturday as to edits that should be made to the final slides.
- **General remarks on presentations**
  - *Division of labor:* All group members should participate equally in the preparation of the presentations and other related tasks. Those who are not the principle presenters should be responsible for answering questions and guiding class discussion.
  - *Coordination:* Group members should coordinate and communicate the content of the presentation. You are expected to prepare a single and coherent presentation.
  - *Practice:* Meet in person with your group and practice your presentation in advance. Do not read from your notes! Groups which practice their presentation beforehand do much better in classroom.
  - *Simplicity:* Your presentation should be in simple and non-technical language. Do not present things you do not understand yourself. If you do not get it right, others will not get it! Discuss it in your group, and if there are still concerns contact [ir.rdm@politics.ox.ac.uk](mailto:ir.rdm@politics.ox.ac.uk) rather than the instructors directly.

- **Assignments:** To provide feedback on your understanding of the basic concepts you are expected to complete the following assignments. These assignments should be completed individually.
  - You will complete three assignments and a take home exam.
  - All assignments should be emailed to [ir.rdm@politics.ox.ac.uk](mailto:ir.rdm@politics.ox.ac.uk) by 3pm on the day they are due.
  - **Assignments submitted after the deadline will not be read and feedback will not be given**
  
- **Assignment 1: due October 21 (Friday 2nd week)**
  - Identify the primary research question, theory/explanation, and epistemological approach for one of the following articles.
    - Hafner-Burton, Emilie M, Brad L LeVeck, and David G Victor. 2016. “How Activists Perceive the Utility of International Law.” *The Journal of Politics* 78(1): 167–80.
    - Tanisha M. Fazal, “Why States No Longer Declare War,” 2012. *Security Studies* 21/4: 557-593.
    - Risse, Thomas. 2000. “Let's Argue!': Communicative Action in World Politics.” *International Organization*. 54(1): 1–39.
  - Word limit: 500 words.
  
- **Assignment 2: due November 4 (Friday 4th week)**
  - For **ONE** of the following articles (1) identify the main concept measured in this study, (2) how the concept is operationalized, and (3) critique how the concept is operationalized, (4) propose an alternative measurement of this concept.
    - Peters, Margaret E. 2014. “Open Trade, Closed Borders Immigration in the Era of Globalization.” *World Politics* 67(01): 114–54.
    - Caprioli, Mary. 2002. “Gender Equality and State Aggression: the Impact of Domestic Gender Equality on State First Use of Force.” *International Interactions*: 1–21.
    - Sala, Brian R, John T Scott, and James F Spriggs. 2007. “The Cold War on Ice: Constructivism and the Politics of Olympic Figure Skating Judging.” *Perspectives on Politics* 5(01): 17–29.
  - Word limit: 500 words.
  
- **Assignment 3: due November 25 (Friday 7th week)**
  - For one of the following articles (1) identify, (2) discuss and critique the case selection mechanism, (3) suggest and alternative selection process for this study.
    - Simmons, Beth. 2000. “International Law and State Behavior: Commitment and Compliance in International Monetary Affairs.” *American Journal of Political Science*. 94(4): 819–35.
    - Kaufman, Stuart. 2006. “Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice: Testing Theories of Extreme Ethnic Violence” *International Security* 30/4.
    - Hyde, Susan D. 2007. “The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence From a Natural Experiment.” *World Politics* 60(1): 37.
  - Word limit: 500 words.

- **Take Home Exam: due December 9 (Friday 9th week)**
  - This question will be similar to the research design question you'll be asked on the final exam.
  - **Example take home exam question:** A researcher seeks to determine the link between democracy and foreign direct investment by using a mixed methods research design. He first runs a regression analysis on 80 developing countries and finds that the more democratic a country is the more aid they receive. He then selects a typical case (a moderately democratic country with a moderate level of foreign direct investment) to evaluate the mechanisms that he proposed would create the link between the two.
    - a. Are there any problems with this research design, if so what are they?
      - a. If there are problems explain why such issues could affect inferences made from the study.
      - b. If there are not problems explain why the research design does not affect inferences made from the study.
    - b. How would you propose to conduct this study instead?
    - c. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of your own research design.
  - You will be given the question for your take home exam on December 2nd.

**General remarks:** Any further requirements and details will be discussed in class. Any requests, issues and communication related to the RDM classes should be send to [ir.rdm@politics.ox.ac.uk](mailto:ir.rdm@politics.ox.ac.uk). In case you come across conflicting information regarding the *Research Design and Methods* class, requirements, organization, test etc., please note that this syllabus takes precedence over the Handbook, anything posted on WebLearn or any other source.

**Background reading:** The following list is intended as a suggestion of some broader background readings across a wide variety of possible approaches to the study of politics, history and social science. Students are encouraged to focus on those readings that are most likely to be useful for their particular research interests.

Booth, Wayne C., Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. 2008. *The Craft of Research*. (3rd rev. ed.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Henry E. Brad, and David Collier. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brady, Henry E. and David Collier. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. (2nd ed.) Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield.

Collier, David and John Gerring. 2009. *Concepts and Methods in Social Science. The Tradition of Giovanni Sartori*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Elman, Colin and Miriam Elman (eds.). 2003. *Progress in International Relations Theory: Metrics and Methods of Scientific Change*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Elster, Jon. 2007. *Explaining Social Behavior. More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

George, Alexander L. and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerring, John. 2012. *Social Science Methodology. A Unified Framework*. (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goertz, Gary. 2006. *Social Science Concepts: A Users Guide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kennedy, Peter. 2008. *A Guide to Econometrics*. (6th ed.) New York: Wiley/Blackwell.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Klotz, Audie and Deepa Prakash (eds.). 2008. *Qualitative Methods in International Relations. A Pluralist Guide*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Leopold, David and Marc Stears (eds.). 2008. *Political Theory. Methods and Approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Little, Daniel. 1991. *Varieties of Social Explanation*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press. Long, J. Scott. 1997. *Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables*. Thousand

- Oaks, CA: Sage. Mahoney, James, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. 2003. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, Stephen L. and Christopher Winship. 2007. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ragin, Charles C. 2008. *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reus T Smit, Christian, and Duncan Snidal. 2008. *Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Part IV.
- Shively, W. Phillips. 2012. *The Craft of Political Research*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Sprinz, Detlef F. and Yael Wolinsky-Trahansky (eds.). 2004. *Models, Numbers & Cases. Methods for Studying International Relations*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Trachtenberg, Marc. 2006. *The Craft of International History. A Guide to Method*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Turabian, Kate L. 2007. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Evera, Stephen. 1997. *Guide to Methodology for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

## Week 1: Questions in International Relations

*What questions do we pose in IR? Do they imply different epistemologies? Do we explain or understand IR?*

- Hollis, Martin and Steve Smith. 1990. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Clarendon Press. Chapters 1-4.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapter 1.
- Friedrichs, Jörg, and Friedrich Kratochwil. 2009. On Acting and Knowing: How Pragmatism Can Advance International Relations Research and Methodology. *International Organization* 63(4): 701-731.
- Elman, Colin and Miriam Elman. 2001. Bridges and Boundaries: Historians, Political Scientists, and the Study of International Relations. Chapter 1.

**Group exercise: Please bring three IR research questions that are of interest to you?**

### Further readings

- Lamont, Christopher. 2015. Research Methods in International Relations. Chapters 1-2
- Zinnes, Dina A. 1980. Three Puzzles in Search of a Researcher. *International Studies Quarterly* 24 (3): 315-342.
- Jackson, Patrick T. 2010. *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Bennett, Andrew. 2003. A Lakatosian Reading of Lakatos: What Can We Salvage from the Hard Core? In Elman, Colin and Miriam Elman (eds.), *Progress in International Relations Theory: Metrics and Methods of Scientific Change*. Cambridge: MIT Press, Chapter 14.

## Week 2: Theories, Mechanisms, and Explanations in IR

*How do answer our questions? How do we make sense of IR puzzles? How do we build our theories?*

- Hedström, Peter. 2010. Studying Mechanisms: Strengthening Casual Inference in Quantitative Research. In Box-Steffensmeier, Janet M., Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.). Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapter 13.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chapter 2.
- Mearsheimer, John J, and Stephen M Walt. 2013. “Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing Is Bad for International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 427–57.
- Monteiro, Nuno P. and Keven G. Ruby. 2009. IR and the false promise of philosophical foundations. *International Theory* 1(1): 15-48.

### Examples

- Agnew, John (1994). The territorial trap: the geographical assumptions of international relations theory. *Review of international political economy*, 1(1), 53-80.
- Nielsen, Richard A, and Beth A Simmons. 2015. “Rewards for Ratification: Payoffs for Participating in the International Human Rights Regime?.” *International Studies Quarterly*. 59(1): 197–208.

### Further readings

- Cox, Rober .W., 1981. Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10(2), p.126.
- Fearon, J. and Wendt, A., 2002. Rationalism v. constructivism: a skeptical view. *Handbook of international relations*, 1, pp.52-72.
- Wendt, A.E., 1987. The agent-structure problem in international relations theory. *International organization*, 41(03), pp.335-370.
- Capoccia, G. and Kelemen, R.D., 2007. The study of critical junctures: Theory, narrative, and counterfactuals in historical institutionalism. *World politics*, 59(03), pp.341-369.
- Sil, R. and Katzenstein, P.J., 2010. Analytic eclecticism in the study of world politics: Reconfiguring problems and mechanisms across research traditions. *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(02), pp.411-431.



### Week 3: Concepts and Measurements

*Why and how do elaborate concepts in IR? Do we need to measure them? And how?*

- Brady, Henry E., and David Collier. 2004. Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards. (2nd ed.) Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield, Chapter 3.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. *American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033-1053.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. *Social Science Concepts: A Users Guide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapter 2.
- Adcock, Robert and David Collier. 2001. Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research. *American Political Science Review* 95(3): 529-546.
- Gerring, John. 1999. What Makes a Concept Good? *Polity* 31(3): 357-393.

#### Examples

- Epstein, David L., Robert Bates, Jack Goldstone, Ida Kristensen and Sharyn O'Halloran. 2006. Democratic Transitions. *American Journal of Political Science* 50(3): 551-569.
- Pevehouse, Jon, Timothy Nordstrom and Kevin Warnke. 2004. The Correlates of War 2 International Governmental Organizations Data Version 2.0. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 21(2): 101-119.
- Vabulas, Felicity and Duncan Snidal. 2013. Organization without Delegation: Informal Intergovernmental Organizations (IIGOs) and the Spectrum of Intergovernmental Arrangements. *Review of International Organizations* 8(2): 193-220.

#### Further readings

- Collier, David and James Mahon. 1993. Conceptual Stretching Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis. *American Political Science Review* 87(4): 845-855.
- Collier, David, Jody LaPorte and Jason Seawright. 2012. Putting Typologies to Work: Levels of Measurement, Concept-Formation, and Analytic Rigor. *Political Research Quarterly* 64(2): 217-232.
- Elman, Colin. 2005. Explanatory Typologies in Qualitative Studies of International Politics. *International Organization* 59(2): 293-326.

## Week 4: Causality, Causal Inference, Process Tracing

*Do we look for causality? What is a counterfactual? What do we mean for process-tracing?*

- Brady, Henry. 2010. Causation and Explanation in Social Science. In Box- Steffensmeier, Janet M., Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.). *Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapter 10.
- Bennett, Andrew and Jeffrey Checkel. 2012. Process Tracing: From Philosophical Roots to Best Practices. Unpublished Manuscript, 27-40.
- Fearon, James D. 1991. Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science. *World Politics* 43(2):169-195.
- Hyde, Susan D. 2007. "The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence From a Natural Experiment." *World Politics* 60(1): 37.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapter 3.
- Brady, Henry E., and David Collier. 2004. Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards. (2nd ed.) Lanham, MD: Roman and Littlefield, Chapter 3.

### Example

- Fortna, Virginia. 2004. Interstate Peacekeeping: Causal Mechanisms and Empirical Effects. *World Politics* 56(4): 485-590, 503-516.
- Gilligan, M.J. and Sergenti, E.J., 2008. Do UN interventions cause peace? Using matching to improve causal inference. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 3(2), pp.89-122.
- Autesserre, S., 2009. Hobbes and the Congo: frames, local violence, and international intervention. *International Organization*, 63(02), pp.249-280.

### Further Readings

- Collier, David. 2011. Understanding Process Tracing. *Political Science and Politics* 44(4): 823-830.
- Elster, Jon. 2007. *Explaining Social Behavior. More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Chapters 1 & 2.
- Tilly, Charles. 2001. Mechanisms in Political Processes. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 21-41.

## Week 5: Bias in Case and Variable Selection

*How do we select cases? What do we mean for omitted variable bias? And why endogeneity is a problem?*

- Geddes, Barbara. 1990. How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics. *Political Analysis* 2(1): 131-150.
- Ashworth, Scott, Adam Meirowitz, Kristopher W Ramsay, and Joshua D Clinton. 2008. "Design, Inference, and the Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *The American Political Science Review*.
- 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.
- Clarke, Kevin. 2005. "The Phantom Menace: Omitted Variable Bias in Econometric Research." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22(4): 341-52.

### Example

- Rosato, S., 2003. The flawed logic of democratic peace theory. *American Political Science Review*, 97(04), pp.585-602.
- Slantchev, B.L., Alexandrova, A. and Gartzke, E., 2005. Probabilistic causality, selection bias, and the logic of the democratic peace. *American Political Science Review*, 99(03), pp.459-462.
- Gartzke, Eric. 2007. "The Capitalist Peace." *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 166-91.
- Dafoe, A., 2011. Statistical critiques of the democratic peace: Caveat emptor. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(2), pp.247-262.
- Choi, S.W., 2011. Re-Evaluating Capitalist and Democratic Peace Models. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(3), pp.759-769.

### Further Readings

- Collier, D. and Mahoney, J., 1996. Insights and pitfalls: Selection bias in qualitative research. *World Politics*, 49(01), pp.56-91.
- Oneal, J.R. and Russett, B., 2005. Rule of three, let it be? When more really is better. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 22(4), pp.293-310.
- Stein, von, Jana. 2005. "Do Treaties Constrain or Screen? Selection Bias and Treaty Compliance." *American Political Science Review*. 99(04): 611-22.

## **Week 6: Single and Comparative Case Studies**

- Gerring, John. 2004. What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good For? *American Political Science Review* 98(2): 341-354.
- Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2007. Case Study Methods in International Relations Subfield. *Comparative Political Studies* 40(2): 170-195.
- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapters 4-6.
- Gerring, John. 2007. Is There a (Viable) Crucial-Case Method? *Comparative Political Studies* 40(3): 231-253.
- Mahoney, J. and Rueschemeyer, D., 2003. *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1

### Examples

- Achen, Christopher H. and Duncan Snidal. 1989. Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies. *World Politics* 41(2): 143-169.
- Tannenwald, Nina. 1999. The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use. *International Organization* 53 (3): 433-468.

### Further Readings

- Tarrow, S., 2010. The strategy of paired comparison: Toward a theory of practice. *Comparative political studies*, 43(2), pp.230-259.
- Levy, J.S., 2008. Case studies: Types, designs, and logics of inference. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 25(1), pp.1-18.
- Lieberman, Stanley. 1991. Small N's and Big Conclusion: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases. *Social Forces* 70 (2): 307-320.

## Week 7: Quantitative Methods Opportunities, Challenges and Limits

- Braumoeller, Bear F. and Anne E. Sartori. 2004. The Promise and Perils of Statistics in International Relations. In Sprinz, Detlef F. and Yael Wolinsky-Nahmias (eds.), *Models, Numbers & Cases. Methods for Studying International Relations*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chapter 7.
- Franzese, R.J., 2003. Quantitative Empirical Methods and the Context-Conditionality of Classic and Modern Comparative Politics. *CP: Newsletter of the Comparative Politics Organized Section of the American Political Science Association*, 14(1), pp.20-24.
- Braumoeller, Bear F. 2004. Hypothesis Testing and Multiplicative Interaction Terms. *International Organization* 58(4): 807-820.
- Emilie, M. and Hafner-Burton, M.K., 2009. Network analysis for international relations. *International Organization*, 63(3), pp.559-92.
- Beck, N., Gleditsch, K.S. and Beardsley, K., 2006. Space is more than geography: Using spatial econometrics in the study of political economy. *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(1), pp.27-44.

### Example:

- O'Loughlin, J., Ward, M.D., Lofdahl, C.L., Cohen, J.S., Brown, D.S., Reilly, D., Gleditsch, K.S. and Shin, M., 1998. The diffusion of democracy, 1946–1994. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 88(4), pp.545-574.
- Gleditsch, K.S. and Ward, M.D., 2006. Diffusion and the international context of democratization. *International organization*, 60(04), pp.911-933.

### Further Readings

- De Boef, S. and Keele, L., 2008. Taking time seriously. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(1) pp.184-200.
- Beck, N., Katz, J.N. and Tucker, R., 1998. Taking time seriously: Time-series-cross-section analysis with a binary dependent variable. *American Journal of Political Science*, 42(4), pp. 1260-1288.
- Beck, N. and Katz, J.N., 1995. What to do (and not to do) with time-series cross-section data. *American political science review*, 89(03), pp.634-647.

## Week 8: Mixed Methods

*Can we use quantitative and qualitative methods? How? Are there limitations?*

- Collier, David and Colin Elman. 2008. Qualitative and Multimethod Research: Organizations, Publications, and Reflection on Integration. In Janet Box-Steffensmeier, Henry Brady and David Collier (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Chapter 34.
- Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research. *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 435-452.
- Rohlfing, I., 2008. What You See and What You Get Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Research. *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(11), pp.1492-1514.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1995. Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide in Political Science. *American Political Science Review* 89(2):471-474.

### Example

- Milewicz, Karolina and Manfred Elsig. 2014. The hidden world of multilateralism? Treaty commitments of newly democratized states in Europe. *International Studies Quarterly* 58(2): 322–335
- Kelly, Judith. 2007. Who Keeps International Commitments and Why? The International Criminal Court and Bilateral Nonsurrender Agreements. *American Political Science Review* 101(3): 573-589.

### Further Readings

- Mahoney, J. and Goertz, G., 2006. A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research. *Political Analysis*, 14(3), pp.227-249.
- Mahoney, James. 2010. After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research. *World Politics* 62(1): 120-147.