

**Kvalitativ samhällsvetenskaplig metod**  
**Qualitative Methods in the Social Sciences**  
**Vanessa Barker**  
**Stockholm University**

**HT 2017**  
**Course Plan**

**1. Decision**

The course plan has been approved by the Board of the Department of Sociology, Stockholm University as of May 30, 2013.

**2. General Information**

The course consists of 7.5 ECTS credits and is at the Advanced Level.

**3. Course Code**

SO7040

**4. Education requirements**

Bachelor degree or 3 semesters of Sociology.

**5. Course Description**

This course aims to introduce advanced students to a range of qualitative methods and techniques for data processing and data analysis. We examine the underlying logic of different qualitative methods and how qualitative researchers approach questions of causality, inference, conceptualization, measurement and social meaning in social science research. Students will become familiar with a range of techniques for data collection and specific methods for interpreting and analyzing data. Students will conduct independent field research and apply a specific qualitative method and technique to data analysis on a selected topic.

**6. Intended Learning Outcomes**

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to:

- Identify and describe a range of qualitative methods for data processing
- Demonstrate knowledge of the underlying logic of different qualitative methods
- Evaluate different qualitative methods and techniques for data collection
- Evaluate different qualitative methods and techniques for data analysis
- Apply a specific type of qualitative method to data analysis

**7. Teaching & Learning Activities**

The course is provided at half time basis for 10 weeks. Teaching is conducted through lectures, seminars, and student-centered activities. Students are expected to do the following:

- Complete assigned reading before each class meeting;
- Participate actively in class discussion;
- Conduct independent Field Research;
- Complete written assignments

**8. Assessment**

Assessment is based on how well students accomplish the Intended Learning Outcomes (outlined above) as demonstrated in written work and participation. Each assignment is weighted and scaled as follows:

AQM Paper	80
Presentation	10
Participation	10

Course Work is evaluated according to the following standard reference criteria:

A= This grade is earned when the student demonstrates his/her ability to apply a specific AQM to a particular research problem in a sophisticated, reflexive, coherent, consistent, and logical way. The student can analyze both advantages and limitations of the particular method selected. The student can accurately compare, contrast, and critically evaluate varying qualitative approaches to research design and carry out an independent research project using AQM. The student is engaged in class discussion and actively participates, demonstrating a high level of understanding of core principles of AQM.

B= This grade is earned when the student demonstrates his/her ability to apply a specific AQM to a particular research problem in a coherent and consistent way but may lack a reflexive or sophisticated understanding of the underlying principles. The student can analyze both advantages and limitations of the particular method selected but may place more emphasis on one or the other. The student can accurately compare, contrast, and critically evaluate varying qualitative approaches to research design and carry out an independent research project using AQM. The student is engaged in class discussion and participates, demonstrating a solid level of understanding of core principles of AQM.

C= This grade is earned when the student demonstrates his/her ability to apply a specific AQM to a particular research problem in a coherent way but lacks a reflexive or sophisticated understanding of the underlying principles. At a basic level, the student can explain the advantages and limitations of the particular method selected. The student can accurately compare and contrast varying qualitative approaches to research design but may show limits with critical evaluation. The student can carry out an independent research project using AQM but may need some guidance. The student is engaged in class discussion and participates, demonstrating a basic level of understanding of core principles of AQM.

D= This grade is earned when the student has some difficulty demonstrating his/her ability to apply a specific AQM to a particular research problem in a coherent way. The student can explain some of the advantages and limitations of the particular method selected but may also include inaccuracies and weak understanding. The student cannot accurately compare and contrast varying qualitative approaches to research design and cannot sufficiently critically evaluate them. The student has difficulty carrying out an independent research project using AQM without substantial guidance. The student is disengaged from class discussion and demonstrates a lower level of understanding of core principles of AQM.

E= This grade is earned when the student some difficulty demonstrating his/her ability to apply a specific AQM to a particular research problem in a coherent way. The student can explain some of the advantages and limitations of the particular method selected but may also include inaccuracies and weak understanding. The student cannot accurately compare and contrast

varying qualitative approaches to research design and cannot sufficiently critically evaluate them. The student has difficulty carrying out an independent research project using AQM without substantial guidance. The student is disengaged from class discussion and demonstrates a very low level of understanding of core principles of AQM.

Fx= This grade is earned when the student cannot complete the work assigned for the course. The student cannot apply a specific AQM to a particular research problem in a coherent way. The student cannot explain the advantages and limitations of the particular method selected without inaccuracies. The student cannot accurately compare and contrast varying qualitative approaches to research design and cannot sufficiently critically evaluate them. The student cannot carry out an independent research project using AQM without substantial guidance. The student is disengaged from class discussion and demonstrates a very low level of understanding of core principles of AQM.

F= This grade is earned when the student cannot complete the work assigned for the course. The student cannot apply a specific AQM to a particular research problem in a coherent way. The student cannot explain the advantages and limitations of the particular method selected without inaccuracies. The student cannot accurately compare and contrast varying qualitative approaches to research design and cannot sufficiently critically evaluate them. The student cannot carry out an independent research project using AQM without substantial guidance. The student has not attended at least half of the class meetings.

Note: E grade is needed to pass the course. Fx indicates that the student is offered the opportunity to upgrade his/her course work as long as the course is provided in order to achieve at least E grade. A student with E grade is not entitled to redo course work to raise his/her grade. Students who receive Fx or F on course work twice from the same instructor can request to be evaluated by another instructor. Such a request should be sent to the Director of Studies. Students can request to have course work according to this syllabus up to three semesters after it ceases to be valid. Such a request should be sent to the Director of Studies.

## 9. Schedule of class meetings and location

Day	Date	Time	Topic	Location
Monday	28 Aug	10-12	Principles of Qualitative Method	B307
Tuesday	29 Aug	9-11	Research Design & Ethics	F320
Thursday	31 Aug	8-10	Case Study: Heat Wave	D307
Monday	4 Sept	11-13	Case Study	D307
Tuesday	5 Sept	8-10	Ethnography	D320
Monday	11 Sept	11-13	Field Research: Mikaela Sundberg	E420
Thursday	14 Sept	8-10	Interviewing: Mikaela Sundberg	D215
Monday	18 Sept	13-15	Visual Methods	FB610
Wednesday	20 Sept	8-10	Comparative Historical Methods: Daniel Ritter	D307
Monday	25 Sept	10-12	Data Analysis	B487
Wednesday	27 Sept	13-15	Data Analysis	F3154
Tuesday	17 Oct		Drafts Due for workshop	Mondo
Thursday	19 Oct	13-15	Peer Workshop	FB720
Thursday	26 Oct	9-12	Presentations & Final Papers Due	F289

## 10. Required Literature:

Creswell, J (2013) *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*, SAGE.  
 Klinenberg, E (2002) *Heat Wave: A Social Autopsy of Disaster in Chicago*. University of Chicago Press.  
 Articles and Chapters listed on Course plan

Recommended:

Hochschild, A (2016) *Strangers in their own Land*. The New Press.

Goffman A (2014) *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an America City*. New York: Picador.

Sundberg M (2015/2017) *A Sociology of the Total Organization. Atomistic Unity in the French Foreign Legion*. Routledge.

Ritter D (2014) *The Iron Cage of Liberalism: International Politics and Unarmed Revolutions in the Middle East and North Africa*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barker (2017) *Nordic Nationalism and Penal Order: Walling the Welfare State*. Routledge.

Recent Dissertations:

Sommer-Houdeville, T (2016) *Remaking Iraq: Neoliberalism and a System of Violence after the US invasion, 2003-2011*.

Dean, L (2016) *The Social Role of Buildings*

Mengiste, TA (2017) *Struggle for Mobility: Risk, hope, and community of knowledge in Eritrean and Ethiopian migration pathways towards Sweden* (Social Anthropology)

## 10. Topics and Reading assignments

### Principles of Qualitative Method

Creswell, J. Chapters 1-2 in *Qualitative Inquiry*

### Research Design

Creswell, Chapters 3-5

### Case Study: Social Autopsy: Heat Wave

Klinenberg, E. (2002) *Heat Wave: A Social Autopsy of Disaster in Chicago* (University of Chicago Press).

Creswell, pp. 97-110

Barker, V (2017) Appendix, *Nordic Nationalism*.

### Case Study Continued:

Flyvberg, B "Chapter 17: Case Study"

Gerring John. 2007. "What is a Case Study and What is it Good for?"

Recommended:

Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research*

Goertz and Mahoney (2012) *A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences*

### Ethnography

Creswell pages 90-97;

Creswell, Appendix E

Blix, S. B., & Wettergren, Å. (2015). The emotional labour of gaining and maintaining access to the field. *Qualitative Research*, 15(6), 688-704.

Hage, G. (2009). Hating Israel in the Field On ethnography and political emotions. *Anthropological Theory*, 9(1), 59-79.

Katz, J. (2001). From how to why On luminous description and causal inference in ethnography (Part I). *Ethnography*, 2(4), 443-473.

Katz, J. (2002). From How to Why On Luminous Description and Causal Inference in Ethnography (part 2). *Ethnography*, 3(1), 63-90.

McDonald, S. (2005). Studying actions in context: a qualitative shadowing method for organizational research. *Qualitative research*, 5(4), 455-473.

Willis, P., & Trondman, M. (2000). Manifesto for Ethnography. *Ethnography*, 1(1), 5-16.

#### Recommended:

Agar, M. (1986). *Speaking of ethnography* Newbury Park: Sage.

Goffman, A (2014) *On the Run*. Chicago:University of Chicago Press

Desmond, M (2016) *Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City*

Wacquant, Loïc. 2002. "Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, Morality and the Pitfalls of Urban Ethnography." *American Journal of Sociology* 107 (6): 1468-1532

Anderson, Elijah. 2002. "The Ideologically Driven Critique." *American Journal of Sociology* 107 (6): 1533-1550.

#### Field Research

Creswell, pages 70-88

Creswell, Appendices B, C, D

Sundberg M (2015/2017) *A Sociology of the Total Organization. Atomistic Unity in the French Foreign Legion*. Routledge, Chapters 1 and 4.

#### Interviewing

Creswell, Chapter 6-7

Lamont, M. & Swidler, A. (2014) Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing. *Qualitative Sociology* 37, 153-171.

Sundberg, M. (2015) "Hierarchy, Status and Combat Motivation in the French Foreign Legion" in King, A. (ed.) *Frontline: Combat and Cohesion in Iraq and Afghanistan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sundberg, M. (2011) "[The Dynamics of Coordinated Comparisons: How Simulationists in Astrophysics, Oceanography and Meteorology create Standards for Results](http://sss.sagepub.com/content/41/1/107)", *Social Studies of Science*, 41 (1). <http://sss.sagepub.com/content/41/1/107>

Sundberg, M. (2007) "[Mobilizing Networks. Researcher Roles in Atmospheric Science](http://asj.sagepub.com/content/50/3/271.abstract)", *Acta Sociologica* 50 (3). <http://asj.sagepub.com/content/50/3/271.abstract>

#### Comparative & Historical Analysis

Ritter, Daniel P. (2014). "Comparative Historical Analysis." Pp. 97-116

in *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*, edited by D. della Porta. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mahoney, James. 2004. 'Comparative-Historical Methodology'. *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 81-101.

Mahoney, James, Erin Kimball, and Kendra L. Koivu. 2009. 'The Logic of Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences'. *Comparative Political Studies* 42(1): 114-46.

Mill, John Stuart. 1974 [1843]. *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive: Being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Recommended:

Skocpol, Theda. 2003. 'Doubly Engaged Social Science: The Promise of Comparative Historical Analysis'. Pp. 407-28 in *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Skocpol, Theda, and Margaret Somers. 1980. 'The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22(2): 174-97.

Mahoney, James. 2003. "Strategies of Causal Assessment in Comparative Historical Analysis." In *Comparative Historical Analyses in Social Science*.

Clemens, Elisabeth S. 2007. "Toward a Historicized Sociology: Theorizing Events, Processes, and Emergence." *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* 2007. 33:527–49

### **Data Analysis**

Creswell, Chapters 8-10

Chapter 10 on Validation and Evaluation

TBA

### **Digital Methods (recommended)**

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn (2011) *New Media, Old Methods—Internet methodologies and the Online/Offline divide*. In onsalvo, Mia, and Ess, Charles (eds.) *The Handbook of Internet Studies*, pp. 43-58

(Can be found as E-book at SU library: <http://libris.kb.se/bib/12313351>).

Robert V. Kozinets, Pierre-Yann Dolbec and Amanda Earley (2014) Chapter 18: Netnographic Analysis: Understanding Culture Through Social Media Data. In Uwe Flick (ed.) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. Sage Publications: London  
(Can be found as E-book at SU library).

Brabham, D. C. (2008). Crowdsourcing as a model for problem solving an introduction and cases. *Convergence: the international journal of research into new media technologies*, 14(1), 75-90.

Marres, N., & Weltevrede, E. (2013). Scraping the social? Issues in live social research. *Journal of Cultural Economy*, 6(3), 313-335.

(Full text found at

[https://scholar.google.se/scholar?cluster=12445791141833061251&hl=en&as\\_sdt=0,5](https://scholar.google.se/scholar?cluster=12445791141833061251&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5))

### **Peer Workshop**

Creswell, Chapter 11