# Research Methods Lab

Academic year 2023-2024

16th February, 2024

## Table of contents

## List of Tables

# 1 Course details

> **Course information**
>
> - Course title: **Research Methods Lab**
> - Course code: **xxx**
> - Course session: **Academic year 2023-2024**
> - Course convenor: **Jamal Shahin**
> - Caliweb link
> - Canvas link
>
> Contact details for Jamal Shahin
> - Location: Pleinlaan 5
> - Office hours: immediately after class and by appointment
> - Phone: 0032474 48 09 74 (SMS/WhatsApp only)
> - Email: jamal.shahin@vub.be
> - WWW: https://researchportal.vub.be/en/persons/jamal-shahin
>
> Read and re-read this syllabus very carefully.
>
> Please use Canvas' messaging system for queries about the course; resend unanswered messages after four days.
>
> **Many questions can be more efficiently dealt with in person (or by re-reading this course manual or the student handbook!).**

## 1.1 Course objectives

The Research Methods course is taught throughout the academic year and aims primarily at supporting EuroMaster students in the conception, design, drafting and completion of their thesis in a coordinated and structured manner. This will be done by providing students with support for development of their conceptual framework for the conception and drafting of their thesis - sharing knowledge on research methods in social sciences - guiding them towards a systematic and analytical way of thinking for their research in the field of EU integration, as well as providing customised help during the process of writing. The course is thus designed as an essential means to acquaint students with the appropriate research techniques and methodologies in the canon of European Studies, and offers a variety of tools, approaches, methods of analysis, writing and research skills.

This course aims to provide support to students who are preparing to write their Master thesis in the EuroMaster programme. This course has a particular focus on making policy in the European Union. It is designed to focus on extracting policy-relevant issues that will influence your research and thesis work, whether it relates to contemporary policymaking, theoretical questions, governance or a historical contextualisation of EU policy. The aims of the module are:

- To encourage students to gather primary data for their thesis
- To show students how to critically integrate primary data into an MA thesis
- To expose students to theoretical frameworks around EU governance in their chosen policy field
- To encourage students to engage in collaborative and participative group work

## 1.2 Course description

This course is designed for students on the EuroMaster programme at the Brussels School of Governance at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel, and **should be carried out in the academic year that you wish to submit your thesis**. It will help you improve your research skills regarding both your Master thesis and post-study activities. The skills we focus on developing in this course will be useful for your professional development as we focus on linking research to policy.

We start by inviting you to consider your 'burning question' –or what you really want to address– in your MSc thesis. We then devote the subsequent weeks to identifying methods and theoretical approaches that will help you address this question in your thesis, with a specific focus on the relationship between policy fields and research approaches. We also concentrate on data-gathering techniques, notably looking at interview techniques. We will invite you to learn more about the practice of European policymaking through interactions with EU officials and other 'experts' in Brussels. Throughout the entire course, you will carry out –*inter alia*– the following tasks:

1. Identifying a topic that is worthy of research for an MSc thesis, including scanning literature.
2. Developing a methods paper and reflecting on the conceptual framing that should be a core part of the thesis.
3. Writing up a policy background document (to help direct research on your theses).

You will work in small groups to execute some of these tasks, although all deliverables will be submitted individually. The tasks described above are designed to help you come to terms with starting out on carrying out your MSc thesis. For this, we anticipate that you will further your skills in the following areas:

- Formulating a detailed research proposal
- Gathering data for your research project, and (re)formulating your research proposal
- Applying a (set of) theory(ies) to help you execute your thesis
- Adopting a (number of) method(s) to help you execute your thesis
- Presenting your initial findings concerning your research in written form
- Reflecting on the research process.

## 1.3 Method of instruction

We shall meet in plenary session at the allotted times mentioned in the schedule summary. Additional meetings may be organised: you will be asked to participate on a 'best-effort' principle.

Classes take place in the evenings, and will consist of a blend of interactive lectures, group work, and feedback sessions. **Peer review** is an integral element of the course structure. Smaller group sessions may take place online or physically, in addition to plenary sessions on campus at the VUB. Keep an eye on the VUB's scheduling system, as well as our Canvas site.

We are all expected to participate actively in the classroom, both before and during the sessions. We shall make use of a diversity of methods to encourage participation (jigsaws, reflections on news items, flipping the classroom, *et cetera*).

# 2 Expectations

## 2.1 Time

It is estimated you will need to allocate 12% of your study time as a minimum **(that is approximately 4 hours per week over the entire academic year)** for this course. This will be spent on preparation for and participation in the meetings and completing the deliverables. The amount of effort will vary from week to week, but we try to ensure that the workload is spread throughout the course.

## 2.2 Participation

Meeting preparation, attendance and participation are vitally important. Your degree of preparation and participation is noted. Absence, or failing to prepare the material requested will influence your grade negatively. Contact time will focus on engaging in discussion and development of your own ideas. Given the nature of the course, *participation is required in all the meetings mentioned in the course schedule*.

## 2.3 Not thesis supervision sessions

This course is designed to help you develop your thesis. However, the course convenor will not act as a second supervisor for your thesis. Please bear this in mind when interacting with your thesis supervisor.

## 2.4 Reading

In addition to the required readings and the preparatory tasks for each session, you should read a pertinent selection of literature from the course bibliography. You should choose texts that are relevant to your research objectives. An additional requirement is to keep informed through regular reading of current news sources related to your chosen topic.

## 2.5 Assignments

The assignments checklist provides a summary of the work to be submitted during the course. It goes without saying that you should be thinking about *all your assignments* from the start of the course.

# 3 Course evaluation

Students are requested by email to anonymously evaluate their courses when the University sends out requests for evaluation forms. Please do complete the course evaluation, as the EuroMaster Board

uses the results to improve the education in your programme. You can fill in the form at the VUB's student evaluation portal.

Your feedback is crucial, and helps us build better courses. Be critical during your course evaluation, but also be to the point, polite, and constructive. Finally, ask yourself: could I use this feedback myself?

However, you should not feel as though you have to wait until the end of the course in order to voice any issues that you may have. The course convenor invites you to engage either prior or immediately after our sessions, or via canvas messaging to discuss any concerns.

## 4 Assessment

### 4.1 Results

Results will be posted on Canvas no more than 15 working days after submission (and at least five working days before the resit). An average of 10 is the minimum grade you need to pass the course. Lower grades on one deliverable may be compensated by higher grades on others. Submission of "P/F" assignments are a requirement for passing the course.

### 4.2 Feedback and inspection

As all assignments will be graded on Canvas, you will be able to see the grading and comments on the asssignments on canvas. Should you require further feedback, please do not hesitate to reach out to the course convenor.

### 4.3 Resits and incomplete course submissions

Deliverable results lapse after the end of the semester in which the final mark was awarded. If you do not complete a course in one semester, you will have to retake the course at a later opportunity, thereby incurring additional fees.

The course convenor cannot offer a new exam to students who miss an exam due to illness or other impediment. Resits are designed to provide for such circumstances. Resits are therefore not intended to always allow students two opportunities to sit an exam.

Resits are only available for individual submissions. In case of a resit, the last grade counts as the final grade. The individual paper resit will be a rewritten version of the paper, deadline to be determined by the course convenor. **Individual papers that are submitted late count as resits.**

### 4.4 Writing conventions and fraud

You are expected to inform yourself of standard academic procedures for citing and referencing: coherence and consistency is most important. Please feel free to use your preferred referencing standard (MLA, APA, Chicago, Harvard, etc.). Work will be downgraded for language, spelling, and grammatical errors when and where this obfuscates meaning or understanding. Please double check before submitting. You are expected to be familiar with the University's code of conduct and rules on plagiarism, which are explained in the EuroMaster Student Handbook. **For more information on understanding what constitutes plagiarism, see the relevant section of the VUB's** Teaching and Examination Regulations.

## 5 Online repository

The canvas course contains some videos that have been produced that explain, *i.a.*, plagiarism, interview techniques, and referencing software (zotero). You should watch these on your own time.

We shall refer to them as and when necessary in the course meetings. Other resources will be made available to you in the course of the following weeks/months: keep an eye on this space on the canvas site!

# 6   Study material

There are no core texts for this course. I strongly suggest that you take all resources mentioned in the Annex - Suggested readings section of this course manual into consideration. However, the following sources provide excellent inspiration for your work in this course:

- Lynggaard, K., Löfgren, K., & Manners, I. (2015). Crossroads in european union studies. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 3–17). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_1
- Bruter, M., & Lodge, M. (2013). *The palgrave macmillan political science research methods in action*. Palgrave Macmillan. http://site.ebrary.com/id/10753305
  OCLC: 868951404
- Della Porta, D., & Keating, M. (Eds.) (2008). Contents. In *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (pp. vii–viii). Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/approaches-and-methodologies-in-the-social-sciences/contents/2A25113FF8039E314EFBEFDA5625C883
- Klotz, A., & Prakash, D. (Eds.) (2008). *Qualitative methods in international relations: A pluralist guide*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230584129

The following texts may be useful for specific aspects of research design.

For **general research principles**, please review:

- Denscombe, M. (2010). *Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice* (2. ed). Open Univ. Press, McGraw-Hill.
- Lynggaard, K., Löfgren, K., & Manners, I. (2015). Crossroads in european union studies. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 3–17). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_1
- Curini, L., & Franzese, R. (2020). *The SAGE handbook of research methods in political science and international relations* (1–2). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526486387
- Guthrie, G. (2010). Research proposal and literature review. In *Basic Research Methods: An Entry to Social Science Research* (pp. 25–37). SAGE Publications.
- Thody, A. (2006). *Writing and presenting research*. SAGE.
- Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The craft of research* (Third edition). University of Chicago Press.
- Yang, K. (2014). Qualitative analysis. In M. Bovens, R. E. Goodin, & T. Schillemans (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Accountability*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641253.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199641253-e-040

For **interviews**, see:

- Bailer, S. (2014). Interviews and surveys in legislative research. In S. Martin, T. Saalfeld, & K. W. Strøm (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199653010.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199653010-e-011
- Bogner, A., Littig, B., & Menz, W. (Eds.) (2009). *Interviewing experts*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bogner, A., Littig, B., & Menz, W. (2018). Generating qualitative data with experts and elites. In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection* (pp. 652–665). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526416070
- Dorussen, H., Lenz, H., & Blavoukos, S. (2005). Assessing the reliability and validity of expert interviews. *European Union Politics*, *6*(3), 315–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116505054835

For **case studies, process tracing, and related method(ologie)s**, see:

- Bates, R. H. (2009). From case studies to social science: A strategy for political research. In C. Boix & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199566020-e-7
- Kronsell, A., & Manners, I. (2015). Single policy study: Three variations in design. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 86–101). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_6
- Bevir, M. (2006). *Governance stories*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203969090
- Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The "digital natives" debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*(5), 775–786. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x
- Pouliot, V. (2014). Practice tracing. In A. Bennett & J. T. Checkel (Eds.), *Process Tracing* (pp. 237–259). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858472.013
- Collier, D. (2011). Understanding process tracing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *44*(04), 823–830. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511001429
- Gerring, J. (2009). The case study: What it is and what it does. In C. Boix & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (pp. 91–122). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.003.0004
- Bennett, A., & Elman, C. (2006). Qualitative research: Recent developments in case study methods. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *9*(1), 455–476. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.8.082103.104918
- Della Porta, D., & Keating, M. (Eds.) (2008). Contents. In *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (pp. vii–viii). Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/approaches-and-methodologies-in-the-social-sciences/contents/2A25113FF8039E314EFBEFDA5625C883
- Vennesson, P. (2008). Case studies and process tracing: Theories and practices. In D. Della Porta & M. Keating (Eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (pp. 223–239). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801938.013
- Checkel, J. T. (2008). Process tracing. In A. Klotz & D. Prakash (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (pp. 114–127). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230584129_8

For **multimethod and multilevel research**, see:

- Collier, D., & Elman, C. (2009). Qualitative and multimethod research: Organizations, publication, and reflections on integration. In J. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199286546-e-34
- Heinrich, C. J., & Hill, C. J. (2011). Multilevel methods in the study of bureaucracy. In R. F. Durant (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of American Bureaucracy*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199238958.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199238958-e-21
- Jones, B. S. (2008). Multilevel models. In J. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199286546-e-26

For alternative and more **critical research approaches**, see:

- Hay, C., & Rosamond, B. (2002). Globalization, european integration and the discursive construction of economic imperatives. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *9*(2), 147–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760110120192
- Hardin, R. (2008). Normative methodology. In J. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199286546-e-2
- Durning, D. (2004). Hajer, maarten a. And wagenaar, hendrik (eds.), deliberative policy analysis: Understanding governance in the network society. Cambridge university press, cambridge, 2003, 307 pp.: Morçöl, göktug, a new mind for policy analysis: Toward a post-newtonian and

postpositivist epistemology and methodology. Praeger publishers, westport, CT, 2002, 275 pp. *Policy Sciences*, *37*(3–4), 357–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-005-1765-z

- Wood, L., Bernt, P., & Ting, C. (2009). Implementing public utility commission web sites: Targeting audiences, missing opportunities. *Public Administration Review*, *69*(4), 753–763. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.02022.x
- Woods, N. (2006). *Describing discourse: A practical guide to discourse analysis*. Hodder Arnold.
- Burke, A. (2009). Postmodernism. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199219322.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199219322-e-21
- Dominguez, S., & Hollstein, B. (Eds.) (2014). *Mixed methods social networks research*. Cambridge University Press. http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9781139227193
- Wald, A. (2014). Triangulation and validity of network data. In S. Dominguez & B. Hollstein (Eds.), *Mixed Methods Social Networks Research* (pp. 65–89). Cambridge University Press. http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9781139227193A014
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd edition.). SAGE.
- Jacobs, T. (2018). The dislocated universe of laclau and mouffe: An introduction to post-structuralist discourse theory. *Critical Review*, *30*(3–4), 294–315.

For more **specific methods**, methodologies, and approaches, see the following:

- Bates, R. H. (2009). From case studies to social science: A strategy for political research. In C. Boix & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199566020-e-7
- Bevir, M. (2009). Meta-methodology: Clearing the underbrush. In J. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199286546-e-3
- Checkel, J. T. (2006). *Constructivist approaches to european integration* (Working Paper 6; p. 41). Arena Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo.
- Checkel, J. T. (2004). Social constructivisms in global and european politics: A review essay. *Review of International Studies*, *30*(2), 229–244. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210504006023
- Chynoweth, P. (2012). Legal research. In A. Knight & L. Ruddock (Eds.), *Advanced Research Methods in the Built Environment* (pp. 28–38). Blackwell.
- Franzese, R. J. (2009). Multicausality, context-conditionality, and endogeneity. In C. Boix & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199566020-e-2
- Freedman, D. A. (2009). *On types of scientific enquiry: The role of qualitative reasoning* (J. M. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier, Eds.; Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.003.0012
- Haas, P. M. (2014). Ideas, experts and governance. In M. Ambrus, K. Arts, E. Hey, & H. Raulus (Eds.), *The Role of 'Experts' in International and European Decision-Making Processes* (1st ed., pp. 19–43). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139871365.003
- Princen, S. (2015). Studying agenda setting. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 123–135). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_8
- Malena, C., & Finn Heinrich, V. (2007). Can we measure civil society? A proposed methodology for international comparative research. *Development in Practice*, *17*(3), 338–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701336766
- Quirk, J. (2009). Historical methods. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199219322.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199219322-e-30
- Vibert, F. (2014). The need for a systemic approach. In M. Bovens, R. E. Goodin, & T. Schillemans (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Accountability*. Oxford University Press. http:

//www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641253.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199641253-e-001

- Kaiser, W., & Meyer, J.-H. (Eds.) (2013). *Societal actors in european integration*. Palgrave Macmillan. http://www.palgraveconnect.com/doifinder/10.1057/9781137017659
- Kaiser, W., & Meyer, J.-H. (2013). Beyond governments and supranational institutions: Societal actors in european integration. In W. Kaiser & J.-H. Meyer (Eds.), *Societal Actors in European Integration* (pp. 1–14). Palgrave Macmillan. http://www.palgraveconnect.com/doifinder/10.1057/9781137017659
- Kydd, A. H. (2009). Methodological individualism and rational choice. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199219322.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199219322-e-25
- Luhtakallio, E., & Eliasoph, N. (2014). Ethnography of politics and political communication. In K. Kenski & K. Hall Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Communication*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199793471.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199793471-e-28
- Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2012). Follow the policy: A distended case approach. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 44*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1068/a44179
- Carta, C. (2016). *EU foreign policy through the lens of discourse analysis: Making sense of diversity* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315580692
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as social interaction. In *Discourse studies*. Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2012). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Sage.
- Hermann, M. (2008). Content analysis. In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations : A Pluralist Guide* (pp. 151–167). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis. A toolkit*. Routledge.
- Hyland, K., & Paltridge, B. (2011). *Continuum companion to discourse analysis*. Continuum International Pub. Group.
- Wodak, R., & Krzyżanowski, M. (2008). *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences*. Palgrave Macmillan.

# 7 Course schedule

In addition to the meeting moments below, we may organise *ad hoc- meetings during the course of the year, as per requirements from your side, and opportunities from the teaching staff side.

**All classes are held onsite, unless otherwise stated.**

## Pre-course reading and survey

You are required to read the course manual, view the resources on the canvas pages, and submit your response to the pre-course survey, which can be found here: https://forms.office.com/r/gHLQyFEp7S.

> Required actions
>
> - Guthrie, G. (2010). Research proposal and literature review. In *Basic Research Methods: An Entry to Social Science Research* (pp. 25–37). SAGE Publications.
> - Guthrie, G. (2010). Research methodology. In *Basic Research Methods: An Entry to Social Science Research* (pp. 38–50). SAGE Publications.
> - Guthrie, G. (2010). *Basic research methods : An entry to social science research*. Sage Publications Pvt. Ltd. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xw w&AN=340339&site=ehost-live&scope=site
> - Schmitter, P. (2008). The design of social and political research. In D. Della Porta & M. Keating (Eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (pp. 263–295). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801938.0 15
> - Watch the video about zotero in the module on canvas
> - Fill in the pre-course survey

## 7.1 Session 1: Intro to course and supervisors / MaThIS and thesis guidelines

At the first meeting, we shall start with an introduction to a number of members of the teaching team on the EuroMaster. They will describe topics of interest to them, for thesis supervision. We shall also introduce MaThIS.

We shall then go on to discuss your 'burning question': the topic that makes you want to carry out research. We shall discuss their relevance to your professional careers post-MSc. We will do this in smaller groups, and discuss these topics to try to help us explain what are the core challenges in our respective areas of interest. We will try to identify common problems and discuss what are the obstacles or barriers to answering these burning questions. We shall break you into groups defined by your themes, and discuss what your key issues are, or may be.

We shall also cover the deliverables in greater detail, to ensure that you can all start to work on them.

> Required reading
>
> - McCauley, A., & Ruggeri, A. (2020). From questions and puzzles to research project. In *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations* (1–2, pp. 26–43). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526486387
> - Review the other material in the canvas module

## 7.2 Session 2: General principles of thesis design

During the second meeting, we will introduce different methods involved in thesis design and execution. This will principally cover 'types' of research (empirical and/or theoretical contributions). The

objective of this meeting is to clarify the objectives of your thesis and to identify ways in which you can deal with different questions.

- By this meeting, you should have identified a potential supervisor. We need to have the respective professor registered as your thesis supervisor in MaThIS by 15 November.
- If not already done so (!!), familiarise yourself with https://biblio.vub.ac.be/, and come to the virtual classroom with a list of other sources you regularly use. NB, you may find this list of databases useful.

We may have a guest lecture from the VUB's librarian, who will help with finding sources.

> **Required reading**
>
> - Rosamond, B. (2015). Methodology in european union studies. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 18–36). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_2
> - González-Ocantos, E. (2020). Designing qualitative research projects: Notes on theory building, case selection and field research. In *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations* (1–2, pp. 104–120). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526486387
> - Review the other material in the canvas module

## 7.3   Mini-sessions 3: Theories of and concepts in European Integration

Based upon your experiences in collating data for the annotated bibliography, we shall discuss how to make use of theoretical frames and conduct a literature review. We shall brainstorm around different scientific literatures you should be referring to during your research. During class, you will discuss your draft annotated bibliographies of recent and 'classic' scientific publications in your field of research. This will, again, be carried out in thematic groups. We shall be commenting on the following criteria:

- Diversity of literature
- Balance between classic texts and more recently-published work
- Relevance of the literature to your preliminary research question
- Theoretical 'narrative' present in the collection of literature
- Clarity of your annotations
- Usefulness of your annotations for your own research.

We shall also examine how theories are applied to a number of texts using the 'jigsaw method'.

- Group 1: ?
- Group 2: Slapin, J. B. (2008). Bargaining power at europe's intergovernmental conferences: Testing institutional and intergovernmental theories. *International Organization*, *62*(1), 131–162. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818308080053
- Group 3: Moravcsik, A., & Nicolaidis, K. (1999). Explaining the treaty of amsterdam: Interests, influence, institutions. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *37*(1), 59–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5965.00150

> **i Jigsaw Method**
>
> 1. In preparation for the session, each student will prepare one of the texts for the discussion session (see canvas for your respective text);
> 2. In the first part of the jigsaw session, 'expert groups' will be formed by students who have all read the same text. The students will use the expert group to exchange ideas about the questions posed, complement one another and formulate a final joint answer to the questions which will be presented within the jigsaw groups;

3. In the second part of the jigsaw session, the different pieces of the puzzle in the literature are put together in 'jigsaw groups', which consist of three students, each having read a different text;

4. On the basis of this exchange a final plenary discussion will be launched in which critical questions are posed about the different perspectives presented. What are the main differences? What is the value of the different perspectives taken? Could you think of critiques? What do these perspectives teach us about European integration?

## 7.4   Mini-sessions 4: Data collection and writing conventions

In this meeting, we shall discuss how to collect and organise raw data for your thesis. We shall talk about using statistical databases, policy documents, *grey- literature, interviews and other techniques to gather data. We shall talk about various techniques and methods of collecting data. YOu will present your plans for data collection to the group.

> Required reading
>
> Please refer to at least some of the literature in the Annex - suggested readings for inspiration in this area. Pick literature relevant to your specific needs. For example, the following are very useful when referring to interview techniques:
> - Bailer, S. (2014). Interviews and surveys in legislative research. In S. Martin, T. Saalfeld, & K. W. Strøm (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199653010.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199653010-e-011
> - Bogner, A., Littig, B., & Menz, W. (Eds.) (2009). *Interviewing experts*. Palgrave Macmillan.
> - Dorussen, H., Lenz, H., & Blavoukos, S. (2005). Assessing the reliability and validity of expert interviews. *European Union Politics*, *6*(3), 315–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116505054835
> - Haas, P. M. (2014). Ideas, experts and governance. In M. Ambrus, K. Arts, E. Hey, & H. Raulus (Eds.), *The Role of 'Experts' in International and European Decision-Making Processes* (1st ed., pp. 19–43). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139871365.003

You will be required to develop a plan for data collection for your thesis, which you will present in these small groups.

**The following sessions will take place in semester 2, with dates tbc.**

## 7.5   Mini-sessions 5: Analysis

In these smaller group meetings, we shall first discuss how to link the state of the art in academic literature to your policy discussions. We shall also specifically look into how to critically analyse qualitative data, addressing issues of provenance, context, intention, language, *et cetera*. To do so, I shall ask you to draw up timelines during the class, to present to your thematic group.

## 7.6   Session 6: Rethinking your RQ and choosing methods

It often becomes necessary, after an initial exploration, to rethink the premise of your research and redesign your research question. This class will allow us to discuss what gaps have emerged between our research questions and our initial investigation of the scientific and policy debates in our field. We shall also address potential methods, tools and techniques that you would decide to use in your ongoing research, taking feasibility and relevance into account.

# 8   Work to be submitted during the course

During the course, you will be expected to submit several pieces of work via Canvas.

- Evaluation criteria for each deliverable are clearly described below. Please refer to these before submitting your deliverables.
- There are two submission moments for deliverables, depending on when you wish to submit your thesis.
- The deadlines are grouped and are very late in the process: it is in your interest to write these documents much earlier!!
- Please note that **earlier submission of the deliverables does not bind you to submitting your thesis in the first session.**
- Please note that the grade you receive for each specific deliverable may not be reflected in the final grade of your thesis, which depends very much on the broader research carried out, as well as the interplay between these deliverables.
- You should share these deliverables with your thesis supervisor once you have generated the thesis outline document. Please do not overburden your thesis supervisors by sharing earlier versions of the documents, but discuss with them **when and what they want to review**.

## 8.1   Formatting requirements

It is important to note the following requirements for all deliverables, excluding the 'Thesis pitch' and the MaThIS entry .

- All documents should be submitted through Canvas, and conform to the following rules: A4, **fully justified paragraphs**, with single line spacing **and page numbers clearly identified**. Minimum font size: 10.
- As we agree the deadlines at the beginning of the course, deadlines **must** be adhered to. Late submissions will not receive detailed feedback.
- **Documents submitted through email will be deleted.**

### 8.1.1   Front page of deliverables

- As a minimum, the following information should be clearly marked on the front page of the submission:
    - student number
    - course title and academic year
    - deliverable name
    - date of actual submission (regardless of the deadline)
    - thesis supervisor's name on the front page
    - one of the following statements: "I have discussed my research question with my thesis supervisor" / "I have not yet discussed my research question with my thesis supervisor"

### 8.1.2   Second page of deliverables

- The second page of each deliverable should start with the following:
    - your current "research question"
    - the current version of your "thesis pitch" (c. 300 words)
- Note that the first two pages of your submission are not included in the page limits described below.

## 8.2 Thesis supervisor approval

Your thesis title (draft!) and supervisor need to be filled in on MaThIS, the VUB's Thesis Information System by 15 November.

## 8.3 Thesis pitch

Your thesis 'pitch' should be a short piece of text that explains what you wish to achieve with your thesis. You are required to submit a document in discussion with your thesis supervisor. This should be a 'working document' that is not by any means final at this stage. This thesis 'pitch' is to be submitted in text form directly onto the canvas platform. This document will evolve, and you are required to add the current version of this document to each deliverable. Upon submission, you will be asked to review submissions of your colleagues. This provides you with an opportunity to provide some written commentary (and moral support!) to your colleagues.

## 8.4 Plan for data collection

You should produce a one page document that briefly outlines what you believe your sources of data will be, and how you intend on collecting/collating these data. This will help you focus your research over the coming months, and also serves as the basis for the methods paper, due later in the year.

## 8.5 Annotated bibliography

Your annotated bibliography should contain descriptions of at least nine (and no more than eleven) **academic sources** pertinent to your research topic. You should provide full references for the sources (in your preferred referencing style) and a short description of the main arguments in the text. This shall be useful to ensure that your research question contributes to ongoing debates and has not been answered before. You may also choose to identify methodological and conceptual sources that provide insights into how to address your chosen topic. It is considered good practice to 'categorise' your sources into groups, in order to show that you are capable of seeing the bigger picture in your research field. *Alongside summing up the main arguments of your sources, you should also provide at the end of your annotated bibliography between half a page and one page summarising the literature you have examined*, highlighting any gaps in the literature and outlining how your thesis might fill in these gaps. Do not use policy documents or grey literature in this annotated bibliography. A key element of the grading criteria for this deliverable will be your ability to reference academic texts, according to the referencing style you have chosen.

---

**❗** Assessment criteria annotated bibliography

1. consistency in referencing
2. quality of the summaries of each text
3. quality of final summary of literature and the identification of gaps (if relevant)
4. the number and diversity of references used

---

You may wish to use the excel sheet provided in canvas as a template for your work. See also the online version, if you prefer to share your work.

## 8.6 Methods and concepts paper

This document containts two parts. The first part (methods) will be used as the basis (after comments) for the work you will carry out in collecting data. Your paper should consider different methods, including qualitative and quantitative methods. You should also refer to different disciplinary approaches in this paper. Finally, you are required to elaborate on the methods that will serve to help you address the Research Question you have identified in class and in discussion with your supervisor.

This will help you plan the remaining stages of your research. The second part (concepts) will emerge as a result of your annotated bibliography and the insights that you have gathered during your initial policy background research. In this, you should be able to develop a document that outlines the theoretical considerations you will endeavour to take up in your thesis. This document should explain what theories are relevant to your research, how they have been used, and whether you think there are opportunities for further refinement or application of different theoretical frameworks, given the evolutions in the policy field.

> **❗ Assessment criteria methods and concepts paper**
>
> 1. Do you cover a range of potential methods? (Qualitative/quantitative, if appropriate)
> 2. Do you cover methods and concepts from different disciplines?
> 3. Relevance of the methods to your research question (which needs to be clearly stated in the paper).
> 4. Do your concepts build on the policy backgrounder and link to the methods you describe?
> 5. Do you outline a number of (prospective) theories to address in your thesis?
> 6. Do you provide a critical review of (prospective) theories?
> 7. Do you outline the relevance of different theory/theories to your research question?

## 8.7   Policy background paper

Your background paper should provide the policy background of your research topic. This deliverable should consist of a rather detailed description of the key policy issues relevant to your thesis, with a particular focus on how they relate to EU policymaking. It should cover policy/primary literature, please make sure **not** to include any academic sources in the background document. At this stage, we are looking to practice **data-gathering skills** and improve your capacity to **organise policy statements** and **identify paradoxes, puzzles or policy problems**. This will be useful for you in providing you with some policy insights into your chosen topic area.

> **❗ Assessment criteria policy background paper**
>
> 1. Clear and consistent treatment of a policy field?
> 2. Covers policy and/or other primary source literature?
> 3. Quality of critical reading of the policy field?
> 4. Describes evolution of policy field?
> 5. Does the paper highlight tensions in the policy field, and potential proposal for future policy?

## 8.8   Thesis outline

You should be able to draft up a document that summarises the following aspects of your thesis research thus far (this is indicative):

1. The key question(s) you wish to address in your research (which is informed by your 'burning question')
2. A basic overview of the policy environment relating to your research topic
3. An overview of the academic debate on your topic (derived from your annotated bibliography, but which shows the reader how *you* will use this literature to inform your research)
4. A proposed structure of your thesis, with a brief description of each chapter
5. A list of literature consulted.

Although you must submit this document through canvas, you are also responsible for submitting this document along with all previous deliverables to your supervisor at this time. Please note that they will not grade the work.

# 9 Deliverables checklists

## 9.1 Thesis submission on 31 May

Table 1: deadlines for material for first session thesis submissions

| Item | Weight | Date due | Length |
|---|---|---|---|
| D0.1: Pre-meeting survey | - | X November | - |
| D1: Thesis entry in MaThIS | - | 15 November | - |
| D2: Thesis 'pitch' | - | 30 November | 300 words max. |
| D3: Plan for data collection | P/F | Session 4 | 1p max. |
| D4: Annotated Bibliography | 30% | 15 February | 6pp max. |
| D5: Policy background paper | 35% | 28 February | 6pp max. |
| D6: Methods and concepts paper | 35% | 15 March | 6pp max. |
| D7: Thesis outline | P/F | 31 March | 7pp max. |

All deadlines at 6pm.

## 9.2 Thesis submission on 15 August

Table 2: deadlines for material for second session thesis submissions

| Item | Weight | Date due | Length |
|---|---|---|---|
| D0.1: Pre-meeting survey | - | X November | - |
| D1: Thesis entry in MaThIS | - | 15 November | - |
| D2: Thesis 'pitch' | - | 30 November | 300 words max. |
| D3: Plan for data collection | P/F | Session 4 | 1p max. |
| D4: Annotated Bibliography | 30% | 15 April | 6pp max. |
| D5: Policy background paper | 35% | 30 April | 6pp max. |
| D6: Methods and concepts paper | 35% | 15 May | 6pp max. |
| D7: Thesis outline | P/F | 31 May | 7pp max. |

All deadlines at 6pm.

# 10   Summary of meetings

Class objectives are detailed above. The following table provides a brief summary.

Table 3: summary of course meetings

| Session # | Date | Time |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1: Intro. | 10 November | 6pm - 9pm |
| 2: Principles | 24 November | 6pm - 9pm |
| 3: Theories | 4/7/8 December | 6pm - 9pm |
| 4: Methods and writing conventions | 18/20/21 December | 6pm - 9pm |
| 5: Analysis | tbc | 6pm - 9pm |
| 6: Wrapping up | tbc | 6pm - 9pm |

# 11 Annex - Suggested readings

You should (again!) familiarise yourself with the European Commission's Eurlex web-based database, which provides access to most Commission Communications. Furthermore, European Council Presidency Conclusions will be very important to your research. These can be generally found at the European Council's website.

A list of suggested reading is below. Not all the reading suggested below is compulsory, and many, many things are not included in this list. However, you are advised to use some of this material along with others you find during your investigations.

Turabian, K. L., Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., Williams, J. M., & University of Chicago Press Staff, W. C. (n.d.). *A manual for writers of research papers, theses, and dissertations, eighth edition*. University of Chicago Press. http://www.bibliovault.org/BV.landing.epl?ISBN=9780226816388

Curini, L., & Franzese, R. (2020). *The SAGE handbook of research methods in political science and international relations* (1–2). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526486387

González-Ocantos, E. (2020). Designing qualitative research projects: Notes on theory building, case selection and field research. In *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations* (1–2, pp. 104–120). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526486387

McCauley, A., & Ruggeri, A. (2020). From questions and puzzles to research project. In *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations* (1–2, pp. 26–43). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526486387

Bogner, A., Littig, B., & Menz, W. (2018). Generating qualitative data with experts and elites. In *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection* (pp. 652–665). SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526416070

Jacobs, T. (2018). The dislocated universe of laclau and mouffe: An introduction to post-structuralist discourse theory. *Critical Review*, *30*(3–4), 294–315.

Carta, C. (2016). *EU foreign policy through the lens of discourse analysis: Making sense of diversity* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315580692

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd edition.). SAGE.

Kronsell, A., & Manners, I. (2015). Single policy study: Three variations in design. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 86–101). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_6

Lynggaard, K., Löfgren, K., & Manners, I. (2015). Crossroads in european union studies. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 3–17). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_1

Princen, S. (2015). Studying agenda setting. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 123–135). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_8

Rosamond, B. (2015). Methodology in european union studies. In K. Lynggaard, I. Manners, & K. Löfgren (Eds.), *Research Methods in European Union Studies* (pp. 18–36). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137316967_2

Bailer, S. (2014). Interviews and surveys in legislative research. In S. Martin, T. Saalfeld, & K. W. Strøm (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199653010.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199653010-e-011

Checkel, J. T., & Bennett, A. (2014). Beyond metaphors. In A. Bennett & J. T. Checkel (Eds.), *Process Tracing* (pp. 260–275). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858472.014

Dominguez, S., & Hollstein, B. (Eds.). (2014). *Mixed methods social networks research*. Cambridge University Press. http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9781139227193

Haas, P. M. (2014). Ideas, experts and governance. In M. Ambrus, K. Arts, E. Hey, & H. Raulus (Eds.), *The Role of 'Experts' in International and European Decision-Making Processes* (1st ed., pp. 19–43). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139871365.003

Hollstein, B., & Wagemann, C. (2014). Fuzzy-set analysis of network data as mixed method. In S.

Dominguez & B. Hollstein (Eds.), *Mixed Methods Social Networks Research* (pp. 237–268). Cambridge University Press. http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9781139227193A022

Luhtakallio, E., & Eliasoph, N. (2014). Ethnography of politics and political communication. In K. Kenski & K. Hall Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Communication*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199793471.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199793471-e-28

Pouliot, V. (2014). Practice tracing. In A. Bennett & J. T. Checkel (Eds.), *Process Tracing* (pp. 237–259). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139858472.013

Vibert, F. (2014). The need for a systemic approach. In M. Bovens, R. E. Goodin, & T. Schillemans (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Accountability*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641253.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199641253-e-001

Wald, A. (2014). Triangulation and validity of network data. In S. Dominguez & B. Hollstein (Eds.), *Mixed Methods Social Networks Research* (pp. 65–89). Cambridge University Press. http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9781139227193A014

Yang, K. (2014). Qualitative analysis. In M. Bovens, R. E. Goodin, & T. Schillemans (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Accountability*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199641253.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199641253-e-040

Bruter, M., & Lodge, M. (2013). *The palgrave macmillan political science research methods in action*. Palgrave Macmillan. http://site.ebrary.com/id/10753305
OCLC: 868951404

Kaiser, W., & Meyer, J.-H. (2013). Beyond governments and supranational institutions: Societal actors in european integration. In W. Kaiser & J.-H. Meyer (Eds.), *Societal Actors in European Integration* (pp. 1–14). Palgrave Macmillan. http://www.palgraveconnect.com/doifinder/10.1057/9781137017659

Kaiser, W., & Meyer, J.-H. (Eds.). (2013). *Societal actors in european integration*. Palgrave Macmillan. http://www.palgraveconnect.com/doifinder/10.1057/9781137017659

Chynoweth, P. (2012). Legal research. In A. Knight & L. Ruddock (Eds.), *Advanced Research Methods in the Built Environment* (pp. 28–38). Blackwell.

Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2012). Follow the policy: A distended case approach. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, *44*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1068/a44179

van Dijk, T. A. (2012). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Sage.

Collier, D. (2011). Understanding process tracing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *44*(04), 823–830. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511001429

Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis. A toolkit*. Routledge.

Heinrich, C. J., & Hill, C. J. (2011). Multilevel methods in the study of bureaucracy. In R. F. Durant (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of American Bureaucracy*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199238958.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199238958-e-21

Hyland, K., & Paltridge, B. (2011). *Continuum companion to discourse analysis*. Continuum International Pub. Group.

Denscombe, M. (2010). *Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good practice* (2. ed). Open Univ. Press, McGraw-Hill.

Guthrie, G. (2010). *Basic research methods : An entry to social science research*. Sage Publications Pvt. Ltd. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=340339&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Guthrie, G. (2010). Research methodology. In *Basic Research Methods: An Entry to Social Science Research* (pp. 38–50). SAGE Publications.

Guthrie, G. (2010). Research proposal and literature review. In *Basic Research Methods: An Entry to Social Science Research* (pp. 25–37). SAGE Publications.

Aldrich, J. H., Alt, J. E., & Lupia, A. (2009). The eitm approach: Origins and interpretations. In J. M. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.003.0037

Bates, R. H. (2009). From case studies to social science: A strategy for political research. In C. Boix & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199566020-e-7

Bevir, M. (2009). Meta-methodology: Clearing the underbrush. In J. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady,

& D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199286546-e-3

Bogner, A., Littig, B., & Menz, W. (Eds.). (2009). *Interviewing experts*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Burke, A. (2009). Postmodernism. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199219322.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199219322-e-21

Collier, D., & Elman, C. (2009). Qualitative and multimethod research: Organizations, publication, and reflections on integration. In J. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199286546-e-34

Franzese, R. J. (2009). Multicausality, context-conditionality, and endogeneity. In C. Boix & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199566020-e-2

Freedman, D. A. (2009). *On types of scientific enquiry: The role of qualitative reasoning* (J. M. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier, Eds.; Vol. 1). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.003.0012

Gerring, J. (2009). The case study: What it is and what it does. In C. Boix & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics* (pp. 91–122). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.003.0004

Kydd, A. H. (2009). Methodological individualism and rational choice. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199219322.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199219322-e-25

Littig, B. (2009). Interviewing the elite – interviewing experts: Is there a difference? In A. Bogner, B. Littig, & W. Menz (Eds.), *Interviewing Experts* (pp. 98–112). Palgrave Macmillan.

Pfadenhauer, M. (2009). At eye level: The expert interview — a talk between expert and quasi-expert. In A. Bogner, B. Littig, & W. Menz (Eds.), *Interviewing Experts* (pp. 81–97). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230244276_4

Quirk, J. (2009). Historical methods. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199219322.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199219322-e-30

Wood, E. J. (2009). Field research. In C. Boix & S. C. Stokes (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Oxford University Press. http://oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199566020.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199566020-e-5

Wood, L., Bernt, P., & Ting, C. (2009). Implementing public utility commission web sites: Targeting audiences, missing opportunities. *Public Administration Review*, *69*(4), 753–763. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2009.02022.x

Bennett, A., & Elman, C. (2008). Case study methods. In C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199219322.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199219322-e-29

Bennett, S., Maton, K., & Kervin, L. (2008). The "digital natives" debate: A critical review of the evidence. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *39*(5), 775–786. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2007.00793.x

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2008). *The craft of research* (Third edition). University of Chicago Press.

Checkel, J. T. (2008). Process tracing. In A. Klotz & D. Prakash (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (pp. 114–127). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230584129_8

Della Porta, D., & Keating, M. (Eds.). (2008). Contents. In *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (pp. vii–viii). Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/approaches-and-methodologies-in-the-social-sciences/contents/2A25113FF8039E314EFBEFDA5625C883

Hardin, R. (2008). Normative methodology. In J. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199286546-e-2

Hermann, M. (2008). Content analysis. In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations : A Pluralist Guide* (pp. 151–167). Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, B. S. (2008). Multilevel models. In J. Box-Steffensmeier, H. E. Brady, & D. Collier (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. Oxford University Press. http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199286546-e-26

Klotz, A. (2008). Introduction. In A. Klotz & D. Prakash (Eds.), *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide* (pp. 1–7). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230584129_1

Klotz, A., & Prakash, D. (Eds.). (2008). *Qualitative methods in international relations: A pluralist guide*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230584129

Schmitter, P. (2008). The design of social and political research. In D. Della Porta & M. Keating (Eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (pp. 263–295). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801938.015

Slapin, J. B. (2008). Bargaining power at europe's intergovernmental conferences: Testing institutional and intergovernmental theories. *International Organization*, *62*(1), 131–162. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818308080053

Vennesson, P. (2008). Case studies and process tracing: Theories and practices. In D. Della Porta & M. Keating (Eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences: A Pluralist Perspective* (pp. 223–239). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801938.013

Wodak, R., & Krzyżanowski, M. (2008). *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Malena, C., & Finn Heinrich, V. (2007). Can we measure civil society? A proposed methodology for international comparative research. *Development in Practice*, *17*(3), 338–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701336766

Ackerly, B. A., Stern, M., & True, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Feminist methodologies for international relations*. Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, A., & Elman, C. (2006). Qualitative research: Recent developments in case study methods. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *9*(1), 455–476. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.8.082103.104918

Bevir, M. (2006). *Governance stories*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203969090

Checkel, J. T. (2006). *Constructivist approaches to european integration* (Working Paper 6; p. 41). Arena Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo.

Hajer, M. A. (2006). The living institutions of the EU: Analysing governance as performance. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, *7*(1), 41–55. http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/15705850600839546

Thody, A. (2006). *Writing and presenting research*. SAGE.

Woods, N. (2006). *Describing discourse: A practical guide to discourse analysis*. Hodder Arnold.

Dorussen, H., Lenz, H., & Blavoukos, S. (2005). Assessing the reliability and validity of expert interviews. *European Union Politics*, *6*(3), 315–337. https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116505054835

Checkel, J. T. (2004). Social constructivisms in global and european politics: A review essay. *Review of International Studies*, *30*(2), 229–244. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210504006023

Durning, D. (2004). Hajer, maarten a. And wagenaar, hendrik (eds.), deliberative policy analysis: Understanding governance in the network society. Cambridge university press, cambridge, 2003, 307 pp.: Morçöl, göktuğ, a new mind for policy analysis: Toward a post-newtonian and postpositivist epistemology and methodology. Praeger publishers, westport, CT, 2002, 275 pp. *Policy Sciences*, *37*(3–4), 357–365. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11077-005-1765-z

Hajer, M. (2003). Policy without polity? Policy analysis and the institutional void. *Policy Sciences*, *36*(2), 175–195. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4532594

Hajer, M. A., & Wagenaar, H. (2003). *Deliberative policy analysis: Understanding governance in the network society* (M. A. Hajer & H. Wagenaar, Eds.). Cambridge University Press. http://ebooks.cambridge.org/ref/id/CBO9780511490934

Aberbach, J. D., & Rockman, B. A. (2002). Conducting and coding elite interviews. *Political Science & Politics*, *35*(04), 673–676. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001142

Berry, J. M. (2002). Validity and reliability issues in elite interviewing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *35*(4), 679–682. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096502001166

Goldstein, K. (2002). Getting in the door: Sampling and completing elite interviews. *PSOnline*, 669–672.

Hay, C., & Rosamond, B. (2002). Globalization, european integration and the discursive construction of economic imperatives. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *9*(2), 147–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/13501760110120192

Moravcsik, A., & Nicolaidis, K. (1999). Explaining the treaty of amsterdam: Interests, influence, institutions. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *37*(1), 59–85. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5965.00150

van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as social interaction. In *Discourse studies*. Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.

Boice, R., Andrasik, F., & Simmons, W. L. (1984). Teaching interview skills: A procedural account of measuring students' progress. *Teaching of Psychology*, *11*(2), 110–111. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328023top1102_16