



Department of
Methodology

MY410

**Fundamentals of Research Design
for International Development**

Michaelmas Term 2021

Department of Methodology
London School of Economics and Political Science

Course Description

This course introduces MSc students in the Department of International Development to theoretical and practical foundations of social science research design. It is neither qualitative nor quantitative in focus, but rather is concerned with core interdisciplinary principles of research design that span disciplinary and methodological traditions.

Grounded in examples from International Development research, the course is centred on exploring principles of research design for different types of research questions. The course will provide a platform for students to consider a range of research design options, as well as methodological techniques. It is intended to help students become more informed and critical readers of social scientific, and specifically International Development, research. It is also intended to help students appreciate the various trade-offs entailed in research design choices so that they can make decisions about which to adopt in their own dissertations. By the end of the course, students will be familiar with a variety of research design options and will be better equipped to embark on their own research projects. The course is not designed to provide students with all the skills and techniques they need, i.e., it is not an explicitly “methods” course, but it will familiarise students with the trade-offs involved in adopting particular approaches and incorporating various forms of evidence and information into their dissertations. The course therefore has the dual aim of helping students become both critical readers and critical producers of International Development research. In doing so, it should make positive contributions to students’ learning experience both in their dissertation process, and in other courses they take in ID (and elsewhere at LSE).

The teaching on the course is premised on the idea that how we do research ultimately depends on the nature of the particular research question and the type and kinds of evidence that are available. There are strengths, weaknesses, and trade-offs to most of the decisions we make when planning and doing research. As the weeks of the course progress, the strengths and weaknesses, and thus the implicit trade-offs, of the research designs we consider will vary. Our goal is for students to better understand the consequences of these research design decisions, both in the published research that they read, and that they will need to make in their own research.

Teaching Staff

Convenor & Lecturer:

Dr Eleanor Power (COL.8.03, e.a.power@lse.ac.uk, sign up for office hours on Student Hub, Thursdays 10:00-12:00)

Class Teachers:

Dr Sonja Marzi (CON.6.10, S.Marzi@lse.ac.uk, sign up for office hours on Student Hub, Tuesdays 17:30-19:30)

Dr Chao-yo Cheng (CON.6.18A, C.Cheng23@lse.ac.uk, sign up for office hours on Student Hub, Tuesdays 12:00-14:00)

Dr Ivan Deschaneaux (CON.6.10, I.Deschaneaux@lse.ac.uk, sign up for office hours on Student Hub, Mondays 10:00-12:00)

Dr Saloni Atal (S.Atal@lse.ac.uk, sign up for office hours on Student Hub, Wednesdays 15:30-16:30 and Thursdays 15:30-16:30)

Administrator:

Lucia Pedrioli (COL.8.07, methodology.admin@lse.ac.uk)

Your study schedule

Week	Recorded mini-lectures Watch between Mon-Thurs:	Online lecture discussion Friday 9:30am OR Friday 3pm	Prepare for Seminar (all materials on Moodle)	Participate in your Seminar
1	Introduction: MY410 & good research design	Introductions and cohort-building	Sign up to a seminar group on LSE for You. Seminars start in week 2.	None this week!
2	From research question to research design	'What is your epistemology?'	Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mason: 4 types of puzzles 4 abstracts 	Research puzzles
3	The relationship between theory and data	'How to read a paper'	Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sumner & Tribe article 	Research Questions & Research Design
4	Designing desk-based research	Asking 'desk-based' research questions	Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nunn article Meyer chapter 	Theory and data
5	Case studies	A case of what?	Draft <ul style="list-style-type: none"> topic for your formative assignment 	Doing an annotated bibliography
6	Reading week: no lecture or seminars			
7	Quantitative research designs: Inference and causality	Highs and lows of RCTs	Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilkinson & Fairhead article 	Case studies
8	Operationalisation and measurement	Measurement and operationalisation for Covid-19	Readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carlitz article 	Quantitative research designs
9	Collecting primary qualitative data	Collecting qualitative data	Reflect on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MPI Infographic 	Operationalisation & measurement
10	Analysing qualitative data	Analysing qualitative data	Reading <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moreno article 	Doing physically distanced qualitative research
11	Ethics, Reflexivity & Writing	Reflexivity and writing	Reading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MY410 Research Proposal template Sample proposals 	Research proposals

Modes of teaching and learning

Your weekly study for this course has four components:

1. Recorded mini-lectures (asynchronous, online, weeks 1-5 and 7-11)

Between Monday and Thursday each week you should view the set of mini-lectures, available on the MY410 Moodle page. You should reflect on the issues raised, questions asked and/or tasks set, in preparation for the online discussion with the lecturer. Note that some of these mini-lectures will be by Dr. Flora Cornish, who has previously taught on this course, but is on leave for MT 2021-2022.

2. Lecture discussion sessions (synchronous, online, weeks 1-5 and 7-11)

Lecture discussion sessions (called 'lectures' on your LSE timetable) are timetabled on a Friday. There are 2 sessions, to allow for people in different time zones to attend, but the second is a repeat of the first, so you should only attend one of these sessions. These are interactive sessions, with opportunities to ask questions about the recorded lecture material, and take part in interactive learning activities related to the lecture material.

3. Seminar preparation (individual, in your own time, or with a peer study group)

Each week, there is some preparation to do for seminars. Please allow yourself time to read the paper or undertake the preparation we have set, as seminars are active learning opportunities which depend on you being prepared.

4. Seminars (weeks 2-5 and 7-11)

There are many seminar groups available, scheduled at different times. You should sign up for a seminar group that fits your timetable on [LSE for You](#). We plan on having two seminars start online, to accommodate students who are arriving in London after the start of term. If you know you will be starting remote, please sign up for one of these seminar groups. Our expectation is that these seminar groups will move to their allocated classroom after the first few weeks of term.

You are expected to attend the same seminar group every week. If you need to officially change groups for whatever reason, please email methodology.admin@lse.ac.uk with your request. It is better for students and teachers to keep movement to a minimum, but we know that life happens. If you need to temporarily move groups (for just one week or two), you may join one of the other groups. Please identify a seminar that suits you, and email both your seminar teacher and the teacher of the group you wish to join, to let them know.

Learning outcomes

- Articulate the strengths, weaknesses, and trade-offs associated with the diversity of research designs used in International Development research
- Critically appraise published research in International Development
- Produce a robust research design and proposal for a dissertation-scale study

Teaching and learning under unpredictable pandemic conditions

Students and teachers are courageously approaching an academic year with many unknowns and unfamiliar challenges. We have prepared ourselves for different and sometimes disrupted social connection between

teachers and students, and among students. We have re-designed the delivery of the course to work well under restrictions necessitated by the pandemic, and we are all adapting to different ways of teaching and learning. We know we will all need to exercise flexibility, kindness and understanding. We will need to make extra efforts to get to know each other across relatively new platforms, in Zoom lecture discussions, in seminar classrooms, and possibly across time zones.

Stability and flexibility

As far as possible, we aim to keep the learning experience stable and predictable, and to follow the outline of your study schedule and modes of teaching and learning above. However, it is possible that, due to changes in public health advice, or the situation of students, some variation to teaching and learning activities may be required, such as moving between online and in-person modalities. If changes are required, we will notify you as early as we can.

Where possible, students should remain with the seminar group they join in week 2. But we recognise that circumstances may change, and where possible, we will be flexible. For any questions about seminar sign-up or if you need to move seminar group, please email methodology-admin@lse.ac.uk, making sure you mention the course code MY410 in your email.

Safety on campus

For students who are attending on-campus seminars, we will work with you to minimize risk. Staff follow LSE health and safety guidance, including guidance about face-coverings, physical distancing, self-monitoring for symptoms, testing, self-isolating if necessary, and reporting a COVID-19 positive test to the School. Students should please read the LSE's [advice guidance on the coronavirus](#). Most importantly, please follow all health and safety advice to minimize your own risk and the risk to others. If you experience any Covid-19 symptoms, you should immediately self-isolate, report your symptoms to [LSE Trace](#), inform your department contact, and call 111 or go to [NHS 111 online](#) for advice. Further details are provided in the student code. If you have to self-isolate, we will make sure that you can continue to participate fully in the course remotely. If your teacher has to self-isolate or becomes unwell, we will continue to provide you with teaching, but the mode of delivery may have to be flexible.

Course forum

We use a course forum on the Moodle page, to clarify specific questions about the course and to discuss the course content. If you have queries about the structure or logistics of the course, please post a question there. If you have a question, there are probably other students who have the same question too! If you can answer a fellow student's question, please do. We will also use the forum for discussion about the lecture material and content.

Seminar preparation

The series of seminars is designed to advance students' skills as critical readers and critical producers of research. These skills will be assessed in the assignments due for this course. The "critical reader" skills will be very helpful in other courses where critical assessment of literature is important. Students will draw again on both sets of skills when they produce their dissertations.

Seminars are active learning spaces, which depend upon students doing the prescribed preparation in advance and participating actively in the seminar discussions and workshop activities. Across the series, students will participate in whole-class discussion, small group discussions, research skills practice, discussion of their own work, critical assessment of published research, and constructively critical assessments of peers' work. Students will learn and practice the skills assessed in the course assignments.

Seminar preparation will be flagged at the end of each lecture, and links on Moodle will take you to the readings/preparation. Please make sure you come to seminars prepared!

Reading list

Under each lecture topic we list 1-2 methodological readings that cover fundamental issues addressed in the lecture. These are not required readings but are chosen to offer further grounding for the key themes we cover. For most seminars, there is required reading. These readings are usually not readings about methodology but are examples of research studies which allow us to examine how scholars work through the key issues discussed in the lecture in their papers. All papers are available on via the LSE e-library and via the MY410 Moodle page. Additional readings relevant to each lecture topic are listed at the end of this syllabus, for those who wish to deepen their understanding in a particular area.

Assessment

MY410 develops students' fundamental research skills as critical readers and critical producers of research, and the assessments are designed accordingly. Full and detailed instructions are given in Instructions documents on the Moodle page.

Assessment timeframe

MT Week 6	4pm Thursday 4 th November 2021	Formative assignment Building a research question from a literature review
MT Week 9	4pm Thursday 25 th November 2021	Feedback on formative assignment
MT Week 11	4pm Thursday 9 th December 2021	Summative Assignment 1 Annotated Bibliography
LT Week 3	4pm Thursday 3 rd February 2022	Feedback on Summative Assignment 1
LT Week 7	4pm Thursday 3 rd March 2022	Summative Assignment 2 Research Proposal
LT Week 11	4pm Thursday 31 st March 2022	Feedback on Summative Assignment 2

Formative assignment: Building a research question from a literature review (500 words)

Due: 4pm Thursday 4th November 2021 (MT week 6)

The formative assignment begins your preparation for both of your summative assignments, one of which is an Annotated Bibliography and the other, a Research Proposal. At the early stages of a research design, we bring together a review of the literature, our substantive knowledge, and our hunches, to narrow down a topic and articulate a research question. In this formative assignment, we ask you to review three research articles in your area of interest, and on the basis of that review, articulate a possible research question.

The seminar in week 5 will discuss identifying research topics and doing Annotated Bibliographies and give you an opportunity to discuss your topic and research question. You will receive feedback on your formative assignment by the end of week 9.

Summative assignment 1 (33%): Annotated bibliography (1500 words)

Due: 4pm Thursday 9th December 2021 (MT week 11)

In writing an Annotated Bibliography, you demonstrate the critical reading skills which equip you to be sophisticated and critical readers of international development research. You will choose your own topic and research question for the Annotated Bibliography and identify 3 relevant readings to write about. It may be a good idea to tackle the topic which you will address in your dissertation but doing so is entirely optional.

Summative assignment 2 (67%): Research proposal (1500 words)

Due: 4pm Thursday 3rd March 2022 (LT week 7)

This assignment sharpens students' skills as critical producers of international development research. Students write a research proposal, which sets out a feasible research design to answer their research question. Students choose their own research topic and research question, and design a study which could feasibly be conducted within the constraints of a Masters dissertation. The proposal may serve as the basis of the proposal for the DV410 dissertation, or it may be on a separate topic – there is no expectation or pressure either way. A template is provided, outlining the material expected in each section of the proposal.

Submission

All assignments must be submitted via Moodle. No printed copies are required.

Format: A Microsoft Word or PDF document, with numbered pages. Summative assignments are marked anonymously. For summative assignments, please name your file using the format MY410-GROUPY-ZZZZZ. For example, if you are in MY410 Seminar group 2, and your candidate number is 98765, you should title your file MY410-GROUP2-98765.

Extensions

We hope students will have a smooth trajectory through the course and its deadlines as far as possible but understand that some of you may need extensions. Please see the Department of Methodology [Coursework submission guidelines](#) for full details on our policy regarding extensions. Please read it carefully before submitting a request to understand the conditions under which an extension can be granted, and what information you need to include in your request. Two weeks is usually the maximum length of an extension. To request an extension, you should complete the [LSE Extension Request form](#) and submit it to the course convenor, Dr Eleanor Power (e.a.power@lse.ac.uk).

Work submitted for MY410 and relationship to MSc Dissertations

At the LSE, students are not normally permitted to resubmit the same work for multiple assessments (e.g., as assessed essays in two different courses). However, the rules on “self-plagiarism” make a specific allowance for the MSc dissertation project:

- 1. Students should also take care in the use of their own previous work. A piece of work may only be submitted for assessment once either to the LSE or elsewhere. Submitting the same work twice will be regarded as an offence of 'self-plagiarism' and will be considered under these Regulations. However, earlier essay work may be used as an element of a dissertation, provided that the amount of earlier work used is acceptable to the department and the work is properly referenced. Students wanting to use earlier work must seek clarification from the relevant department or institute.*

Please read the full plagiarism policy of the LSE at the following URL, if you have not done so previously:

<https://info.lse.ac.uk/Staff/Divisions/Academic-Registrars-Division/Teaching-Quality-Assurance-and-Review-Office/Assets/Documents/Calendar/RegulationsAssessmentOffences-Plagiarism.pdf>

Because MY410 is conceptualised and designed as a course that can build towards your dissertations, the department has agreed that ideas developed in the MY410 assignments can be incorporated into your MSc dissertation, for example by using elements from the proposal as the basis for the methods or research strategy section, or by using the critical ideas developed in the annotated bibliography for the literature review section. A dissertation, however, is a very different type of document to these assignments, and if you are re-purposing material from the assignments for the dissertation, it will need to be carefully revised to fit with the flow of the dissertation.

Weekly teaching schedule

Week 1 – Introduction: MY410 & good research design

This lecture introduces the aims, objectives and structure of the course. It also introduces the forms of assessment used in the course and explains how they are designed to advance students' research skills in ways that will support their independent research for other courses including the dissertation.

We introduce the underpinning philosophy of this course, which is that any research topic can be addressed with a number of different, valid, research designs. The skill of research design is in being aware of the opportunities, strengths and weaknesses presented by a research design and making an informed choice. There is no absolutely 'best' methodology, but a good research design depends on a strong coherent logic between the issue, the theory, the research questions and the methodology. We will outline a general research design framework that guides the course and structures students' critical interrogation of research articles, and their design of their own research studies.

Key reading

- Sumner and Tribe (2008) *International development studies*, "What is "rigour" in development studies?" Ch. 5, pp. 99-127
- Mason, J. (2002). [*Qualitative researching*](#) (2nd ed.). London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications. (Chapter 1)

Week 2 – From research question to research design

In this lecture, we will consider how go about determining what sort of research design is appropriate for a research topic and question. Different questions, building on different types of theory, will call for certain methods and not others. Good methodological fit occurs when there is a clear congruence between theory, question, and method. We will discuss which sorts of studies demonstrate such fit and present a broad framework for determining which research methods fit with your research question.

Key reading

- Crotty, M. (2003). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage. Chapter 1.

Week 3 – The relationship between theory and data

Doing research implies a commitment to learning from evidence. At the same time, the things we observe in the evidence do not speak for themselves but are important or interesting in relation to our prior expectations or theories. This lecture introduces approaches to thinking about the relationship between theory and data in social science research and explores these approaches from both positivist and non-positivist positions. Attention is paid to understanding a range of approaches from the more inductive (bottom up, data-driven), to the more deductive (theory-driven).

There are a range of theory-data relations that a researcher might encounter or use. In this lecture we consider strategies such as using theory to structure an answer to a substantive problem, offering a critique or problematization of a theory, or making an incremental advance to a theory. The lecture will use examples to explore the range of positions adopted in social science research, with a particular focus on research design considerations.

Key reading

- Sumner and Tribe (2008) *International development studies*, “What is the “big picture” in development studies?” Ch. 4, pp. 81-98

Week 4 – Designing desk-based research

This lecture introduces ways of making use of the wealth of existing evidence in international development to answer new research questions and research problems, also known as 'desk-based research'. We may use desk-based research to bring together multiple sources to weigh evidence for and against specific hypotheses or theories. We might construct a case study, investigating or testing a particular theory. We might critically analyse particular development interventions or policies against a set of criteria or a specific theoretical framework. We could conduct a meta-analysis, systematic review, or other study of the literature.

Just like primary empirical studies, desk-based studies also require a research design. We need to justify our selection of materials and our approach to their analysis and convince the reader that the approach taken is capable of providing a meaningful answer to the research question. And, conversely, empirical studies also have a desk-based component, involving a systematic and critical search of the literature. The lecture introduces the key concerns for each of these aspects of desk-based research.

Key reading

- Barrientos (2007) "Interrogating information through a literature study" in Thomas, A., & Mohan, G. *Research skills for policy and development: how to find out fast*. Ch. 5, pp. 113-134.

Week 5 – Case studies

In the introduction to his textbook on case studies, the political scientist and case study methodologist John Gerring states the following:

Apparently, the methodological status of the case study is still highly suspect. Even among its defenders there is confusion over the virtues and vices of this ambiguous research design... This leads to a paradox: although much of what we know about the empirical world has been generated by case studies, and case studies continue to constitute a large proportion of the work generated by the social science disciplines..., the case study method is generally unappreciated – arguably, because it is poorly understood. (Gerring 2007: 7-8)

In this lecture, we will consider what constitutes a case study, where case studies come from, what they are useful for, and their limitations. We will consider a variety of approaches to designing and conducting case studies, from single-n to small-n comparative designs and including “case-oriented” and “variable-oriented” approaches. We will especially focus on how we ensure that a case study speaks to a broader literature, by asking the question 'of what is this a case?'

Key reading

- Lund, C. (2014). Of what is this a case?: analytical movements in qualitative social science research. *Human Organization*, 73(3), 224–234.

Week 6 – Reading week

No lecture

Week 7 – Quantitative research designs: Inference and causality

This lecture will provide an overview of different quantitative approaches to social scientific research questions. Such approaches are generally deductive, using established theory to make specific hypotheses, which are then tested. These are generally studies which aim to make causal claims about social phenomena. As such, we will also discuss broader issues of inference and causality. While we may aspire to causal inference, this is often difficult to achieve. We will briefly introduce different methods that variably manage to establish causality, noting the trade-offs entailed in each, such as experiments, instrumental variables, matching, and regression. The lecture is meant not as a full primer in methods of causal inference, but rather as a broader discussion of why researchers go to such lengths to try to convincingly establish causal relationships.

Key reading

- Mahoney, J., & Goertz, G. (2006). A tale of two cultures: Contrasting quantitative and qualitative research. *Political Analysis*, 14(3), 227–249.
- King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: scientific inference in qualitative research*. “Descriptive Inference” and “Causality and Causal Inference” Chs. 2-3, pp. 34-114.

Week 8 – Operationalization and measurement

In conducting empirical research, we need to turn our general concepts of interest (e.g., poverty, empowerment) into something concrete that can be observed, recorded and/or measured. In some cases, concepts are already narrowly defined and clear measures exist (e.g., what is a country's infant mortality rate or life expectancy?). However, in other cases, we are interested in broader and more difficult to measure concepts (e.g., how developed is a country? how "universal" is healthcare provision?).

This week outlines the logic of conceptualisation, operationalization and measurement, based on examples from a range of International Development research. We discuss benchmarks by which to assess and compare the resulting measures of social concepts. We reflect critically on the ways in which our conceptual definition, and relative ease of measurement, can shape how and which research is done.

Key reading

- Laderchi, C. R., Saith, R., & Stewart, F. (2003). Does it matter that we do not agree on the definition of poverty? A comparison of four approaches. *Oxford Development Studies*, 31(3), 243–274.

Week 9 – Collecting primary qualitative data

We typically employ qualitative research designs when we want to explore how issues manifest and appear from the perspectives of, or within the everyday lives of, our research participants. Why do people not make use of the latrines provided by a massive development project? How is scarcity and excess of water produced through everyday politics along the Nile?

Qualitative research usually involves generating new primary data through intensive engagement with research participants. In-depth interviews, focus groups, and participant observation are three of the most widely used qualitative research strategies. Interviews and focus groups involve probing research participants for their views, experiences, perspectives, beliefs or accounts. Participant observation starts from the premise that one's ability to understand the beliefs and practices of others requires actually sharing in their everyday experiences and in their larger social context. Such a focus on everyday practice can give particular insight into the informal, the unspoken, and the unintended.

We discuss the core research design concerns for these qualitative methods, primarily 'sampling', and the tools and guides we use to structure our data generation ('topic guides', 'observation frameworks'). We consider examples that use qualitative research as their sole source of evidence, and ones which combine qualitative and quantitative methods.

Key readings

- Mason (2002), "Qualitative interviewing: Asking, listening, and interpreting" in May (ed.) *Qualitative Research in Action*, pp. 226-241
- Gottlieb (2006) "Ethnographic Methods" in Perecman and Curran (eds.) *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research*, ch. 3, pp. 47-68

Week 10 - Analysing qualitative data

"Help, I am drowning in data!" is a common response to the realisation that we have gathered a rich dataset of interview or focus group transcripts, fieldnotes, workshop recordings, or documents, and need to somehow bring some order to them. The process of qualitative data analysis is a way of bringing order and meaning to a body of unstructured data, so that we are in a position to answer our research questions.

This lecture will introduce contrasting approaches to analysing qualitative data. Thematic analysis is the predominant approach to synthesising the meanings in textual data, using a systematic process of coding and identifying underlying themes or patterns. Discourse analysis is a more critical and interpretive approach to analysis, which investigates how language constructs subjects and objects in ways that have important effects in the world.

Key readings

- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001) Thematic Networks: An Analytic Tool for Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3): 385-405.
- Dunn, K. C., & Neumann, I. B. (2016). Discourse analysis in the social sciences. Undertaking discourse analysis for social research, 1-16.

Week 11– Ethics, reflexivity and writing

This lecture will discuss a range of ethical issues important to international development research. Crucially, the ethical implications of research need to be considered not only in the course of collecting and analysing data but also at the design and planning stage. Reflexivity - considering and accounting for the researcher's own positionality in relation to the research, including the conceptualisation of the research, the field, research participants, relevant interests and implications of the research - is key. The first half of this lecture will consider critical issues of ethics and positionality for students to consider as they plan their own research projects.

In the second half of the lecture we will turn to practical issues regarding writing-up research. This will include thinking about the appropriate structure and style of academic writing, the purposes of citation and reviewing the literature, the essential components of reporting one's research methodology, the audience you should have in mind while writing, contextualising your contribution, and strategies for dealing with problems you might experience in the course of your research. This discussion will be framed in relation to the second summative assignment which is due at the start of Summer Term.

Key reading

- Sumner and Tribe (2008) *International development studies*, "What is the purpose of development studies?" Ch. 2, pp. 37-46
- Morse (2006) "Writing an Effective Research Report or Dissertation" in Desai, V., & Potter, R. B. *Doing development research*. Ch. 30, pp. 297-309

Additional Resources

General references available online through LSE:

- Desai, V., & Potter, R. B. (2006). *Doing development research*. London: SAGE.
- Gerring, J. (2017). *Case study research: principles and practices* (Second edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- King, G., Keohane, R. O., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Laws, S., Harper, C., & Marcus, R. (2003). *Research for development: a practical guide*. London: SAGE.
- Lipton, P. (2004). *Inference to the best explanation* (2nd ed.). London; New York, London: Routledge, Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.
- May, T. (2002). *Qualitative research in action*. London: SAGE.
- Perecman, E., & Curran, S. R. (Eds.). (2006). *A handbook for social science field research: essays & bibliographic sources on research design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shaffer, P. (2013). *Q-squared: combining qualitative and quantitative approaches in poverty analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skovdal, M., & Cornish, F. (2015). *Qualitative research for development: a guide for practitioners*. Rugby: Practical Action Publishing.
- Sumner, A., & Tribe, M. (2008). *International development studies: theories and methods in research and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Special Issues:

- Jerven, M., & Johnston, D. (2015). Statistical tragedy in Africa? Evaluating the Data Base for African Economic Development. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 51(2), 111–115.
 - Introduction to a special issue of the journal, all on questions of measurement and development in Africa
- Kanbur, R., & Shaffer, P. (2007). Epistemology, normative theory and poverty analysis: implications for Q-squared in practice. *World Development*, 35(2), 183–196.
 - Introduction to special issue on “Experiences of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches in Poverty Analysis”
- Mosley, P. (2012). Introduction. *Journal of International Development*. 24, S1-S2.
 - Introduction to special issue on “Poverty, Financial Inclusion and Livelihood Strategies”
- Mowat, R., Subramanian, S. V., & Kawachi, I. (2018). Randomized controlled trials and evidence-based policy: A multidisciplinary dialogue. *Social Science & Medicine*, 210, 1.
 - Introduction to special issue.
- Storeng, K. T., & Mishra, A. (2014). Politics and practices of global health: Critical ethnographies of health systems. *Global Public Health*, 9(8), 858–864.
 - Introduction to special issue on “Critical Ethnographies of Health Systems Policies and Practices”

Other references (not available online):

- Adams, V. (2016). *Metrics: what counts in global health*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Blanche, M. T., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Research in practice: applied methods for the social sciences*. Juta and Company Ltd.
- Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods* (Fifth edition.). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Cerwonka, A., & Malkki, L. H. (2007). *Improvising theory: process and temporality in ethnographic fieldwork*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data: complementary research strategies*. Thousand Oaks. London: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (Fourth edition, international student edition.). Los Angeles, Calif.: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches* (Fourth edition. International Student Edition.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.
- de Vaus, D. (2001). *Research design in social research*. SAGE.
- Denscombe, M. (2007). *The good research guide: for small-scale social research projects* (3rd ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Denscombe, M. (2010). *Ground rules for social research: guidelines for good practice* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif., London: Sage Publications.
- Fife, W. (2005). *Doing fieldwork: ethnographic methods for research in developing countries and beyond*. Springer.
- Gilbert, G. N. (2008). *Researching social life* (3rd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Grbich, C. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: an introduction* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Lewis, D., & Mosse, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Development brokers and translators: the ethnography of aid and agencies*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching* (2nd ed.). London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Mukherjee, C., White, H., & Wuyts, M. E. (1998). *Econometrics and data analysis for developing countries*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., McNaughton Nicholls, C., & Ormston, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers* (Second edition). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Robson, C., & McCartan, K. (2016). *Real world research: a resource for users of social research methods in applied settings* (Fourth Edition.). Chichester, West Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley.
- Thomas, A., & Mohan, G. (2007). *Research skills for policy and development: how to find out fast*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Thomas, A., Chataway, J., & Wuyts, M. (1998). *Finding out fast: investigative skills for policy and development*. London; Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications in association with the Open University.
- Vayda, A. P., & Walters, B. B. (2011). *Causal explanation for social scientists: a reader*. Lanham, Md.: AltaMira Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods* (Fifth edition.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.

Extra readings for Week 2 - From research question to research design

- Mayan, M. (2009). Chapter 4, Research Question and Sampling. In M. J. Mayan (Ed.), *Essentials in qualitative inquiry*: Vol. Qualitative essentials (pp. 57–65). [ebook available via LSE library]
- Silverman, D. (2013). Chapter 6. Formulating a research question. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Doing qualitative research* (Fourth edition, pp. 79–102). [ebook available]

Extra readings for Week 3 - The relationship between theory and data

- Battilana, J., & Dorado, S. (2010). Building sustainable hybrid organizations: the case of commercial microfinance organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1419–1440.
- Fife, W. (2005) *Doing fieldwork: ethnographic methods for research in developing countries and beyond*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp 139-147.
- Wilson, H. S., Hutchinson, S. A., & Holzemer, W. L. (2002). Reconciling incompatibilities: a grounded theory of HIV medication adherence and symptom management. *Qualitative Health Research*, 12(10), 1309–1322.

Extra Readings for Week 4 - Designing desk-based research

- Araral, E., & Wang, Y. (2013). Water governance 2.0: a review and second generation research agenda. *Water Resources Management*, 27(11), 3945-3957.
- Bakker, K., Kooy, M., Shofiani, N. E., & Martijn, E.-J. (2008). Governance failure: rethinking the institutional dimensions of urban water supply to poor households. *World Development*, 36(10), 1891–1915.
- Cornwall, A., & Brock, K. (2005). What do buzzwords do for development policy? a critical look at 'participation', 'empowerment' and 'poverty reduction.' *Third World Quarterly*, 26(7), 1043–1060.
- Dixon-Woods, M., Cavers, D., Agarwal, S., Annandale, E., Arthur, A., Harvey, J. & Riley, R. (2006). Conducting a critical interpretive synthesis of the literature on access to healthcare by vulnerable groups. *BMC medical research methodology*, 6(1), 35.
- Donner, J. (2008) 'Research Approaches to Mobile Use in the Developing World: A Review of the Literature', *Information Society*, 24(3), pp. 140–159.
- Fox, J. A. (2015) 'Social Accountability: What Does the Evidence Really Say?', *World Development*, 72, pp. 346–361.
- Gaventa, J. and McGee, R. (2013) 'The Impact of Transparency and Accountability Initiatives', *Development Policy Review*, 31(s1), pp. s3–s28.
- Laws, S., Harper, C., & Marcus, R. (2003). *Research for development: a practical guide*. London: SAGE. Ch 12, pp. 213-220.
- McCoy, D. C., Hall, J. A. and Ridge, M. (2012) 'A systematic review of the literature for evidence on health facility committees in low- and middle-income countries', *Health Policy and Planning*, 27(6), pp. 449–466
- Mercer, C. (2002). NGOs, civil society and democratization: a critical review of the literature. *Progress in development studies*, 2(1), 5-22.
- Meth and Williams (2006) "Literature Reviews and Bibliographic Searches" in Desai, V., & Potter, R. B. *Doing development research*. Ch. 22, pp. 209-221.
- Molyneux, S. *et al.* (2012) 'Community accountability at peripheral health facilities: a review of the empirical literature and development of a conceptual framework', *Health Policy and Planning*, 27(7), pp. 541–554.
- Morvant-Roux, S., Guérin, I., Roesch, M., & Moisseron, J.-Y. (2014). Adding value to randomization with qualitative analysis: the case of microcredit in rural Morocco. *World Development*, 56, 302–312.
- Rao, V., Ananthpur, K., & Malik, K. (2017). The anatomy of failure: an ethnography of a randomized trial to deepen democracy in rural India. *World Development*, 99, 481–497.
- Steinert, J. I., Zenker, J., Filipiak, U., Movsisyan, A., Cluver, L. D., & Shenderovich, Y. (2018). Do saving promotion interventions increase household savings, consumption, and investments in Sub-Saharan Africa? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World Development*, 104, 238–256.

Extra Readings for Week 5 - Case studies

- Gerlach, E., & Franceys, R. (2010). Regulating water services for all in developing economies. *World Development*, 38(9), 1229–1240.
- Muñoz, I., Paredes, M., & Thorp, R. (2007). Group inequalities and the nature and power of collective action: case studies from Peru. *World Development*, 35(11), 1929–1946.
- Rudra, N. (2011). Openness and the politics of potable water. *Comparative Political Studies*, 44(6), 771–803.

Extra Readings for Week 7 - Quantitative research designs: Inference and causality

- Björkman, M., & Svensson, J. (2009). Power to the people: evidence from a randomized field experiment on community-based monitoring in Uganda. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(2), 735–769.
- Chase, R. S. (2002). Supporting communities in transition: the impact of the Armenian social investment fund. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 16(2), 219–240.
- Chattopadhyay, R., & Duflo, E. (2004). Women as policy makers: evidence from a randomized policy experiment in India. *Econometrica*, 72(5), 1409–1443.
- Collins, D., Morduch, J., Rutherford, S., & Ruthven, O. (2009). *Portfolios of the poor: how the world's poor live on \$2 a day*. Princeton, N.J. ; Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Duflo, E., & Pande, R. (2007). Dams. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(2), 601–646.
- Dunning, T (2012). *Natural Experiments in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - *Evaluates whether people's play in experimental games is predictive of their future financial decisions (repayment of microfinance loans).*
- Karlan, D. S. (2005). Using experimental economics to measure social capital and predict financial decisions. *American Economic Review*, 95(5), 1688–1699.
- Pattanayak, S., Poulos, C., Patil, S., Mallick, R., Blitstein, J., & Praharaj, P. (2009). Shame or subsidy revisited: social mobilization for sanitation in Orissa, India. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 87(8), 580–587.
- Shami, M. (2012). Collective action, clientelism, and connectivity. *American Political Science Review*, 106(3), 588–606.
 - *Uses a cluster-randomized design and difference-in-difference evaluations*

Extra Readings for Week 8 - Operationalisation and measurement

- Goetz, A. M., & Gupta, R. S. (1996). Who takes the credit? Gender, power, and control over loan use in rural credit programs in Bangladesh. *World Development*, 24(1), 45–63.
- Jerven, M. (2013). *Poor numbers: how we are misled by African development statistics and what to do about it*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Introduction and Ch. 3, pp. 1-7 and 55-82
- Kanbur, R., & Shaffer, P. (2007). Epistemology, normative theory and poverty analysis: implications for Q-squared in practice. *World Development*, 35(2), 183–196.
- Randall, S., & Coast, E. (2015). Poverty in African households: the limits of survey and census representations. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 51(2), 162–177.
- Sullivan, C. (2002). Calculating a water poverty index. *World Development*, 30(7), 1195–1210.
- Sumner and Tribe (2008) *International development studies*, “What can we “know” in development studies?” Ch. 3, pp. 53-80.
- Tsai, L. L. (2007). Solidary groups, informal accountability, and local public goods provision in rural China. *American Political Science Review*, 101(2), 355–372.

Extra Readings for Week 9 - Collecting primary qualitative data

- Anand, N. (2012). Municipal disconnect: On abject water and its urban infrastructures. *Ethnography*, 13(4), 487–509.
- Andersson, R. (2014). *Illegality, Inc.: Clandestine migration and the business of bordering Europe*. University of California Press. Appendix: A note on method, pp. 283–288. Available online via LSE library.
- Atkinson, P. (1992). *Understanding ethnographic texts*. Newbury Park, CA; London: SAGE. Available online through the library.
- Biradavolu, M. R., Burris, S., George, A., Jena, A., & Blankenship, K. M. (2009). Can sex workers regulate police? Learning from an HIV prevention project for sex workers in southern India. *Social science & medicine*, 68(8), 1541–1547.
- Blasco, G. y, & Wardle, H. (2006). *How to read ethnography*. Abingdon [England]; New York, London: Routledge. Available online through the library.
- Bourgois, P., & Schonberg, J. (2007). Intimate apartheid: Ethnic dimensions of habitus among homeless heroin injectors. *Ethnography*, 8(1), 7–31.
- Cahill, C. (2007). Participatory Data Analysis. In S. Kindon, R. Pain, & M. Kesby (Eds.), *Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods: Connecting People, Participation and Place*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Campbell, C., Skovdal, M., Mupambireyi, Z., Madanhire, C., Nyamukapa, C., & Gregson, S. (2012). Building adherence-competent communities: Factors promoting children's adherence to anti-retroviral HIV/AIDS treatment in rural Zimbabwe. *Health & Place*, 18(2), 123–131.
- Chambers, R. (1994). Participatory rural appraisal (PRA): Challenges, potentials and paradigm. *World Development*, 22(10), 1437–1454.
- Edwards, R. (2013). *What is qualitative interviewing?* London: Bloomsbury.
- Elwood, S. A., & Martin, D. G. (2000). "Placing" interviews: location and scales of power in qualitative research. *The professional geographer*, 52(4), 649–657.
- Evans, C., & Lambert, H. (2008). Implementing community interventions for HIV prevention: insights from project ethnography. *Social science & medicine*, 66(2), 467–478.
- Franks, M. (2011). Pockets of Participation: Revisiting Child-Centred Participation Research. *Children & Society*, 25(1), 15–25.
- Garikipati, S. (2008). The impact of lending to women on household vulnerability and women's empowerment: evidence from India. *World Development*, 36(12), 2620–2642.
- Guérin, I. (2014). Juggling with debt, social ties, and values: the everyday use of microcredit in rural South India. *Current Anthropology*, 55(S9), S40–S50.
- Hopkins, P. E. (2007). Thinking critically and creatively about focus groups. *Area*, 39(4), 528–535.
- Johnson, S. (2004). Gender norms in financial markets: evidence from Kenya. *World Development*, 32(8), 1355–1374.
- Kar, S. (2013). Recovering debts: Microfinance loan officers and the work of "proxy-creditors" in India. *American Ethnologist*, 40(3), 480–493.
- Kavle, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (Third edition). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Kitziinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of health & illness*, 16(1), 103–121.
- Langevang, T. (2007). Movements in Time and Space: Using Multiple Methods in Research with Young People in Accra, Ghana. *Children's Geographies*, 5(3), 267–282.
- Langevang, T. (2007). Movements in time and space: using multiple methods in research with young people in Accra, Ghana. *Children's geographies*, 5(3), 267–282.
- Locke, C., & Lloyd-Sherlock, P. (2011). Qualitative life course methodologies: Critical reflections from development studies. *Development and change*, 42(5), 1131–1152.

- Mancini Billson, J. (2006). Conducting focus group research across cultures: consistency and comparability. ESRC Research Group on Wellbeing in Developing Countries. *Working Paper*, 27.
- McIlwaine, C., & Moser, C. (2003). Poverty, violence and livelihood security in urban Colombia and Guatemala. *Progress in Development Studies*, 3(2), 113-130.
- Mosse, D. (2004). Is Good Policy Unimplementable? Reflections on the Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice. *Development and Change*, 35(4), 639-671.
- Müller, T. R. (2006). Education for social change: Girls' secondary schooling in Eritrea. *Development and change*, 37(2), 353-373.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Short (2006) "Focus Group Interviews" in Perecman and Curran (eds.) *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research*, ch. 5, pp. 103-116

Extra readings for week 10 - Analysing qualitative data

- Baker, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis*. A&C Black.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). *Using thematic analysis in psychology*. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Hepburn, A., & Potter, J. (2006). Discourse analytic practice. *Qualitative Research Practice: Concise Paperback Edition*, 168.
- Skovdal, M., & Cornish, F. (2015). Analysing qualitative data. *Qualitative research for development: a guide for practitioners*. Practical Action Publishing.

Extra readings for Week 11 - Ethics, Reflexivity & Writing

- Block, K., Warr, D., Gibbs, L., & Riggs, E. (2012). Addressing ethical and methodological challenges in research with refugee-background young people: reflections from the field. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 26(1), 69-87.
- Brewer, J. D. (2016). The ethics of ethical debates in peace and conflict research: Notes towards the development of a research covenant. *Methodological Innovations*, 9.
- Gaillard, J. C., & Gomez, C. (2015). Post-disaster research: is there gold worth the rush?: opinion paper. *Jàmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 7(1), 1-6.