The Promises and Pitfalls of Using Student-Generated Data to Teach Deductive Qualitative Analysis

Elizabeth Ralph-Morrow, *University College London, UK*
Daniel Schulte, *University College London, UK*
John-Paul Salter, *University College London, UK*
Alexandra C. Hartman, *University College London, UK*

ABSTRACT A specific challenge of qualitative methods teaching is including skills for both data generation and data analysis, with recent audits of political science curricula revealing that the latter is particularly neglected at the undergraduate level. There are few published discussions on the importance of teaching analytical mechanics or guidance provided on how best to find and use data for teaching. This article explains how we integrated an exercise that enabled our class of more than 100 undergraduate students to generate their own original data and then to practice deductive coding and analysis. In addition to discussing our teaching experiences, we draw on interviews with our students to reflect on the successes and challenges of our approach and to offer suggestions to other instructors who want to replicate our strategy in a large undergraduate setting.

Recent audits of qualitative-methods syllabi and curricula highlighted that few students are being taught data analysis skills (Emmons and Moravcsik 2020; Turner and Thies 2009). There may be multiple reasons for this, including that in comparison to quantitative methods, qualitative-methods curricula must encompass a wider range of topics and skills. A pedagogical neglect of qualitative data analysis is not a new concern (Miles 1979); however, redressing it has become increasingly urgent in the face of disciplinary calls for greater research transparency (Elman and Kapiszewski 2014). Qualitative political scientists are routinely criticized by other members of the profession for failing to adhere to methodological rules regarding data analysis (Moravcsik 2010) and giving insufficient attention to how data are analyzed (Goodman and Cyr 2024). Unless emerging scholars are taught how to provide a clear account of the analysis they undertook to arrive at their relevant inferences and conclusions (Buthe and Jacobs 2015, 2), qualitative methods will continue to be criticized for a lack of rigor.

The literature suggests that three key barriers exist to teaching students how to analyze qualitative data. First, as Elman and Kapiszewski (2014, 43) noted, qualitative scholars do not consistently share the evidentiary basis of their conclusions and explain how those conclusions were reached. This means that there are relatively few examples of "model" qualitative scholarship that contain an explicit discussion of analytic methods. Second, as Jacobs, Kapiszewski, and Karcher (2022) observed, qualitative analytic methods textbooks tend to focus more on the epistemological underpinnings of those methods than on the mechanics of using them. Third, as discussed by Elman, Kapiszewski, and Kirilova (2015), the reluctance of qualitative political scientists to share their material means that there is a dearth of data on which students can practice analytical skills. Despite initiatives to increase the availability of qualitative data—such as Syracuse University's Qualitative Data Repository—there is little in the

Corresponding author: Elizabeth Ralph-Morrow *is a lecturer (teaching) in qualitative methods and political science at University College London. She can be reached at liz.ralph-morrow@ucl.ac.uk.*
Daniel Schulte *is a lecturer (teaching) in protest, revolution, and qualitative methods at University College London. He can be reached at d.schulte@ucl.ac.uk.*
John-Paul Salter *is an associate professor (teaching) in public policy at University College London. He can be reached at john-paul.salter@ucl.ac.uk.*
Alexandra C. Hartman *is a professor of political science at University College London. She can be reached at alexandra.hartman@ucl.ac.uk.*

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of American Political Science Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

doi:10.1017/S1049096525101686

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096525101686 Published online by Cambridge University Press

way of a stock of data that can easily be repurposed for classroom use.

This article discusses how we sought to overcome these challenges when teaching deductive coding—a method in which theoretical concepts provide a lens to analyze data—to more than 100 undergraduate students. We first explain what is meant by deductive coding before describing the broader active learning framework—which required students to conduct an interview with a faculty member to generate data—within which this qualitative-analysis task was embedded. We then outline how we taught our students the analytical steps of deductive coding and describe the different data on which students practiced their new skills. Finally, we reflect on the pros and cons of our teaching approach; explain how we managed to orchestrate a relatively complex series of stages in a large and compulsory undergraduate class; and conclude by providing suggestions to other faculty members who want to replicate our pedagogical approach when teaching their students how to link theory with data.

Unless emerging scholars are taught how to provide a clear account of the analysis they undertook to arrive at their relevant inferences and conclusions, qualitative methods will continue to be criticized for a lack of rigor.

DEDUCTIVE CODING AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

What role does masculinity play in climate-change discourse? Is Boris Johnson a populist? Do menstrual-leave policy debates bolster or undermine the status of women? One way in which these questions—adapted from recent student dissertations that used qualitative methods—can be answered persuasively is by a researcher (1) translating key theoretical concepts into a coding framework; (2) applying that framework to their data; and (3) discussing the evidence that supports or undermines their framework (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane 2006; Fife and Gossner 2024).

What we are describing here is a type of deductive qualitative analysis (Fife and Gossner 2024) that can operationalize, test, and refine existing theories using a coding framework and a corpus of data. Hypothesis testing is the goal of deductive analysis; however, before researchers can reach that final point to evaluate whether H1 is stronger than H2 (for example), they first must be able to classify the evidence as supporting H1 or H2. Deductive coding facilitates the intermediary step of classifying evidence as being more for H1 or H2 and enables the linking of concepts central to political science theory to actual data.

Deductive-coding approaches are evident in recent examples of qualitative and mixed-methods political science published in prominent journals such as *American Political Science Review* and *British Journal of Political Science*. A key aspect of Bailard et al.'s (2024) study of the relationship between the Proud Boys' online and offline activities involved analyzing Telegram messages through the lens of the collective-action framing literature. These authors clarified the three main types of collective-action frames (i.e., diagnosis, prognosis, and motivation); defined what was meant by each frame; and suggested which words and phrases they considered an indicator of that frame's presence in Proud Boy communications. Thijssen and Verheyen (2022) used a similar approach in their analysis of solidarity in party manifestos. They drew on a four-part typology to identify different manifestations of solidarity. After distilling key concepts from the literature (e.g., compassionate solidarity), Thijssen and Verheyen (2022) suggested how they would ascertain the relevant concept's presence in a party manifesto (e.g., by a party claiming that it is a victim or has been marginalized).

A core component of deductive qualitative analysis is the creation of a coding framework in which theoretical concepts provide a lens through which data can be analyzed. A strong deductive-coding framework should list each theoretical concept for which a researcher proposes to code the data, define that concept, and suggest an "exemplary instance" of data that would warrant the application of the code (Fife and Gossner 2024, 6). A deductive-coding framework clearly links theory to empirics, requiring that scholars and students define theoretical concepts and suggest how they will practically identify them within their data.

We understand that qualitative analysis and coding often are equated with inductive approaches (Ezzy 2002; Saldaña 2021). Nevertheless, we believe that it is important for political science students to master the mechanics of deductive coding. A deductive-coding framework provides an important first step in making explicit "the interpretive processes linking observations to conclusions or understandings" (Buthe and Jacobs 2015, 3). Moreover, by requiring scholars to define theoretical concepts, deductive coding guards against criticism that qualitative political science is conceptually opaque (Buggs and Sims 2024).

AN ACTIVE LEARNING APPROACH TO TEACHING QUALITATIVE DEDUCTIVE ANALYSIS

We taught deductive coding to our students as part of their compulsory undergraduate training in qualitative methods. There are more than 100 students enrolled on our introductory qualitative methods course who are undertaking degrees in either politics and international relations or politics, philosophy, and economics. The course runs for 10 weeks with paired one-hour lectures and one-hour seminars, and it is divided into three parts: preparing for data collection, collecting data, and analyzing data. Deductive coding was taught explicitly during a one-week period as part of the data-analysis component. However, students were given additional opportunities to discuss their coding frameworks in subsequent seminars and during a writing retreat that took place shortly before their assessments were due.[1]

In comparison to other subjects that may be taught as part of a political science degree, methods learning is particularly focused on skill development, with research showing that students master methods better when they are required to practice (Allen and Baughman 2016; Duncan and Brown 2021). Therefore, we advised students on the first day of class that they would be required in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096525101686 Published online by Cambridge University Press

week 5 to conduct a 10-minute-long interview with a faculty member on the question: Why are women academics underrepresented in our university's political science department? We also informed students about the requirements of their final assessment: write a 2,500-word paper that identifies the ethical and positionality issues arising from the faculty–student interview; draft a semi-structured question guide; and design a coding framework that could be used to analyze interview data.[2] Asking our students to learn by doing and giving them a concrete experience in which to test abstract concepts meant that both our assessment and approach to teaching qualitative methods aligned with the principles of active and experiential learning (Bonwell and Eisen 1991; Kolb 2014).

Asking our students to learn by doing and giving them a concrete experience in which to test abstract concepts meant that both our assessment and approach to teaching qualitative methods aligned with the principles of active and experiential learning.

Before undertaking their interview, students were tasked with designing an interview guide that tested a theory that sought to explain why women are underrepresented in our political science department. To assist them with this task, we gave a lecture on interviewing that provided guidance on how to construct interview questions that are theoretically motivated but colloquially expressed (Kapiszewski, MacLean, Read 2015, 216). We also gave students an opportunity in the seminars to practice their interview questions and to receive feedback on their question guides. To help our students narrow their theoretical focus when designing their question guide, we provided articles that sought to explain the gender gap in political science. These articles included Brown et al. (2020), who suggested that gender differences in risk aversion fuel publication disparities, and Teele and Thelen (2017), who speculated that women are excluded from coauthored teams. We encouraged our students to test these authors' ideas in interviews.

After students conducted their interview, they were taught to deductively analyze their data during a one-hour lecture and a one-hour seminar. The lecture and seminar aimed to surmount common pedagogical obstacles by providing students with (1) examples of qualitative data analysis that clarify how conclusions were reached; (2) an understanding of the mechanics of undertaking qualitative data analysis; and (3) original data on which to practice.

To scaffold the students' learning of the analytical process without influencing their subsequent interpretation of their own data, we intentionally chose readings and data from topics unrelated to the faculty–student interview question. Thus, before attending the first lecture and seminar for this part of the course, students were instructed to read March's (2017) comparison of different types of populism. This article was selected because it is accessible, focuses on a topic of likely interest to students, and—important for our purposes—explains how the concept of populism was operationalized to code party manifestos. To further meet our objective of providing instances of qualitative data analysis that specify how conclusions were reached, students were asked to read Fife and Gossner (2024), whose study illustrated the steps of qualitative deductive analysis using two worked examples.

During our lecture, we used multiple strategies to impart an understanding of the mechanics of undertaking qualitative deductive analysis. First, we walked students through the analytical steps taken by March (2017) when he constructed his coding framework: dividing a definition of populism into smaller conceptual components, elaborating on the meaning of each component, and suggesting an exemplar of each component. After we reconstructed March's (2017) coding framework, we asked students to apply it to an excerpt of Reform UK's manifesto. Students were encouraged to explain to the class how they coded the data before the lecturer displayed a slide showing her own approach to the task.

To further consolidate understanding of the mechanics of qualitative deductive analysis, we provided every student with a partially completed coding framework that had begun to operationalize Glick and Fiske's (1996) theory of ambivalent sexism.[3] The framework that students were given had a column for the code, a column for a description of the code's meaning, and a column to provide an exemplary instance of data that warranted the application of the code. Students were instructed to complete the first two columns (i.e., code word and description) and then to apply their coding framework to data—in this case, an excerpt from Stephanie Meyers' young-adult *Twilight* novel that is notable for its patriarchal themes. (Figure 1 is an excerpt of the completed framework; the full template and data extraction are in the online appendix.)

Finally, in the seminars, students were tasked with replicating these steps to construct a deductive-coding framework that could be used to analyze their own data—that is, the material generated during their interview with a faculty member. This time, they were given a blank coding template (see the online appendix) and asked to complete the first two columns—code and description—before applying it to their interview data. Figure 2 outlines the steps of our teaching sequence for those instructors who want to replicate our approach in their own course.

After students completed a section of their coding framework and identified data exemplars, they were encouraged to share their progress with the class. During this discussion, we observed that students' code descriptions often were brief and superficial, lacking the level of detail that an outsider would need to understand the connection between theoretical concepts and data. For example, some students who had focused on Brown et al.'s (2020) notion of risk aversion defined it as a person who dislikes taking chances. We urged these students instead to identify the attributes of their relevant concept (in this case, risk aversion) and suggest how it may be manifested in the context under consideration (in this case, an academic environment). To provide all students with a model of an appropriate level of detail, we also drew their attention to Bailard et al.'s (2024) coding framework, in which the authors provide a brief definition of their codes as well as suggest how these theoretical concepts may be manifested empirically.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096525101686 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Figure 1

Ambivalent Sexism Coding Framework

Ambivalent Sexism Coding Framework		
Code	**Description**	**Data Examples**
Paternalism **(benevolent)**	Men have greater authority, power and physical strength than women and should therefore serve as their protectors and providers; particularly, men should protect and provide for their wives, mothers and daughters. Women should be cherished and set on pedestals by men, and men should financially provide for their women.	"It's just that you are so soft, so fragile. I have to mind my action every moment that we're together so that I don't hurt you". "You don't realise how incredibly *breakable you are. I* can never, never afford to lose any kind of control with you"".

As part of their course assessment, students were required to submit the coding framework used to analyze their interview data. When we appraised our students' work, we believed that a good framework would contain a list of codes with rich and detailed descriptions, as well as a data exemplar that warranted the application of the code. Most of our students performed well on their assessment and we were pleased to see many coding frameworks that successfully operationalized theories by providing codes, comprehensive descriptions, and a discernible link between codes and data. Students who performed less well typically had frameworks that provided brief definitions of relevant concepts without furnishing the detail necessary to identify those concepts in real-world data or selected data exemplars that did not appear to correspond to the relevant codes.

DEBRIEFING WITH STUDENTS

After our module concluded and all assessments had been graded, we issued an open call for our students to participate in an interview with a faculty member at our university to reflect on their experiences of undertaking qualitative research and deductive coding.[4] To encourage student candor, the interviews were conducted by a faculty member who had not taught the module.

The interviewers focused on asking questions about the students' approach to mastering the steps of deductive coding and drafting their own coding framework. In their answers, students suggested that our approach to teaching deductive coding had been successful and that our multipronged approach of providing templates, data, and opportunities to practice helped them to master the fundamentals of the exercise. One student stated:

> [T]he coding part for me was the most intimidating.... In the lecture, we had examples of how your data should be organized and also those slides were given to us after so we could access those at any time and replicate that for our own data. That was very useful.

Another student also described practice and examples as having been helpful in overcoming her initial trepidation:

> [Coding] was a bit scary or intimidating at first just because we're not used to doing this....We went through a lot of examples in the lecture that were useful and in seminar again we got to talk through it as in just go around the room and share what is your piece of data, what is the code you would give it, and so on. And just to get the feedback from your seminar leader....So that was really useful.

It also was apparent that student engagement—that is, the investment and effort directed toward mastering academic skills (Newmann 1992, 12)—was bolstered by asking students to code their own data. When asked about the experiences of coding her own data, one student stated:

> I think one of the advantages was that because it was data I collected, I had a strong interest in it, so I was extra keen on presenting it accurately and as convincingly as I could.

Another student recalled:

> Psychologically, I felt a lot more motivated to do this because...I thought of all the [interview] questions...it was me throughout the entire process. It was all me, and analyzing my own data is much more interesting....

Some students also observed that the fact that they had collected the data themselves meant that additional and valuable

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096525101686 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Figure 2

Teaching Sequence

Teaching Sequence		
Step One	Lecturer distils theoretical concept and provides students with relevant data to code	Concept: Populism per March (2017) Data: Excerpt of Reform UK manifesto
Step Two	Lecturer provides students with partially completed coding framework and asks them to (i) complete their description of concepts and (ii) apply their coding framework to lecturer-supplied data[1]	Concept: Ambivalent sexism per Glick and Fiske (1996) Data: Excerpt from *Twilight* novel
Step Three	Seminar leader provides students with blank coding framework and asks them to (i) identify and describe relevant concepts from their chosen theory (ii) use that framework to analyse the data they gathered in the staff/student interview[2]	Concept: Chosen by students Data: Gathered by students during their staff/student interview

[1] A partially completed coding framework and data are available in the Supplementary Materials.
[2] A blank coding framework is available in the Supplementary Materials.

information—such as participant body language, emotions, and tone of voice—became available to them as part of the analytical process. One student recalled how the physical reaction of her participant following a question about departmental hiring processes had factored into her assessment of the data:

> …he kind of leant back for a minute and he really thought about it, which kind of signalled to me that he was remembering something, and that this might not have been widely known…that meant that the body language would kind of feed into this coding process as well.

Another student similarly noted that words on a page are not the only data relevant to the analytical process:

> I get to see the body language and like, part of what I was saying, that the interview was combatant….It was how he was saying it. I feel like I wouldn't have been able to catch that if I was just reading the transcript.

Some students also observed that the fact that they had collected the data themselves meant that additional and valuable information—such as participant body language, emotions, and tone of voice—became available to them as part of the analytical process.

SUGGESTIONS FOR REPLICATING AND IMPROVING THIS EXERCISE

There are three key considerations that faculty members may want to consider if they want to replicate this exercise. First, there are the logistical hurdles of recruiting interview subjects and potentially securing ethical approval.[5] Extensive forward planning is necessary for an undertaking that involves many human participants. Before the teaching term began, we asked faculty members

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096525101686 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in our department to provide a two-hour window of their time when they would be available to participate in 10 interviews with our students each lasting 10 minutes. After we secured the commitment of a sufficient number of participants, we created an online booking system that could be used by students to reserve an interview slot with a faculty member. The booking system and full assessment instructions were provided to students on their first day of class. Early planning for this exercise was critical to ensuring its success—and we were helped in our recruitment efforts by offering our faculty participants a small incentive in the form of a reduced grading load. Although we think it is valuable for students to obtain interview experience, we also recognize that in certain contexts, this course component could raise insurmountable logistical or ethical challenges. If this were to become the case, then we recommend that students be tasked with gathering original data from other sources (e.g., an archive).

Second, faculty members should consider whether they will dictate the research question that students gather data in response to and/or the theory that students are trying to test. On the one hand, the pedagogical literature suggests that allowing students to pursue their own line of inquiry gives them an opportunity to conduct "real" research (as opposed to merely studying) and bolsters their sense of ownership over the learning process (Levy and Petrulis 2012). On the other hand, our experience suggests that it was easier to teach deductive coding when students were focusing on the same research question and had brought only limited theoretical perspectives to bear on it. If our students had set their own unique research questions (with accompanying unique theoretical perspectives), then faculty members may have been faced with the difficult task of working with them to distill hundreds of different theories into a coding framework.

Third, although we did not require students to discuss intercoder reliability as part of this exercise,[6] it is both beneficial and relatively straightforward to incorporate lecture and seminar activities to meet that goal. Campbell et al. (2013) provided a useful guide to paired intercoder reliability exercises that could be conducted in a classroom setting. For example, two students could develop a coding framework and explain it to their partner; both students would then analyze a portion of the data, compare results, and—in the event of discrepancies—delete unreliable codes and clarify coding definitions before repeating the exercise. If this analysis were carried out on student-generated data, then we anticipate that the exercise would prompt particularly animated discussion—given our previous observation that some students felt that words on a page did not capture the full meaning of their data.

CONCLUSION

This article focuses on identifying the common barriers to teaching qualitative data analysis and explaining how we surmounted them when teaching a large and compulsory undergraduate qualitative-methods course. The study outlines a three-step process that we used to help students master the mechanics of undertaking deductive coding, explains how we enabled each student to acquire original data on which to practice, and document the benefits of this approach. By setting an assessment that encouraged students to gather data, make discoveries, and evidence their own ideas, our students were given the experience of conducting original research (Levy and Petrulis 2012)—which is likely to benefit them as they progress through their academic and professional careers. We hope that the techniques described in this article will encourage other faculty members to draw on experiential learning techniques when teaching their students how to analyze—as well as gather—qualitative data.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

To view supplementary material for this article, please visit http://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096525101686.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there are no ethical issues or conflicts of interest in this research. ■

NOTES

1. In a subsequent lecture and seminar, we taught students how to inductively analyze data and gave them the option of including an inductive-coding framework in their final assessment. However, the teaching and assessment exercises in the online appendix focus exclusively on deductive coding for faculty members who want to replicate this aspect of our instruction.
2. Assessment instructions are included in the online appendix.
3. Glick and Fiske (1996) contend that sexism is both hostile and benevolent and that these two dimensions work together to ensure women's inequality. Students were asked to read this article before the lecture.
4. Twelve students out of a cohort of approximately 130 participated in these 45-minute-long interviews. Our questions focused particularly on asking students about the utility (or not) of the deductive-coding lecture and seminar exercises as well as about their experiences of analyzing data that were and were not their own.
5. Our university provides an exemption for ethical approval for interviews conducted with human participants in the public arena.
6. We introduced the concept of intercoder reliability in our second lecture on data analysis.

REFERENCES

Allen, Peter J., and Frank D. Baughman. 2016. "Active Learning in Research Methods Classes Is Associated with Higher Knowledge and Confidence, Though Not Evaluations or Satisfaction." *Frontiers in Psychology* 7:279.

Bailard, Catie Snow, Rebekah Tromble, Wei Zhong, Federico Bianchi, Pedram Hosseini, and David Broniatowski. 2024. "'Keep Your Heads Held High Boys!' Examining the Relationship Between the Proud Boys' Online Discourse and Offline Activities." *American Political Science Review* 118 (4): 2054–71.

Bonwell, Charles C., and James A. Eison. 1991. "Active Learning; Creating Excitement in the Classroom." *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1*. Washington, DC: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Brown, Nadia E., Yusaku Horiuchi, Mala Htun, and David Samuels. 2020. "Gender Gaps in Perceptions of Political Science Journals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (1): 114–21.

Buggs, Shantel Gabrieal, and Jennifer Patrice Sims. 2024. "Strategizing Fit and Legibility." In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*, ed. Jennifer Cyr and Sara Wallace Goodman, 456–66. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Buthe, Tim, and Alan M. Jacobs. 2015. "Introduction to the Symposium." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13 (1). https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.892931.

Campbell, John L., Charles Quincy, Jordan Osserman, and Ove K. Pedersen. 2013. "Coding In-Depth Semi-Structured Interviews: Problems of Unitization and Intercoder Reliability and Agreement." *Sociological Methods & Research* 42 (3): 294–320.

Duncan, Natasha, and Nadia E. Brown. 2021. "Learning-by-Doing: Teaching Qualitative Methods in DC." *Journal of Political Science Education* 17 (Sup1): 341–51.

Elman, Colin, and Diana Kapiszewski. 2014. "Data Access and Research Transparency in the Qualitative Tradition." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 47 (1): 43–47.

Elman, Colin, Diana Kapiszewski, and Dessislava Kirilova. 2015. "Learning Through Research: Using Data to Train Undergraduates in Qualitative Methods." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 48 (1): 39–43.

Emmons, Cassandra V., and Andrew M. Moravcsik. 2020. "Graduate Qualitative Methods Training in Political Science: A Disciplinary Crisis." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 53 (2): 258–64.

Ezzy, Douglas. 2002. *Qualitative Analysis Practice and Innovation*. New York: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096525101686 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Fereday, Jennifer, and Eimear Muir-Cochrane. 2006. "Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 5 (1): 80–92.

Fife, Stephen T., and Jacob D. Gossner. 2024. "Deductive Qualitative Analysis: Evaluating, Expanding, and Refining Theory." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069241244856.

Glick, Peter, and Susan T. Fiske. 1996. "The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism." In *Social Cognition*, ed. Peter Glick and Susan T. Fiske, 116–60. New York: Routledge.

Goodman, Sara Wallace, and Jennifer Cyr. 2024. "Publishing Qualitative Research." In *Doing Good Qualitative Research*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633137.001.0001.

Jacobs, Alan M., Diana Kapiszewski, and Sebastian Karcher. 2022. "Using Annotation for Transparent Inquiry (ATI) to Teach Qualitative Research Methods." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 55 (1): 216–20.

Kapiszewski, Diana, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. 2015. *Field Research in Political Science: Practices and Principles*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kolb, David A. 2014. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson FT Press.

Levy, Philippa, and Robert Petrulis. 2012. "How Do First-Year University Students Experience Inquiry and Research, and What Are the Implications for the Practice of Inquiry-Based Learning?" *Studies in Higher Education* 37 (1): 85–101.

March, Luke. 2017. "Left and Right Populism Compared: The British Case." *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 19 (2): 282–303.

Miles, Matthew B. 1979. "Qualitative Data as an Attractive Nuisance: The Problem of Analysis." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24 (4): 590–601.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2010. "Active Citation: A Precondition for Replicable Qualitative Research." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 43 (1): 29–35.

Newmann, Fred M. (ed.). 1992. *Student Engagement and Achievement in American Secondary Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Teele, Dawn Langan, and Kathleen Thelen. 2017. "Gender in the Journals: Publication Patterns in Political Science." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 50 (2): 433–47.

Thijssen, Peter, and Pieter Verheyen. 2022. "It's All About Solidarity Stupid! How Solidarity Frames Structure the Party Political Sphere." *British Journal of Political Science* 52 (1): 128–45.

Turner, Charles C., and Cameron G. Thies. 2009. "What We Mean by Scope and Methods: A Survey of Undergraduate Scope and Methods Courses." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42 (2): 367–73.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096525101686 Published online by Cambridge University Press