

# Comparative Methods in International and Comparative Politics

GOVT 6053, Spring 2010

Wednesdays 10:10 am-12:35 pm, McGraw Hall 365

<http://blackboard.cornell.edu>

Professor David Siddhartha Patel  
Department of Government  
White Hall 218  
[patel@cornell.edu](mailto:patel@cornell.edu)

Office hours: Thurs 9:30-11:30 am  
or by appointment

**Overview.** This seminar is designed to introduce doctoral students to methods of political analysis that are commonly used in the political science sub-fields of international relations and comparative politics. It is designed to familiarize students with methodological challenges commonly encountered in comparative research, including concept formation, theory development and testing, case selection, variable operationalization and measurement, and descriptive and causal inference. The material covered in this course, along with material from Government 6353, prepares students to take the comparative politics A exam. Another goal of the course is to prepare students methodologically to conduct original research in comparative politics and write an A paper in the following year. Students, therefore, will apply concepts and techniques to their own research questions as the semester progresses.

Because this seminar is designed to *introduce* doctoral students to some of the major issues in political science methods, and because specific methodological issues in the fields of comparative and international politics are numerous and varied, the list of topics discussed in this course *should not be considered comprehensive*.

**Course requirements and grading.** The requirements of the course are fivefold.

- You are required to attend all class meetings, to come to seminar having read and thought about the assigned material for the week, and to participate actively in class discussions. Each week, students will also be responsible for presenting the week's readings and leading class discussion. Class participation will compose 20% of the final grade.
- Write a peer review of one paper presented this academic year in the PSAC workshop as if you were reviewing the manuscript for a journal. Be sure to provide suggestions for improvement. Further details will be distributed in class. Students are strongly encouraged to regularly attend the PSAC workshop on scheduled Friday afternoons. Your review is due by May 7<sup>th</sup>, but can be completed at any time during the semester. Your review will count for 10% of the final grade.
- Complete all ten research design assignments described below, and be prepared to discuss these ideas in class. These ten assignments consist of 1-3 pages of written work each. Your memos and research design assignments will be assessed on the quality of thinking that went into the project, rather than the proposed theory. The first nine assignments cumulatively count for 50% of the final grade.
- Before the second assignment, I will divide the class into research support groups of 3-4 students. Read the written assignments of the other members of your group as you receive them and e-mail constructive comments to at least two of them for each assignment. Alternatively, groups can choose to meet weekly and discuss each other's ideas.

- Present to the class a 15 minute summary of your research question, theory and observable implications, case selection, and research strategy. This is assignment #10, and it counts for 20% of the final grade.

**Readings.** Four books are available for purchase at the Cornell Bookstore and online. All four are also on reserve in Olin Library. All others readings will be available via the GOVT 6053 Blackboard site. The books are:

- King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sand Castles: Theory Building and Research Design in Comparative Politics*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Collier, David, and Henry E. Brady, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

### **Cornell University policies and regulations.**

Each student in this course is expected to abide by the Cornell University Code of Academic Integrity, which is available at: <http://www.cuinfo.cornell.edu/Academic/AIC.html>. This code includes the following statements: “A Cornell student’s submission of work for academic credit indicates that the work is the student’s own. All outside assistance should be acknowledged, and the student’s academic position truthfully reported at all times.” It is your responsibility to familiarize yourself with university policies regarding plagiarism and other violations of academic integrity. A Cornell tutorial called “Recognizing and Avoiding Plagiarism” can be found at:

<http://plagiarism.arts.cornell.edu/tutorial/index.cfm>

According to the Cornell University Grading System that was adopted by the University Faculty in 1965, the grade of “incomplete” is appropriate only when two (2) basic conditions are both met: 1. The student has a substantial equity at a passing level in the course with respect to work completed, **and** 2. The student has been prevented by circumstances beyond the student’s control, such as illness or family emergency, from completing all the course requirements on time. A grade of “incomplete” may not be given merely because a student fails to complete all course requirements on time and is not an option that can be elected at the student’s own discretion.

## **Course assignments.**

Assignment #1: Choose a puzzle that (a) you think is important and interesting; (b) you think our understanding of is inadequate; (c) you have an intuition of how to improve our understanding of; and (d) you believe it is possible to collect data with which to explore your intuition. The puzzle could be variation in an outcome across time or space, a Pareto sub-optimality or inefficiency, or a phenomenon that simply doesn't "make sense" and you "don't get." The puzzle can be from something you read in 6353 or another class or something from the "real" world. In one page or less, describe your puzzle without using jargon or suggesting a possible explanation. E-mail it to me by 8 a.m., February 1; be prepared to briefly describe your puzzle in seminar.

Assignment #2: Identify and briefly summarize one main and two plausible alternative explanations to your puzzle/question. There are several ways to do this. You could develop explanations "off the top of your head" using intuition, or you might collect two to three articles or books that examine roughly the same puzzle that you have posed (i.e., have roughly the same dependent variable) and draw out the conjectures that the authors offer. You may need to read about a particular case (or a small set of cases) that is an example (or are examples) of the phenomenon that you seek to explain. State your three explanations as clear, testable and falsifiable causal propositions. A falsifiable proposition is one that can be shown to be wrong. If you can't think of any evidence that would convince you that the proposition is wrong, you need to reformulate the proposition. If possible, render the propositions (and their falsifiability) in diagrams or equations or both. Be clear about the mechanism(s) that link the cause (independent variable(s)) and effect (outcomes you are trying to explain). E-mail me and your group a 2-3 page summary by 8 a.m., February 15.

Assignment #3: First, identify several (or, ideally, as many as possible...) direct observable implications of each proposition and indirect ones that follow from the logics employed. Second, construct at least three hypotheses about the observable implications of your possible explanations. Make a list of the information you need to collect to (a) know whether your explanation is wrong (to disconfirm your hypotheses), (b) make a compelling case that your argument is correct, and (c) dismiss the major alternative plausible hypotheses. What would be 'ideal' data to assess each conjecture? E-mail me and your group a 2-3 page summary by 8 a.m., February 22.

Assignment #4: First, define your key independent and dependent variables; clearly state how your variables vary. Second, describe how you would operationalize these variables and discuss the tradeoffs, if any, involved in the operationalizations that you propose. If helpful, follow the steps outlined by Adcock and Collier. E-mail a 2-3 page summary to me and your group by 8 a.m., March 1.

Assignment #5: Identify the relevant universe of cases. Be clear about the unit of analysis. Select cases that you could use to assess the hypotheses of the observable implications of your theory. Think about what cases(s), different from the one(s) that informed your initial intuition, would be most productive to study in greater depth to add confidence that your propositions are correct or incorrect. Explain the rationale you used for selecting this unit of analysis and specific cases and why you used the criteria that you did instead of alternative ones. Explain what additional knowledge, if any, might be gained by collecting qualitative evidence on a small number of additional cases. E-mail me and your group a 2-3 page summary by 8 a.m., March 15.

Assignment #6: Outline a 'large-N' dataset that would produce some statistical test of your theory using, cross-national, sub-national, or survey data. Develop a research strategy for building this dataset, and

provide a few sample “rows.” If possible, outline “coding rules.” Describe the hypotheses amenable to quantitative tests and how the data gathered would allow you to assess those hypotheses.

Optional: Produce some basic statistical test of the theory or an observable implication of your own theory using original data or an existing dataset. Do some descriptive statistics that show the plausibility of the theory, focusing on statistical and graphical descriptions of the dependent and principal independent variables. E-mail me and your group a 2-3 page summary by 8 a.m., March 29.

Assignment #7: For your main theoretical argument, identify the key actors or decision-makers and describe the sequence (if any) in which they interact. Explicitly state the choices available to those actors at each stage in their interaction. Why do those actors make the choices that they do in some situations, but not others, or at some times, but not other times? If appropriate, explain how institutions or other exogenous factors guide, motivate, or constrain the interaction between or the choices available to the actors. Explain why your main theoretical argument makes sense from the perspective of individuals. Can you identify more observable implications from the “micro-mechanism” of your propositions?

Optional: Specify an extensive form game that captures the essential logic of how you consider outcomes to be reached in your own theoretical argument. With pay-offs justified by assumption, solve through backward induction the equilibrium (or equilibria) of your game. What kind of research design will you use to test your model and its predications? E-mail me and your group a 2-3 page summary by 8 a.m., April 5.

Assignment #8, option a: Write a 2-3 page memo describing a lab, field, or natural experiment that could be used to put some aspect of your theory or the mechanisms underlying it to an empirical test. E-mail it to me and your group by 8 a.m., April 19.

Assignment #8, option b: Write a 2-3 page memo describing a possible endogeneity problem in your project and how you intend to solve it. E-mail it to me and your group by 8 a.m., April 19.

Assignment #9: Pick a country in which you could do field research for your project and write a 2-3 memo that does two things. First, make a “to get” list of data that you would need to collect in the country to assess your theories. Second, list or describe practical and logistical issues that you might face in that country as you attempt to collect these data. These might include getting interviews, entering specific sites, setting up to live and work, acquiring research permissions or IRB approval, language concerns, funding issues, and preparations to take your family to the field. If possible, identify at least three other scholars who have worked in that country and see if their books or dissertations contain logistical information that might help you cope with these issues. E-mail a summary to me and your group by 8 a.m., April 26.

Assignment #10: Present a 15 minute summary of your research question, theory and observable implications, case selection, and overall research strategy in class on May 5. Students should prepare transparencies, PowerPoint slides, or printed handouts for their presentation. If necessary, we will find another bloc of time to complete presentations.

## **Class 1. January 27. Introduction**

Kohli, Atul, et al. 1995. "The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium," *World Politics* 48, 1 (October): 1-49.

Geddes. 2003. Chapter 1 (pp. 1-26)

Laitin, David D. 2002. "Comparative Politics: The State of the Subdiscipline." In *State of the Discipline*. Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner, eds. New York: Norton.

### **Supplemental**

Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder, *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.

This book contains in-depth interviews with fifteen scholars in the field of comparative politics about their intellectual formation, their major works and ideas, the nuts-and-bolts of the research process, their relationships with colleagues, collaborators and students, and the evolution of the field. Almond, Bates, Collier, Dahl, Huntington, Laitin, Lijphart, Linz, Moore, O'Donnell, Przeworski, Schmitter, Scott, Skocpol, and Stepan.

Bernstein, Steven, Richard Ned Lebow, Janice Gross Stein, and Steven Weber. 2000. "God Gave Physics the Easy Problems: Adapting Social Science to an Unpredictable World." *European Journal of International Relations* 6, 1: 43-76.

Tetlock, Philip E. 2005. *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cohn, Jonathan. 1999. "Irrational Exuberance: When Did Political Science Forget about Politics?" *The New Republic* October 25, 25-32.

Stark, Andrew. 2002. "Why Political Scientists Aren't Public Intellectuals." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35, 3 (September): 577-579.

Almond, Gabriel A. 1990. *A Discipline Divided: Schools and Sects in Political Science*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Munck, Gerardo L., and Richard Snyder. 2007. "Debating the Direction of Comparative Politics: An Analysis of Leading Journals." *Comparative Political Studies* 40, 1: 5-31.

Replies in the same volume by Mahoney, Wibbels, and Munck and Snyder

Przeworski, Adam. 2007. "Is the Science of Comparative Politics Possible?" In *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, ed. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes. New York: Oxford University Press.

**Class 2. February 3.      Puzzles and questions**

King, Keohane, & Verba. 1994. Chapter 1 (pp. 3-33)

Geddes. 2003. Chapter 2 (pp. 27-88)

Shapiro, Ian. 2002. "Problems, Methods, and Theories in the Study of Politics, or What's Wrong with Political Science and What to Do about It." *Political Theory* 30, 4: 596-619.

Putnam, Robert D., et al. 1993. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Pp. 3-15.

Varshney, Ashutosh. 2001. "Ethnic Conflict and Civil Society: India and Beyond." *World Politics* 53, 3 (April): 362-98. (only read pages 370-374, and focus on Table 1 on p. 372)

**Supplemental**

Lakatos, Imre. 1970. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes." In Lakatos, ed. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 91-138 and 173-180.

Almond, Gabriel, and Stephen Genco. 1977. "Clouds, Clocks, and the Study of Politics." *World Politics* 29, 4 (July): 489-522.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding." *World Politics* 22, 3 (April): 329-343.

**Class 3. February 10. Descriptive inference**

King, Keohane, & Verba. 1994. Chapter 2 (pp. 34-74)

Gerring, John. 2004. "What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good for?" *American Political Science Review* 98, 2 (May): 341-354.

Eckstein, Harry. 1975. "Case Study and Theory in Political Science." In Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby, eds. *Handbook of Political Science Volume 7*. Addison-Wesley. pp. 79-137.

Verba, Sidney. 1967. "Some Dilemmas of Comparative Research." *World Politics* 20, 1 (October): 111-127.

#### **Class 4. February 17. Causality and standards for valid causal inference**

Przeworski, Adam, and Henry Tuene. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. John Wiley & sons, Inc.

Chapter 2, "Research Designs." pp.31-46.

King, Keohane, & Verba. 1994. chapter 3 (pp. 75-114)

Multiple authors. 1995. Symposium on "The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation." *American Political Science Review* 89, 2 (June): 454-481.

*Rethinking Social Inquiry*, chapter 13 and Appendix (Collier, Brady, and Seawright, pp. 222-271)

Beck, Nathaniel. 2006. "Is Causal-Process Observation an Oxymoron?" *Political Analysis* 14, 3 (Summer): 347-352.

Lieberson, Stanley. 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 (December): 307-320.

#### **Supplemental**

Almost all of *Rethinking Social Inquiry*

Mahoney, James. 2008. "Toward a Unified Theory of Causality." *Comparative Political Studies* 41, 4-5: 412-436.

Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65, 3 (September): 682-93.

Holland, Paul W. 1986. "Statistics and Causal Inference." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 81, 396 (December): 945-960.

Fearon, James D. 1991. "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science." *World Politics* 43, 2 (January): 169-195.

Brady, Henry E., David Collier, and Jason Seawright. 2006. "Toward a Pluralistic Vision of Methodology." *Political Analysis* 14, 3 (Summer): 353-368.

Includes their response to Beck, p. 359-360.

Beck, Nathaniel. 2006. "Causal Process 'Observation': Oxymoron or Old Wine?" Unpublished Manuscript. Department of Politics. New York University.

<http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/faculty/beck/cponew.pdf>

Beck's response to the above response.

## **Class 5. February 24. Concepts, concept formation, measurement, reliability and validity**

Jones, Charles O. 1974. "Doing Before knowing: Concept Development in Political Research." *American Journal of Political Science* 18, 1: 215-228.

Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics." *American Political Science Review* 64, 4: 1033-1053.

Adcock, Robert, and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement validity: A shared standard for qualitative and quantitative research." *American Political Science Review* 95, 3: 529-546.

Posner, Daniel. 2004. "Measuring Ethnic Fractionalization in Africa." *American Journal of Political Science* 48, 4 (October): 849-863.

Tsai, Lily L. 2007. "Solidary Groups, Informal Accountability, and Local Public Goods Provision in Rural China." *American Political Science Review* 101, 2 (May): 355-372.

Freedom House's methodology:

[http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=351&ana\\_page=341&year=2008](http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=351&ana_page=341&year=2008)

Polity IV Project user's manual:

<http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/p4manualv2007.pdf>

### **Supplemental**

Goertz, Gary. 2006. *Social Science Concepts: A User's Guide*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Collier, David, and John Gerring. 2008. *Concepts and Methods in Social Science: The Tradition of Giovanni Sartori*. Routledge.

Collier, David, and James E. Mahon Jr. 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 87, 4: 845-855.

King, Gary, et al. 2003. "Enhancing the Validity and Cross-Cultural Comparability of Measurement in Survey Research." *American Political Science Review* 98, 1 (February): 191-207.

Ragin, Charles C. 2008. *Redesigning Social Inquiry: Fuzzy Sets and Beyond*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Munck, Gerardo L., and Jay Verkuilen. 2002. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." *Comparative Political Studies* 35, 1 (February): 5-34.

Schmitter, Philippe C., and Terry Lynn Karl. 1991. "What Democracy Is...and Is Not." *Journal of Democracy* 2, 5:75-88.

Przeworski, Adam. 1999. "Minimalist Conception of Democracy: A Defense." In *Democracy's Value*, ed. Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordón. New York: Cambridge University Press.

## **Class 6. March 3. Principles of selecting the unit of analysis and cases**

King, Keohane, & Verba. 1994. Chapters 4-6 (pp. 115-230)

Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 86-150

Geddes. 2003. Chapter 3 (pp. 89-129)

Brady & Collier, eds. 2004. Chapter 6 (pp. 85-102)

Dion, Douglas. 1998. "Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study." *Comparative Politics*. 30, 2 (January): 127-145.

### **Suicide terrorism**

- Pape, Robert A. 2003. "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review* 97, 3 (August): 1-19.
- Ashworth, Scott, et al. 2008. "Design, Inference, and the Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review* 102, 2 (May): 269-273.
- Pape, Robert A. 2008. "Methods and Findings in the Study of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review* 102, 2 (May): 275-277.

### **Supplemental**

Snyder, Richard. 2001. "Scaling Down: The Subnational Comparative Method." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 36, 1 (Spring): 93-110.

Lustick, Ian S. 1996. "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias." *American Political Science Review* 90, 3 (September): 605-618.

Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2004. "The Possibility Principle: Choosing Negative Cases in Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 98, 4 (November): 653-669.

Collier, David, and James Mahoney. 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 49, 1 (October): 56-91.

### **The deterrence debate**

- Achen, Christopher H., and Duncan Snidal. 1989. "Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies." *World Politics* 41, 2 (January): 143-169.
- Lebow, Richard N., and Janice Gross Stein. 1989. "Rational Deterrence Theory: I Think, Therefore I Deter." *World Politics* 41, 2 (January): 208-224.
- Downs, George W. 1989. "The Rational Deterrence Debate." *World Politics* 41, 2 (January): 225-237.
- Lebow, Richard N., and Janice Gross Stein. 1990. "Deterrence: The Elusive Dependent Variable." *World Politics* 42, 3 (April): 336-369.
- Huth, Paul, and Bruce Russett. 1990. "Testing Deterrence Theory: Rigor Makes a Difference." *World Politics* 42, 4 (July): 466-501.

**Class 7. March 10. Case studies and process-tracing**

George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2004. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chapter 3, "The Methods of Structured, Focused Comparison." pp. 67-72.

Chapter 10, "Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation." pp. 205-232.

Geddes. 2003. Chapter 4 (pp. 131-174)

Elster, Jon. 1989. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 3-10.

Sekhon, Jasjeet S. 2004. "Quality Meets Quantity: Case Studies, Conditional Probability, and Counterfactuals." *Perspectives on Politics* 2, 2 (June): 281-293.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2010. "The Strategy of Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice." *Comparative Political Studies* 43, 2: 230-259.

Coppedge, Michael. 1999. "Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories: Combining Large N and Small in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Politics* 31, 4 (July): 465-476.

**Supplemental**

Mahoney, James. 2010. "After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research." *World Politics* 62, 1 (January).

Elster, Jon. 1989. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gerring, John. 2007. "Is There a (Viable) Crucial-Case Method." *Comparative Political Studies* 40, 3 (March):231-253.

Tetlock, Philip E., and Aaron Belkin, eds. 1996. *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

**Class 8. March 17. Statistics**

Weisberg, Herbert F. 1984. "The Fundamentals of Data Analysis." In *Theory-Building and Data Analysis in the Social Sciences*, ed. Herbert B. Asher, Herbert F. Weisberg, John H. Kessel, and W. Philips Shively. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press. pp.151-185.

Shively, W. Philips. 2001. *The Craft of Political Research*. 5th ed. Prentice Hall. pp. 110-130.

Jackman, Robert. 1985. "Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics." *American Journal of Political Science* 29 (1): 161-182.

Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." *American Political Science Review* 99, 3 (August): 435-452.

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97, 1 (February): 75-90.

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. N.d. "NSF Grant Proposal for Collaborative Project: 'Minorities at Risk' Data Base and Explaining Ethnic Violence."  
<http://www.stanford.edu/group/ethnic/DLJFNSF.doc>

**Supplemental**

King, Gary, Michael Tomz, and Jason Wittenberg. 2000. "Making the Most of Statistical Analyses: Improving Interpretation and Presentation." *American Journal of Political Science* 44, 2 (April): 341-355.

Beck, Nathaniel. 2001. "Time-Series-Cross-Section Data: What Have We Learned in the Past Few Years?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 271-293.

Dessler, David. 1991. "Beyond Correlations: Toward a Causal Theory of War." *International Studies Quarterly* 35, 3 (September): 337-355.

Achen, Christopher H. 2005. "Let's Put Garbage-Can Regressions and Garbage-Can Probits Where They Belong." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22:327-339.

Pepinsky, Thomas B. 2007. "How to Code." Committee on Concepts and Methods Working Paper Series on Political Concepts. Mexico City: CIDE.  
[http://www.concepts-methods.org/working\\_papers/20071005\\_17\\_PC%2018%20Pepinsky.pdf](http://www.concepts-methods.org/working_papers/20071005_17_PC%2018%20Pepinsky.pdf)

**Class 9. March 31. Choice theories**

Wagner, R. Harrison. 2001. "Who's Afraid of Rational Choice Theory?" Unpublished Manuscript. Department of Government, University of Texas, Austin.

Cox, Gary W. 2004. "Lies, damned lies, and rational choice analysis," In Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek E. Masoud, eds. *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. P. 167-185.

Geddes. 2003. Chapter 5 and conclusion (pp. 175-223)

Weingast, Barry. R. 2002. "Rational Choice Institutionalism." In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, ed. Ira Katznelson and Helen V. Milner. New York: W.W. Norton.

Weingast, Barry R. 1997. "The Political Foundations of Democracy and the Rule of Law," *American Political Science Review* 91, 2 (1997), pp. 245-263.

**Supplemental**

GOVT 7073 and 7074 (Game Theory 1 and 2)

Morrow, James. 1994. *Game Theory for political scientists*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 16-38, 51-94, 121-133

Levi, Margaret. 2000. "The Economic Turn in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Political Studies* 33, 6/7 (August/September): 822-844.

Shapiro, Ian. 2005. *The Flight from Reality in the Human Sciences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Munck, Gerardo L. 2001. "Game Theory and Comparative Politics: New Perspectives and Old Concerns." *World Politics* 53, 2 (January): 173-204.

**The deterrence debate revisited**

Fearon, James. 2002. "Selection Effects and Deterrence." *International Interactions*. 28, 1 (January): 5-29.

## **Class 10. April 7. Experiments**

Green, Donald and Alan Gerber. 2002. "Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science." In *Political Science: State of the Discipline*, eds. Ira Katznelson and Helen Milner. New York: Norton. pp. 805-832.

Humphreys, Macartan, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2009. "Field Experiments and the Political Economy of Development." *Annual Review of Political Science* 12:367-78.

Dunning, Thad. 2008. "Improving Causal Inference: Strengths and Limitations of Natural Experiments." *Political Research Quarterly* 61, 2:282-93.

Whitehouse, Mark. 2007. "Is an Economist Qualified to Solve the Puzzle of Autism?" *The Wall Street Journal*. February 27. Page A1.

Posner, Daniel N. 2004. "The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi." *American Political Science Review* 98, 4:529-545.

Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. 2000. "The Effects of Canvassing, Direct Mail, and Telephone Contact on Voter Turnout: A Field Experiment." *American Political Science Review* 94, 3:653-63.

### **Supplemental**

Cook, Thomas D., and Donald T. Campbell. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

McDermott, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methods in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 31-61.

Olken, Benjamin A. 2007. "Monitoring Corruption: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Indonesia." *Journal of Political Economy* 115, 2: 200-249.  
<http://www.nber.org/~bolken/corruptionexperiments.pdf>

Wantchekon, Leonard. 2003. "Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin." *World Politics* 55, 3: 399-422.  
[http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/faculty/wantchekon/research/WP\\_0331.pdf](http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/faculty/wantchekon/research/WP_0331.pdf)

Habyarimana, James, Macartan Humphreys, Daniel N. Posner, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2007. "Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Goods Provision?" *American Political Science Review* 101, 4:709-725.  
<http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/posner/pdfs/HHPW.pdf>

Hyde, Susan D. 2007. "The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence from a Natural Experiment." Manuscript. Yale University.

Posner, Daniel N. 2006. "African Borders as Sources of Natural Experiments." presented in the Colloquium Series of the Yale Program in Agrarian Studies, New Haven.  
<http://www.yale.edu/agrarianstudies/papers/18africanborders.pdf>

Banerjee, Abhijit Vinayak, et al. 2006. "Making Aid Work" and responses. *Boston Review* (July/August).  
<http://bostonreview.net/BR31.4/contents.html>

Bill Easterly's critique of RCTs.  
[http://blogs.nyu.edu/fas/dri/aidwatch/2009/07/development\\_experiments\\_ethica.html](http://blogs.nyu.edu/fas/dri/aidwatch/2009/07/development_experiments_ethica.html)

Duflo, Esther, Rachel Glennerster and Michael Kremer. 2007. "Using randomization in development economics research: a toolkit." Centre for Economic Policy Research Discussion Paper No. 6059.  
<http://econ-www.mit.edu/files/806>

Duflo, Esther. 2005. "Field Experiments in Development Economics." BREAD Policy Paper No. 012.  
<http://ipl.econ.duke.edu/bread/papers/policy/p012.pdf>

Deaton, Angus. 2009. "Instruments of development: Randomization in the tropics, and the search for the elusive keys to economic development." The 2008 Keynes Lecture at the British Academy.  
[http://www.princeton.edu/~deaton/downloads/Instruments%20of%20development%20v1d\\_mar09\\_all.pdf](http://www.princeton.edu/~deaton/downloads/Instruments%20of%20development%20v1d_mar09_all.pdf)

Habyarimana, James, Macartan Humphreys, Daniel N. Posner, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. N.d. "Proctor's Instructions for the Experimental Games described in Habyarimana et al (2007)."  
[http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/posner/pdfs/HHPW\\_protocols.pdf](http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/posner/pdfs/HHPW_protocols.pdf)

**Class 11. April 14. Critical junctures, path dependence, and analytic narratives**

**[readings to be trimmed]**

Bennett, Andrew, and Colin Elman. 2006. "Complex Causal Relations and Case Study Methods: The Example of Path Dependence." *Political Analysis* 14, 3 (Summer): 250-267.

Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 94, 2 (June): 251-267.

Mahoney, James. 2001. "Path-dependent explanations of regime change: Central America in comparative perspective." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 36, 1 (Spring): 111-141.

David, Paul A. 1994. "Why are Institutions the 'Carriers of History'? Path Dependence and the Evolution of Conventions, Organizations and Institutions." *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 5, 2 (December): 205-220.

Lieberman, Evan. 2001. "Causal Inference in Historical Institutional Analysis: A Specification of Periodization Strategies." *Comparative Political Studies* 34, 9: 1011-35.

Alexander, Gerard. 2001. "Institutions, Path Dependence, and Democratic Consolidation." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 13: 249-70.

Thelen, Kathleen, and Sven Steinmo, "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics" in *Structuring Politics*, Sven Steinmo et. al.

Levi, Margaret. 2004. "An analytic narrative approach to puzzles and problems." In Ian Shapiro, Rogers M. Smith, and Tarek E. Masoud, eds. *Problems and Methods in the Study of Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. p. 201-226.

Elster, Jon. 2000. "Rational Choice History: A Case of Excessive Ambition." *American Political Science Review* 94, 3 (September), and reply by authors of *Analytic Narratives*.

**Supplemental**

David, Paul A. 1985. "Clio and the Economics of QWERTY." *American Economic Review* 75 (May):332-337.

Cautionary note: This tale may not be entirely correct.

Robert Bates, et al. 1998. *Analytic Narratives*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Carpenter, Daniel. 2000. "Commentary: What is the Marginal Value of Analytic Narratives?" *Social Science History* 24, 4 (Winter): 653-667.

Kiser, Edgar. 1996. The Revival of Narrative in Historical Sociology: What Rational Choice Theory Can Contribute, *Politics & Society* 24, no. 3 (1996): 249-72.

**Class 12. April 21. Field Work**

Fenno, Richard F. *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. Boston: Little Brown, 1978, 249-293.

Laitin, David D. 1986. *Hegemony and Culture: Political and Religious Change Among the Yoruba*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
pp. 185-205.

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2007. "Field Methods." In *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*, eds. Carles Boix and Susan C. Stokes. New York: Oxford University Press.  
pp. 123-146

Collier, David. 1999. "Data, Field Work and Extracting New Ideas at Close Range." *APSA-CP 10*, 1: 1-2, 4-6.  
<http://www.nd.edu/~apsacp/pdf/APSA-CP20Winter201999.pdf>

Loaeza, Soledad, Randy Stevenson, and Devra C. Moehler. 2005. "Symposium: Should Everyone Do Fieldwork?" *APSA-CP 16*, 2:8-18.  
[http://www.nd.edu/~apsacp/documents/Summer2005\\_001.pdf](http://www.nd.edu/~apsacp/documents/Summer2005_001.pdf)

Lieberman, Evan S. et al. 2004. "Symposium: Field Research," *Qualitative Methods*. 2, 1: 2-14.  
<http://www.asu.edu/clas/polisci/cqrm/Newsletter/Newsletter2.1.pdf>

Read, Ben, Lauren Morris MacLean, and Melani Cammett. 2006. "Symposium: Field Research: How rich? How Thick? How Participatory?" *Qualitative Methods* 4, 2:9-18.

**Supplemental**

Syllabus of GOVT 6523 (Methods for Field Research)

**Class 13. April 28. Disciplined or Disciplinary Scuffles?**

Kuhn. 1996. all.

Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research." *Political Analysis* 14, 3 (Summer): 227-249.

Articles by Robert H. Bates, Chalmers Johnson, and Ian S. Lustick. 1997. "Symposium: Controversy in the Discipline: Area Studies and Comparative Politics." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30, 2 (June): 166-179.

Articles by Peter J. Katzenstein and Valerie Bunce. 2001. "Symposium: 'Area Studies' and the Discipline: Towards New Interconnections." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34, 4 (December): 789-795.

Hall, Peter A., and Sidney Tarrow. 1998. "Globalization and Area Studies: When Is Too Broad Too Narrow?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*. January 23. Page B5.

Laitin, David D. 2003. "The Perestroika Challenge to Social Science." *Politics and Society* 31, 1 (March): 163-184.

Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2004. "A Perestroika Straw Man Answers Back: David Laitin and Phronetic Political Science." *Politics & Society* 32, 3 (September): 389-416

**Supplemental**

In the past (although less so in recent years), the Newsletter of the APSA Organized Section in Comparative Politics (especially in letters from the section's presidents and commentaries on the letters) contained insightful and often controversial statements about the field. Back issues are available online:

<http://www.nd.edu/~apsacp/backissues.html>

Blyth, Mark. 2006. "Great Punctuations: Prediction, Randomness, and the Evolution of Comparative Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 100, 4 (November): 493-498.

Polsby, Nelson. 1998. "Social Science and Scientific Change: A Note on Thomas S. Kuhn's Contribution." *The Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 199-210.

Bernhard, Michael. 2009. "Methodological Disputes in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Politics* 41, 4 (July).

**Class 14. May 5. Student presentations**

Przeworski, Adam, and Frank Salomon. 1995. "The Art of Writing Proposals: Some Candid Suggestions for Applicants to Social Science Research Council Competitions." Social Science Research Council.

[http://fellowships.ssrc.org/art\\_of\\_writing\\_proposals/](http://fellowships.ssrc.org/art_of_writing_proposals/)

Tufte, Edward. 2003. "PowerPoint is evil." *Wired*. 11, 9 (September).

<http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.09/ppt2.html>

Dalton, Russell, and Randolph Siverson. 1998. "Gee! I've Never Spent \$5.5 Million Before: The Six Fallacies of NSF Proposal Writing." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31, 1 (March): 74-76.

Familiarize yourself with Cornell University's Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects.

<http://www.irb.cornell.edu/>

Complete the Training Program for Researchers in the Use of Human Participants.

<http://www.irb.cornell.edu/training/>

**Supplemental**

Several articles from APSA journals on dissertations, including choosing a topic and writing a prospectus

[http://www.apsanet.org/content\\_12965.cfm](http://www.apsanet.org/content_12965.cfm)

Tufte, Edward R. 2003. *The Cognitive Style of PowerPoint*. Cheshire, CT: Graphics Press LLC.  
(On reserve in Olin)