

# Introduction to Qualitative Methods

Lecture and Lab in Political Science MA Curriculum, University of Cologne  
Module CM Qualitative Methods – 14335.0700 Lecture, 14335.0701 Lab

Summer Semester 2026

*Preliminary course syllabus*

Lecturer: Kristi Winters  
Email: [kristi.winters@gesis.org](mailto:kristi.winters@gesis.org)  
Office hours: By appointment

Lab Instructor: Friedrich Haas  
Email: [haas@wiso.uni-koeln.de](mailto:haas@wiso.uni-koeln.de)  
Office hours: By appointment

---

## Course Description

This course provides a practical introduction to designing and conducting qualitative research at the Master's level. It complements courses in quantitative methods and general research design by focusing on the logic, implementation, and limits of qualitative inquiry. Over the semester, students will design and carry out a small-scale qualitative pilot project, moving through the full research cycle from research design to interpretation.

The course begins by examining the foundations of qualitative research and the types of questions it is best suited to address. Students will learn how to formulate precise research questions, define cases and units of analysis, and connect theoretical expectations to empirical strategies. Major qualitative approaches are introduced, including thematic analysis, grounded theory, process tracing, and comparative logic, with particular emphasis on operationalization and evidentiary reasoning. A central component of the course is the structured analysis of qualitative material. Using MAXQDA and systematic coding techniques, students will translate unstructured textual data into analyzable formats and reflect critically on interpretation and inference. The course concludes with group presentations and a discussion of validity, ethics, transparency, and the limits of qualitative generalization.

## Schedule

All students are invited to all lecture sessions. Students are divided into two lab sections and should check which section they are registered for! Attendance in the first session (second week of the semester) is crucial, because this is when we will build the groups for the rest of the semester's work.

	Time	Dates	Location
Lecture	Thursdays 14:00-15:30	April 23, 30; May 21; June 11, 18, 25; July 16	H115, IBW Building
Lab A	Thursdays 16:00-17:30	April 23, 30; May 21; June 11, 18, 25; July 16	H111, IBW Building
Lab B	Fridays 12:00-13:30	April 24; May 8, May 22; June 12, 19, 26; July 17	Hörsaal XII, Main Building

# Objectives

After participating in the course, students will be able to:

- Develop and articulate a coherent qualitative research design, including a clearly specified research question, case definition, and theoretical expectations
- Select and justify appropriate qualitative data sources and analytical strategies in relation to a given research question
- Translate abstract concepts into structured coding schemes and apply systematic qualitative analysis using MAXQDA
- Interpret qualitative evidence critically, reflect on alternative explanations and inferential limits, and revise a research design in light of pilot findings
- Recognize ethical considerations, transparency requirements, and limits of generalization in qualitative research

# Requirements

This course is evaluated via project work examination, meaning there will be several assignments that comprise the final grade. Students must complete three assignments (one out of the first four written tasks, the presentation, and the last task; see the table below) to receive a passing grade. The assignments will be returned to the participants with comments and a grade following the scale below. Students are also expected to complete the readings each week.

During the course, the students will complete the following steps chronologically:

1. Form a group of four during the first lab session and choose an article from the pre-approved selection that the group will work with throughout the semester
2. Write individual parts of the written assignment and submit them via Ilias
3. Identify the data source(s) from the chosen article, then collect and verify as many as possible of them during the lab sessions
4. Use MaxQDA to code sources and come to an assessment about the conclusions presented in the article
5. Make a presentation about your group's work at the end of the semester, reflecting on each student's individual contribution
6. Submit the coding exercise and written evaluation of the evidence after course sessions end

Thus, the examination has three elements: a first written assignment, a presentation, and the pilot findings and study revision. These three components are detailed below:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Deadline to submit</b>
Evaluation of a Published Research Paper	05.06.2026, 23:55
Research Design and Case Logic	05.06.2026, 23:55
Analytical Strategy and Evidentiary Logic	26.06.2026, 23:55
Conceptualization and Coding	26.06.2026, 23:55
Presentations	16 and 17.07.2026
Pilot Findings and Study Revision	24.07.2026, 23:55

## Written Assignment (15 points)

Students will complete a series of written assignments as part of their group's original qualitative pilot project. In each group of four, students will divide responsibilities so that each of the following components is covered:

- Evaluation of a published research paper (research design, data, and methods)
- Research design for the group's pilot study
- Analytical strategy and evidentiary logic
- Conceptualization and coding

Each student will complete **one** of these assignments. It is not permitted for two group members to submit the same assignment. Each assignment should meet the stated word limit (excluding references) and be written in continuous academic prose. Assignments must be uploaded to ILIAS by the specified deadline.

In addition, all students will submit a final synthesis paper (see below) that evaluates the pilot findings and outlines the next stage of research development.

## Presentation (15 points)

At the end of the semester, each group will present the development and findings of their qualitative pilot project. The presentation should demonstrate how the group moved from selecting a question and appropriate data to designing, implementing, and interpreting their own research.

Each group presentation should clearly address:

- **Research Question and Data**  
The research question selected, its theoretical motivation, and the qualitative data chosen and how it sets up the analysis.
- **Research Design**  
The structure of the pilot study, including case definition, scope, and feasibility.
- **Analytical Strategy and Coding**  
The evidentiary logic guiding the analysis and the conceptualization and coding approach used.
- **Findings and Reflections**  
Preliminary findings and brief reflection on methodological challenges, limitations, and how the study could be revised or extended.

While the presentation should be cohesive and integrated, each member must present one clearly defined component.

Students will be graded individually on their own portion of the presentation. Presentations should be prepared collaboratively to ensure conceptual coherence, consistent style, and avoidance of repetition. Each group presentation must not exceed 12 minutes in total.

Presentation slides must be uploaded to ILIAS no later than 14 July 2026 at 23:55.

## Structured Analysis of Pilot Data (15 points)

Students will gain hands-on experience applying qualitative coding to the data collected for their group's original pilot project. This should not be confused with the type of "coding" used in programming languages. Qualitative coding is a systematic method for organizing, conceptualizing, and interpreting textual data.

This assignment requires students to document and justify their coding strategy and demonstrate

how abstract concepts were translated into structured analytical categories and how the resulting analysis relates to the research question. Students should explain whether codes were developed inductively, deductively, or through an iterative combination of both.

The paper should read like the methodological section of a published qualitative study. Avoid bullet-point formatting and write in continuous academic prose.

In addition, students must submit a MAXQDA export (codebook and/or coded segments report) that documents how the coding scheme was applied to the data.

Length: approximately **1500 words**, excluding references, but including tables, figures and images.

This paper should be uploaded to ILIAS along with the MaxQDA report by **24.07.2026, 23:55**.

## Grading Scale

These three assignments total 45 points (15 points each). Course grades will be awarded as follows.

Points Earned	Grade	Points Earned	Grade
42.5 - 45	1.0	29 - 31	3.0
40.5 - 42	1.3	27 - 28.5	3.3
38 - 40	1.7	24.5 - 26.5	3.7
36 - 37.5	2.0	22.5 - 24	4.0
33.5 - 35.5	2.3	0 - 22	5.0 (fail)
31.5 - 33	2.7		

# Participation

While we cannot mandate attendance, please consider that attending the lectures and labs shows respect to your classmates and the instructors. In the first session of the labs, groups will be built for the remainder of the semester, so all students are expected to either attend or notify the instructors that they cannot attend but that they still plan to participate in the group assignment. Please take note of the registration deadlines for the course and the examination (two procedures!) and register in KLIPS 2.0 in a timely fashion.

It is the joint responsibility of instructors and students to create a respectful and inclusive atmosphere in our sessions together. Both instructors want to help you succeed in this course. If you encounter problems during the semester, either with the contents of the course or personally (e.g. illness, family, visa, etc.), and you need an extension or assistance, please contact us as soon as possible. Should you require accommodation for a disability, please also bring this to our attention.

In the spirit of respectful and mutually beneficial participation in the course, it is inappropriate to use online artificial intelligence tools like ChatGPT without citation. You are welcome to use whatever tools help you organize your ideas, find information, and improve your writing, but you should not use ChatGPT or similar tools to generate text for your assignments. This commonly results in citations to references that do not actually exist, and it can impair your learning. Please do not disrespect your classmates and instructors by trying to pass off AI-generated writing as your own work. For more information, you may consult the University of Cologne's statement on the use of AI tools: [https://verwaltung.uni-koeln.de/stabsstelle02.1/content/fag/data/chatgpt/index\\_ger.html](https://verwaltung.uni-koeln.de/stabsstelle02.1/content/fag/data/chatgpt/index_ger.html)

The lecture and labs will be held in English. Please note that the lecturer is not fluent in German.

## Core coursebook

The core coursebook is available for download and free

Hurst, Allison. (2023): Introduction to Qualitative Research Matters: A Helpful Guide for Undergraduates and Graduate Students in the Social Sciences. Oregon State University. <https://open.oregonstate.education/qualresearchmethods/>

# Course Outline

## Week 1: Philosophy of Social Science and the Logic of Qualitative Inquiry

**Lecture:** Thursday, 23 April

**Lab A:** Thursday, 23 April

**Lab B:** Friday, 24 April

This session introduces the philosophical foundations of qualitative research. We examine ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying qualitative inquiry and contrast them with quantitative approaches. The goal is to clarify what constitutes valid qualitative inference and why qualitative methods are essential for certain types of research questions.

Students will reflect on the kinds of research questions that are best addressed using qualitative methods and begin thinking about how qualitative evidence supports scientific reasoning. Particular attention will be given to how theory, cases, and evidence are connected in qualitative research.

### Required Reading

Hurst, A. (2023). *Qualitative research methods: A helpful guide*. Oregon State University.

<https://open.oregonstate.edu/qualresearchmethods/>

- Chapter 3. A short chapter on epistemology (How do we know what we know?)
- Chapter 21. Conclusion: The value of qualitative research

### Additional Readings

Mahoney, J., & Goertz, G. (2006). A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research. *Political Analysis*, 14(3), 227–249. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/political-analysis/article/tale-of-two-cultures-contrasting-quantitative-and-qualitative-research/74CDE90B427798F4986F0B5039D48C67?utm\\_campaign=shareaholic&utm\\_medium=copy\\_link&utm\\_source=bookmark](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/political-analysis/article/tale-of-two-cultures-contrasting-quantitative-and-qualitative-research/74CDE90B427798F4986F0B5039D48C67?utm_campaign=shareaholic&utm_medium=copy_link&utm_source=bookmark)

King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research* (pp. 14–19). Princeton University Press. [https://perguntasapo.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/kkv\\_1994\\_caps-1-e-3.pdf](https://perguntasapo.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/kkv_1994_caps-1-e-3.pdf)

Nakkeeran, N. (2010). Knowledge, truth, and social reality: An introductory note on qualitative research. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine*, 35(3), 379–381. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0970-0218.69249>

Pryce, J., Spencer, R., & Walsh, J. (2014). Philosophical approaches to qualitative research. In *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research methods* (pp. 81–98). Retrieved from Loyola eCommons: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1109&context=socialwork\\_facpubs](https://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1109&context=socialwork_facpubs)

**Lab content:** Building groups and selecting qualitative data and a qualitative article. Attendance at this week's lab is necessary to join a group. Students will work in these groups throughout the rest of the semester.

## Week 2: Research Design in Qualitative Research

**Lecture:** Thursday, 30 April

**Lab A:** Thursday, 30 April

**Lab B:** Friday, 8 May

This session focuses on how to design a qualitative research project at the Master's level. Topics include formulating research questions, defining units of analysis, bounding cases, matching methods to research questions, designing a feasible pilot study.

Students will learn how to move from an abstract question to a structured research plan. Particular attention will be paid to mechanism-oriented questions and explanatory design.

### **Required Reading:**

Hurst, A. (2023). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Helpful Guide*. Oregon State University.

<https://open.oregonstate.edu/qualresearchmethods/>

- Chapter 2. Research Design
- Chapter 4. Finding a Research Question and Approaches to Qualitative Research
- Chapter 5. Sampling
- Chapter 9. Reviewing the Literature

Additional Readings:

Tenny, S., Brannan, J. M., & Brannan, G. D. (2022). *Qualitative study*. In *StatPearls* [Internet].

StatPearls Publishing. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK470395/>

**Lab content:** *Evaluation of data sources used in the selected article and discussion of research design choices. Review of prepared datasets and options for finding your own data for your project.*

## Week 3: Collecting Qualitative Data

**Lecture:** Thursday, 21 May

**Lab A:** Thursday, 21 May

**Lab B:** Friday, 22 May

This session examines major forms of qualitative data collection, including semi-structured interviews and focus groups, documentary and archival research, participant observation and ethnography, digital and political text sources.

We discuss sampling logic, case selection in data collection, and practical constraints in designing small-N research projects. Students will learn how to identify and justify appropriate data sources for their research questions.

### **Required Reading:**

Hurst, A. (2023). *Qualitative research methods: A helpful guide*. Oregon State University.

<https://open.oregonstate.edu/qualresearchmethods/>

- Chapter 10. Introduction to Data Collection Techniques
- Chapter 11. Interviewing
- Chapter 12. Focus Groups
- Chapter 13. Participant Observation
- Chapter 14. Deep Ethnography
- Chapter 16. Archival and Historical Research

#### Additional Readings:

- Lim, W. M. (2024). What Is Qualitative Research? An Overview and Guidelines. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 33(2), 199-229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264619> (Original work published 2025)
- Ugwu, C. N., & Eze, V. H. U. (2023). Qualitative research. *IDOSR Journal of Computer and Applied Sciences*, 8(1), 20–35. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367221023\\_Qualitative\\_Research](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367221023_Qualitative_Research)
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 695–727). Sage.
- Bailer, S. (2014). Interviews and surveys in legislative research. In S. Martin, T. Saalfeld, & K. W. Strøm (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of legislative studies* (pp. 167–193). Oxford University Press.
- Gerson, K., & Damaske, S. (2020). Constructing an interview guide. In *The science and art of interviewing* (pp. 66–99). Oxford University Press.

**Lab content:** Identifying sources and getting started with MAXQDA will be the focus of the labs. For qualitative data analysis (QDA), you will work with MAXQDA. During the course, you will get from us a free MAXQDA license that is valid for 120 days. This will be enough for working on all assignments. In this lab, you will do the first steps with MAXQDA. Substantively, you will start identifying the sources used in the selected article and try to collect them for your reanalysis of the article.

## Week 4: Analytical Strategies I – Thematic Analysis and Grounded Theory

**Lecture:** Thursday, 11 June

**Lab A:** Thursday, 11 June

**Lab B:** Friday, 12 June

This session introduces core approaches to qualitative data analysis, with a focus on: the logic of qualitative coding, inductive and deductive approaches, thematic analysis, grounded theory method and constant comparison.

We will examine how themes and categories emerge from data and how coding decisions shape interpretation. The role of AI-assisted coding tools will be discussed critically.

#### Required Reading:

Hurst, A. (2023). *Qualitative research methods: A helpful guide*. Oregon State University.

<https://open.oregonstate.education/qualresearchmethods/>

- Chapter 17. Content Analysis
- Chapter 18. Data Analysis and Coding
- Chapter 19. Advanced Codes and Coding

#### Required Reading (AI-Assisted Analysis)

- Zhang, X., et al. (2023). *Redefining qualitative analysis in the AI era: Utilizing ChatGPT for efficient thematic analysis*. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10771>

Additional Readings:

- Charmaz, K., & Thornberg, R. (2021). The pursuit of quality in grounded theory. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 305–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1780357>

**Lab content:** This week's lab focuses on the collection of sources and discussion of qualitative coding. Groups should discuss progress on collecting sources and possible problems and strategies to address them. *Introduction to qualitative coding using AI tools and MAXQDA.*

## Week 5: Analytical Strategies II – Case Studies and Process Tracing

**Lecture:** Thursday, 18 June

**Lab A:** Thursday, 18 June

**Lab B:** Friday, 19 June

This session focuses on qualitative strategies for explanation and causal inference, including: the logic of case studies, case comparison, within-case analysis, process tracing and mechanism-based explanation, evaluating different types of evidence.

Students will learn how to assess whether empirical evidence supports or challenges theoretical claims.

This session focuses on qualitative strategies for explanation and causal inference, including the logic of case studies, case comparison, within-case analysis, process tracing, mechanism-based explanation, and the evaluation of different types of evidence. Students will learn how to assess whether empirical evidence supports or challenges theoretical claims.

### Case Study Readings

- Eckstein, H. (1975). Case study and theory in political science. In F. I. Greenstein & N. W. Polsby (Eds.), *Handbook of political science* (Vol. 7, pp. 79–137). Addison-Wesley.
- Levy, J. S. (2008). Case studies: Types, designs, and logics of inference. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 25(1), 1–18.
- Lijphart, A. (1971). Comparative politics and the comparative method. *American Political Science Review*, 65(3), 682–693.
- Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review*, 98(2), 341–354.
- Rohlfing, I. (2012). *Case studies and causal inference* (Chapter 1). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods* (Chapter 4). Sage.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. In *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine. (Online version available at: <https://groundedtheoryreview.com/2008/11/29/the-constant-comparative-method-of-qualitative-analysis-1/>)

### Optional readings for Use Case Method Applied

- Cairney P and Toomey C. Collaborative Policymaking: a qualitative systematic review of advice for policymakers. *Open Res Europe* 2024, 4:204 <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.18440.1>

- Riordan, R. (2025). *A case study of judicial-legislative interactions via the Digital Services Act*. *European Papers*, 10, 259–291. <https://doi.org/10.15166/2499-8249/832>
- García, B. (2018). *Issue framing and institutional constraints in EU agenda-setting*. *Journal of Contemporary European Research* (Open Access). <https://www.jcer.net/index.php/jcer/article/view/833/790>
- Wolfs, W., & Veldhuis, J. J. (2023). Regulating social media through self-regulation: a process-tracing case study of the European Commission and Facebook. *Political Research Exchange*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2474736X.2023.2182696>
- Rasmussen, M. K. (2007). Another Side of the Story: A Qualitative Case Study of Voting Behaviour in the European Parliament. *Politics*, 28(1), 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9256.2007.00305.x> (Original work published 2008)

### Process Tracing Readings

- Bennett, A., & Checkel, J. T. (2014). Process tracing: From methodological roots to best practices. In A. Bennett & J. T. Checkel (Eds.), *Process tracing in the social sciences: From metaphor to analytic tool* (pp. 1–37). Cambridge University Press.
- Trampusch, C., & Palier, B. (2016). Between X and Y: How process tracing contributes to opening the black box of causality. *New Political Economy*, 21(5), 437–454.
- Beach, D., & Pedersen, R. B. (2013). *Process-tracing methods: Foundations and guidelines* (Chapter 3, pp. 23–44). University of Michigan Press.
- Collier, D. (2011). Understanding process tracing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 44(4), 823–830. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096511001429>

### Optional Readings for Process Tracing Applied

- Fairfield, T., & Garay, C. (2017). Redistribution under the right in Latin America: Electoral competition and organized actors in policymaking. *Comparative Political Studies*, 50(4), 1871–1906. (Appendix recommended.)
- Löblová, O. (2018). When epistemic communities fail: Exploring the mechanism of policy influence. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(1), 160–189.
- Wright, C. F. (2015). Why do states adopt liberal immigration policies? The policymaking dynamics of skilled visa reform in Australia. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(2), 306–328.

**Lab content:** The lab will focus on interpreting evidence for the selected empirical article. Following the discussion in the lab, you will practice the interpretation of evidence in your selected article. Goal: reevaluate the interpretation of all evidence that you have identified

## Week 6: Generalization, Transparency, & Ethics in Qualitative Research

**Lecture:** Thursday, 25 June

**Lab A:** Thursday, 25 June

**Lab B:** Friday, 26 June

The final substantive session addresses broader methodological concerns: generalization in small-N research, validity and inference, research transparency and documentation, ethical considerations and data protection, responsible use of AI tools.

Students will reflect on how qualitative research can meet standards of scientific rigor while remaining ethically sound.

### Required Readings:

Hurst, A. (2023). *Qualitative research methods: A helpful guide*. Oregon State University.

<https://open.oregonstate.education/qualresearchmethods/>

- Chapter 6. Reflexivity
- Chapter 7. Ethics
- Chapter 8. Working with Institutional Review Boards

### Additional Readings:

- Lieberman, S. (1991). Small N's and big conclusions: An examination of the reasoning in comparative studies based on a small number of cases. *Social Forces*, 70(2), 307–320.
- Elman, C., Kapiszewski, D., & Lupia, A. (2018). Transparent social inquiry: Implications for political science. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21(1), 29–47.

**Lab content:** Discussion of how generalization is addressed in your selected article. Update of groups on coding: Groups can share the progress that they made, problems that were confronted and strategies for addressing those problems + Information on presentations next week: In the final lecture (see below), each group should present its reanalysis of the selected data in a presentation. In this lab session, guidelines for designing the presentations will be discussed.

## Week 7: Presentations

**Lecture:** Thursday, 16 July

**Lab A:** Thursday, 16 July

**Lab B:** Friday, 17 July

Groups will present the combined results of their written assignments.

**Lab content:** Finalize and share the coding for your article, group presentations.

## Applied Case Study Example: The QESB Research Program

Qualitative research often appears in published form as a polished final product. What is not always visible is the sequence of decisions, revisions, analytical shifts, and methodological trade-offs that occur behind the scenes. It can therefore be difficult for students to understand how researchers actually move from an initial research design to data collection, coding, interpretation, and publication.

The following set of readings traces my own qualitative research program across multiple stages of development. Taken together, these publications provide insight into how research questions are formulated, how coding strategies evolve, how analytical approaches are refined, and how findings are ultimately structured into a peer-reviewed article. The aim is not to present a single “correct” model of qualitative research, but to make visible the iterative and decision-driven nature of the research process. Throughout the semester, these readings will serve as a methodological companion to your own pilot project. They are intended to help you see how qualitative research develops over time and how methodological choices shape substantive conclusions.

I am providing access to all the articles in a dedicated Dropbox folder for your use.

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fo/wn9o48vze5w5bgb9ev8hz/AJQNN6MD2bfZrpXrcotjGkQ?rlkey=nzxkgg1fzle680qkr0s9ms57y&st=hcgwx8fd&dl=0>

## **Week 2 – Research Design**

Winters, K., & Carvalho, E. (2013). *The qualitative election study of Britain: Qualitative research using focus groups*. In P. Brindle (Ed.), *SAGE Cases in Methodology*. London: SAGE Publications.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/978144627305013509945>

This chapter illustrates how a qualitative research project is designed, including research questions, case definition, sampling strategy, and ethical considerations.

## **Week 4 – Conceptualization and Coding (Grounded Theory)**

Carvalho, E., & Winters, K. (2013). *The grounded theory method: Popular perceptions of party leaders during the 2010 British general election*. In *SAGE Research Methods Cases*. SAGE Publications.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/978144627305013528819>

This chapter demonstrates the application of grounded theory to qualitative political data and shows how coding schemes are developed, refined, and justified.

## **Week 5 – Analytical Strategy and Narrative Analysis**

Winters, K. (2019). *Using narrative analysis on qualitative data to identify types of voters*. In *SAGE Research Methods Cases Part 2*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526476821>

This chapter illustrates how analytical strategy can evolve beyond initial coding and how qualitative methods can be layered to deepen interpretation.

## **Week 6 – From Analysis to Peer-Reviewed Publication**

Carvalho, E., & Winters, K. (2014). “‘I went with what I always do...’: A qualitative analysis of ‘Cleggmania’ and vote choice in the 2010 British General Election.” *Parliamentary Affairs*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gst050>

This article demonstrates how qualitative findings are structured into a publishable argument and how methodological choices are translated into peer-reviewed scholarship.