

final

**POLS 506
QUALITATIVE METHODS
Fall 2014**

**Professor Richard Doner
Tuesday 1-4pm / Tarbutton 313
Tel. 727-7914 / rdoner@emory.edu
Office hours: Wed. 3-5 and by appointment**

Course Description

This is a graduate seminar primarily designed for students interested in employing qualitative methods in political science (and other social science disciplines). By qualitative methods, we refer primarily to *research designs* that use small numbers of intensive observations, that do not rely on statistical tests for drawing causal inferences, and that strive to understand causal mechanisms and processes as well as causal effects. Our primary focus will be on research design issues. We will address some aspects of data gathering, but most of that topic will be reserved for the second course in the qualitative methods sequence taught by Prof. Gillespie.

The course is designed to help students develop proficiency in the use of qualitative methods in three respects. The first is to understand and be able to articulate the assumptions about the political world and arguments about scientific knowledge on which qualitative approaches in political science are grounded. In other words, how do we justify research designs involving relatively small numbers of observations as good political science given the fact that such designs may limit our ability to generalize about the phenomenon being studied? In this seminar we will examine two ways of answering this question that have been developed by qualitative methodologists. The first involves research strategies that focus on co-variation among variables *across* observations. These types of qualitative research designs follow a logic similar to that employed in most mainstream quantitative research. The second approach involves a logic of inference in which the focus is on causal processes and mechanisms *within* cases.

The course is also designed to help students position their research along what might be labeled a "theory value chain." There are a number of steps or stages toward our overall objective of theory-based causal inferences. These include concept development and operationalization, theory generation, theory specification, testing of "typological" or "contingent" theory, etc. Although our goal is typically to test theory-based causal inferences, there are times when theory is not sufficiently developed or specified to do so.

The third and perhaps most important goal of the course is to help students develop proficiency in actually conducting qualitative research. Here we will be concerned with more practical concerns, including case selection, concept development, operationalization, scaling, tracing causal processes, and techniques involved in collecting qualitative evidence or data. To these ends, the seminar will make extensive use of existing qualitative research.

Overall, the goal of the seminar is help graduate students develop the tools needed to pursue rigorous qualitative research for the dissertation, in conjunction with quantitative methods and/or game theoretic approaches to hypothesis generation, or as the principal or stand-alone research strategy. When employed with quantitative and/or formal approaches, our goal is to ensure that the qualitative component does not end up as a quasi-structured story or anecdote, as is too often the case.

A word of caution. Doing good qualitative research is challenging; in some ways it is more challenging than doing quantitative or game theoretic work. Several following factors may help to explain the difficulty graduate students often encounter with qualitative research.

First, while important qualitative work on politics has been produced for a very long time, the effort to develop explicit guidelines for doing rigorous qualitative research in political science is relatively recent. Many graduate programs in political science still do not offer courses devoted to qualitative methods; and while professional schools, such as public health programs, often offer training in qualitative methods, these typically limit their focus to techniques of data gathering. There is often little attention to the much tougher challenges of

descriptive and causal inference and of external and internal validity. As a result, the guidelines or rules for doing good qualitative research are less well codified than those for statistical work. As you will discover in this course, basic rules for conducting rigorous qualitative research are still being developed and debated among political scientists.

Second, qualitative research does not produce the "clear" results generated by statistical measures. This is in part for the obvious reason that qualitative work, with the partial exception of QCA, does not yield correlation coefficients. But it is also because qualitative researchers often grapple with the non-linear, complex and/or contingent nature of socio-political phenomenon. In addition, the researcher's judgments about operationalization, coding and scaling in qualitative work are often more visible (and open to challenge) than in large data sets. Consequently, more responsibility often falls on the qualitative researcher to justify basic decisions and casual claims.

Third, in-depth research on a small number of cases often leads students to get lost in fascinating details and stories that in and of themselves may provide little basis for generalization or knowledge accumulation. If properly focused, detailed knowledge of cases is a major strength of qualitative research. However, by failing to keep in mind what precisely they are trying to explain ("what is your question?"), by not specifying what their empirical focus is "a case of," and lacking a clear understanding of which details of a case are important ("what would disconfirm their argument?") and which are less so, students encounter two risks: being overwhelmed by the complexity of the political world, and finding themselves unable to communicate how their research contributes to broader concerns or general explanations that are of interest to most political scientists.

These challenges notwithstanding, this course is based on the assumptions that qualitative methods are an especially appropriate for identifying causal relationships and that a failure to make effective use of such methods can lead to at best an oversimplification of reality and at worst a distortion of reality that in turn undermines effective knowledge accumulation as well as effective institutional and policy design.

Required Texts

Henry E. Brady and David Collier. 2nd edition. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Rowman and Littlefield.

Alexander George and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press.

Marcus Kurtz. 2013. *Latin American State Building in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge Univ. Press.

Unless otherwise noted, all other required readings are available through eJournals on the Woodruff Library homepage. Readings not available on eJournals will be posted on the course Blackboard site (classes.emory.edu) or available at other websites as indicated.

Course Requirements

Attendance and participation (25%): All members of the seminar are expected to read the assigned materials and come prepared to discuss them. Students will each make three oral presentations on selected readings, especially scholarship illustrating the use of qualitative methods. Note that "getting our hands dirty" by reviewing how other scholars have actually used qualitative methods will form an important part of our discussions. Attendance is mandatory. If extraordinary circumstances require that you miss a seminar session, please notify me as soon as possible.

Concept Paper (25% - Due Oct. 10): An essay of 5 pages in which students analyze a concept of their choice. The concept should relate to the student's research interest, whether on the independent or dependent variable side, and should form the basis of the subsequent assignment (research design). Further, the essay should grapple with the challenge of "generality" by providing both descriptive and explanatory typologies based on the concept in question.

Research Design (50% - Due Dec. 16): An essay of 15-20 pages in which students integrate the seminar material into their own research interests. To that end, it's worth reviewing some key aspects of this research component: A research design is best understood as everything in a journal article or scholarly book involving empirical research except the actual data analysis and conclusion. Stated broadly, a research design thus includes a statement of the research question, a constructively critical review of the relevant literature, proposed hypotheses, discussion of key concepts and their measurement as variables, unit of analysis, the proposed logic of inquiry, (e.g. cross-case comparison, large-N, crucial case), and proposed strategy for data gathering. More specific questions include:

1. What is the research question or puzzle the project addresses and how does it relate to the existing literature on the topic? Why should anyone care about this research? What gaps in the literature will your research address?
2. What are the project's objectives and how do they relate to the state of development in the relevant literature? (e.g. theory testing, theory or hypothesis generating, conceptual development.) Put differently, where is your work with regard to the "life cycle" of the relevant theory? How mature or well specified is the argument?
3. What are the hypotheses being tested? How will you know if your theory or hypothesis is wrong? If you are not proposing to test an argument, what are you proposing to do?
4. What type of qualitative research design are you proposing? How does the design fit into the design strategies we have discussed during the semester? Are you employing cross-case and/or within case analysis? Why? To what extent are you also employing quantitative methods and/or formal theory? How do these methods fit together? What's your justification for using multiple methods?
5. What are the independent and dependent variables? Are there any intervening variables? How do these relate to "causal mechanisms"?
6. What are the cases? Why have you chosen them? Do the cases include multiple observations? What kinds of observations are we talking about?
7. How do you intend to operationalize and measure your variables? What measurement problems do you anticipate and how might you address them? What kind of scale will you use and why?
8. What are your (probable) data sources (interviews, archives, etc)? Do you anticipate difficulties in gaining access to these sources? If so, how might you address these problems?
9. What are the main strengths and limitations of this research design?

Schedule of Topics and Readings

1. September 2 Introduction: Contested Assumptions and Implications

- ~Collier, Brady and Seawright, "Introduction," (pp.-10) - *RSI*
- ~Brady, Collier and Seawright, Ch. 1, "Refocusing the Discussion of Methodology" (pp. 11-33)- *RSI*
- ~Collier, Seawright and Munck, Ch. 2, "The Quest for Standards: KKV's *DSI* (pp. 33-63)-*RSI*
- ~Friedman, "On Types of Scientific Inquiry..." Ch. 11 (pp. 221-236) - *RSI*
- ~Giovanni Capoccia and Daniel Ziblatt. 2010. "The Historical Turn in Democratization Studies: A New Research Agenda for Europe and Beyond." *Comparative Political Studies*. 43 (8/9), 931-968.

Supplementary Readings:

- "Ian Shapiro's *The Flight From Reality in the Social Sciences*," *Qualitative Methods* (Fall 2005).
- "The Quantitative-Qualitative Distinction." 2005. *Qualitative Methods*, (Spring) 3:1, pp. 2-21.
- Richard Snyder. 2005. "Creative Hypothesis Generating in Comparative Research." *Qualitative Methods*. (Fall), pp. 2-4.
- Alexander George and Andrew Bennett. Ch. 1: "Case Studies and Theory Development," (pp. 3-36) *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences (CSTD)*

2. Sept. 9 Ontology and Methodology

- ~Peter Hall, 2003. Ch. 11: "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research," (pp. 373-399) in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (reserves direct)
- ~James Mahoney and Gary Goertz, 2006. "A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research," *Political Analysis* 14(3), pp. 227-249.
- ~Paul Pierson. 2013. "Power and Path Dependence." Unpublished ms. (blackboard)
- ~Kathe Thelen, 2003. "How Institutions Evolve: Insights from Comparative Historical Analysis." Ch. 6) in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (reserves direct).
- ~ Barbara Belfani. 2013. "Between complexity and generalization: Addressing evaluation challenges with QCA." *Evaluation*. 9(3), pp. 269-283.

Supplementary

- Kenneth Castro and Philip LoBue, "Bridging Implementation, Knowledge and Ambition Gaps to Eliminate Tuberculosis in the United States and Globally," *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, March 17:3, 2011, 337-342.
- Gabriel Almond and Stephen Genco. 1977. "Clouds, Clocks, and the Study of Politics." *World Politics*, 29 (July): 489-522 (covered in 507)
- Gary Goertz. 2005. "Necessary Condition Hypotheses as Deterministic or Probabilistic: Does It Matter?" *Qualitative Methods*, (Spring) 3:1, pp. 22-27.
- Locke and Thelen,. 1995. "Apples and Oranges Revisited: Textualized Comparisons and the Study of Comparative Labor Politics." *Politics and Society* 23:3 (September).

3. Sept. 16 Inference: Descriptive and Causal - the Case of Economic Development

- ~Collier, Brady, and Seawright, "Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology," Ch. 9, (pp. 161-204)- *RSI*.
- ~David L. Lindauer and Lant Pritchett. 2002. "What's the Big Idea? The Third Generation of Policies for Economic Growth." *Economia* (Fall), 1-39
- ~Jason Seawright, 2010. "Regression-Based Inference: A Case Study in Failed Causal Assessment." Ch. 13 (pp. 247-271) in Brady and Collier, *RSI*.
- ~ James Mahoney and Rachel Vanderpoel. 2014. "Set Diagrams and Qualitative Research." *Comparative Political Studies*, pp. 1-36.

Supplementary

Lant Pritchett. 1998. "Patterns of Economic Growth: Hills, Plateaus, Mountains, and Plains." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper no. 1947.

James Mahoney, 2008. "Toward a Unified Theory of Causality." *Comparative Political Studies*. 41 (4/5), pp. 412-436. #507

Thad Dunning, 2010. "Design-Based Inference: Beyond the Pitfalls of Regression Analysis?" Ch. 14 (pp. 273-311) in Brady and Collier, RSI.

Collier, Brady and Seawright. 2010. "Critiques, Responses, and Tradeoffs: Drawing Together the Debate." Ch. 8 (pp. 135-160) in RSI.

4. Sept. 23 Theory: What Kind? What Claims? Contingency and Typologies

~George and Bennett, "Phase Three: Drawing the Implications of Case Findings for Theory," Ch. 6 (pp. 109-124; and "Integrating Comparative and Within-Case Analysis: Typological Theory," in *CSTD*, Ch. 11, pp. 233-262.

~Colin Elman. 2005. "Explanatory Typologies in Qualitative Studies of International Politics." *International Organization*. 59:2 (Spring), pp. 293-326

~Richard F. Doner and Amy Liu. 2012. "Crises and Change: A Typological Approach." Paper prepared for presentation at the APSA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, August 30-Sept. 2, 2012.

Supplementary

Collier, David, Jody LaPorte and Jason Seawright. 2012. "Putting Typologies to Work: Concept Formation, Measurement and Analytic Rigor." *Political Research Quarterly* 65:2 (June), pp.

John Gerring. 2012. *Social Science Methodology: A Unified Framework*. (Cambridge), pp. 144-150.

Paul Pierson. 2004. "Big, Slow-Moving and...Invisible: Microsocial Processes in the Study of Comparative Politics." in James Mahoney et al., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*.

David Lake, 2011. "Why 'isms' Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress." *International Studies Quarterly*. 55, pp. 465-480.

5. Sept. 30 Concepts, Variables, Operationalization and Coding

~David Collier and James E. Mahoney, "'Conceptual Stretching' Revisited: Alternative Views of Categories in Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 87:4 (December 1993), pp. 845-55.

~ Marcus Kurz and Andrew Schrank, "Growth and Governance: Models, Measures, and Mechanisms," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 69, No. 2, May 2007, pp. 538-554.

~Layna Mosley. 2011. "Conceptualizing Workers' Rights." Ch. 4 (pp. 99-134) in Mosley, *Labor Rights and Multinational Production* (Cambridge).

~Andrew Walker, 2012. "Introduction" (pp. 1-33), in *Thailand's Political Peasants: Power in the Modern Rural Economy* (Univ. of Wisconsin Press)

Supplementary

David Collier and Steven Levitsky, "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49:3 (April 1997), pp. 430-451.

Chalmers Johnson. 1962. "Peasant Nationalism in China," Ch 1 (pp. 1-30) in Johnson, *Peasant Nationalism and Communist Power: The Emergence of Revolutionary China 1937-'945*. (Stanford)

"Symposium II: Conceptualizing Concepts." 2005. *Qualitative Methods*. (Fall), pp. 19-36.

Amartya Sen and Joseph Stiglitz. 2009. "Report on Measuring Development."

Peter Evans, *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*, Chap. 4

6. Oct. 7 Congruence: Single cases, case selection and comparative research

~Arend Lijphart. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method" *American Political Science Review* 65 (September), pp. 682-693

~George and Bennett, 2005. "The Congruence Method," Ch. 9 (pp. 181-204) in *CSTD*.

~ Geoffrey Robinson. 1996. "The Post-Coup Massacre in Bali," *Making Indonesia: Essays on Modern Indonesia in Honor of George McT. Kahin*. Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program, pp. 118-144.

Supplementary

John Gerring, 2007. "What is a Case Study? The Problem of Definition," Ch. 2 (pp. 17-36); and pp. 89-90; in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices* (Cambridge Univ. Press).

Andrew Schrank. 2006. "The Case Study and Causal Inference," Ch. 9 (pp. 169-174), In Perecman and Curran, *A Handbook for Social Science Field Research (Handbook)*.

Layna Mosley. 2008. "Workers' Rights in Open Economies: Global Production and Domestic Institutions in the Developing World." *Comparative Political Studies*. (January) 41, pp. 674-714.

Oct. 14 Fall Break

7. Oct.21 Congruence: Cross-case comparisons, case selection, coding

~George and Bennett, 2005. "Comparative Methods" Chs. 8 (pp. 151-180) in *CSTD*.

~Dan Slater and Daniel Ziblatt. 2008. "Revitalizing the Controlled Comparison: Extreme Variation and External Validity in Qualitative Research." unpublished paper.

~Jason Seawright and John Gerring. 2008. "Case Selection Techniques in Case Study Research: A Menu of Qualitative and Quantitative Options." *Political Research Quarterly*. 61:2 (June), 294-308.

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

~Richard Doner. 2009. Ch. 1 (pp. 1-24), *The Politics of Uneven Development: Thailand's Economic Development in Comparative Perspective* (Cambridge).

~ Eva Bellin. 2000. "Contingent Democrats: Industrialists, Labor, and Democratization in Late-Developing Countries," *World Politics* 52 (January), 175-205.

Supplementary

Barbara Geddes. 1990. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics." In James A. Stimson, ed., *Political Analysis*, vol 2, University of Michigan Press.

Bryan Ritchie, and Dan Slater. 2005. "Systemic Vulnerability and the Origins of Developmental States: Northeast and Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective." *International Organization* 59:2 (Spring

Art, David. "What Do We Know About Authoritarianism After Ten Years." *Comparative Politics*. (April), pp. 351-373.

Emmanuel Teitelbaum. 2011. "Introduction: The Political Management of Industrial Conflict." Ch. 1 (pp. 1-24) in Teitelbaum, *Mobilizing Restraint: Democracy and Industrial Conflict in Post-Reform South Asia*. (Cambridge U. Press).

Victoria Murillo, 2001. Chs 1 (pp. 1-10) and Ch. 7 (pp. 173-195), *Labor Unions, Partisan Coalitions, and Market Reforms in Latin America* (Cambridge).

Rudra Sil. 2009. "Area Studies, Comparative Politics, and the Role of Cross-Regional Small-N Comparison." *Qualitative Methods*. (Fall), 7:2, pp. 26-31.

James Mahoney, "Strategies of Causal Assessment in Comparative Historical Analysis" in *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, ed. Mahoney and Rueschemeyer

Jeffrey Staton, 2004. "Judicial Policy Implementation in Mexico City and Merida." *Comparative Politics*. 37:1 (October), pp. 41-60 #507

Charles Raigin. 2004. "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research." Ch. 8 (pp. 123-138) in Brady and Collier, *RSI*, 1st edition (available from instructor)

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

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

8. Oct. 28 Within-case Analysis: Process tracing and sequence

~Andrew Bennett. 2011. "Process Tracing and Causal Inference." Ch. 10 (pp. 207-219) in Brady and Collier, *RSI*.

~Pauline Jones Luong and Erika Weinthal. 2004. "Contra Coercion: Russian Tax Reform, Exogenous Shocks, and Negotiated Institutional Change," *APSR*, 98:1 (February), pp.

~Stephan Haggard and Robert Kaufman. 2012. "Inequality and Regime Change: Democratic Transitions and the Stability of Democratic Rule," *American Political Science Review* 106:3 (August), pp. 1-22 (available on blackboard / information).

Supplementary

Andrew Bennett. 2007. "Process Tracing: A Bayesian Perspective." In Bennett, pp. 702-721.

George and Bennett, 2005. "Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation," Ch. 10 (pp. 205-232), in CSTD.

Timothy McKeown. 1983. "Hegemonic Stability Theory and 19th Century Tariff Levels in Europe." *International Organization* 37(1): 73-91.

Henry E. Brady, "Data-Set Observations versus Causal-Process Observations," appendix, pp. 267-271, in Collier and Brady, *RSI*.

9. Nov. 4 Within-case analysis: Process tracing and-mechanisms

~Dan Slater. 2008. "Can Leviathan Be Democratic? Competitive Elections, Robust Mass Politics, and State Infrastructural Power." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 43(3-4), 252-272.

~Philip Keefer. 2004. "What Does Political Economy Tell Us About Economic Development – and Vice Versa" Annual Review of Political Science 7:247-72.

~Thad Dunning, 2008. Ch. 1 (pp. 1-36), Ch. 5 (pp. 148-209), *Crude Democracy: Natural Resource Wealth and Political Regimes* (Cambridge).

~Abhijit Banerjee, Rachel Glennerster and Esther Duflo. 2008. "Putting a Band-Aid on a Corpse: Incentives for Nurses in the Indian Public Health System." *Journal of the European Economic Association*. 6(2-3), pp. 387-500.

Supplementary

Michael Ross. 2001. "Does Oil Hinder Democracy?" *World Politics* 53:3 (April), pp. 325-362

Phillip Keefer. 2005. "Democracy, Public Expenditures, and the Poor: Understanding Political Incentives for Providing Public Services." *World Bank Research Observer*, 20:1 (Spring), pp. 1-27

Eric Thun. 2004. "Keeping Up with the Jones': Decentralization, Policy Imitation, and Industrial Development in China." *World Development*. 23:8, pp. 1289-1308.

Page Fortuna. 2004. "Interstate Peacekeeping: Causal Mechanisms and Empirical Effects." *World Politics* (July).

Pauline Jones Luong and Erika Weinthal. 2010. *Oil is Not a Curse: Ownership Structure and Institutions in Soviet Successor States*. (Cambridge U. Press), Ch. 1 (pp. 1-30).

10. Nov. 11 Within-case analysis: Process Tracing – perceptions and preferences (Prof. Dan Reiter and Prof. Carrie Wickham)

~Dan Reiter. 2009. *How Wars End*. (Princeton U. Press), Chs. 4, 6

~Carrie Wickham. 2012. Excerpt from Ch1, and Ch. 3 from *The Muslim Brotherhood: Evolution of an Islamic Movement* (Princeton)

11. Nov. 18 Cross- and within-case analyses (Prof. Marcus Kurtz)

Marcus Kurtz. 2013. *Latin American State Building in Comparative Perspective*.

12. Nov. 25 Mixed Methods

~Sidney Tarrow. 2004. "Bridging the Quantitative-Qualitative Divide." Ch. 6 in RSI.

~Evan Lieberman, "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research." American Political Science Review, 93:3 (August 2005), pp. 435-452.

~ Dan Slater, Ben Smith and Gautam Nair. 2014. "Economic Origins of Democratic Breakdown? ~The Redistributive Model and the Postcolonial State." 2014. *Perspectives on Politics* 12:2 (June), pp. 353-374.

Supplementary

Margaret Levi. 1998. "The Price of Citizenship." In Bates et al, *Analytic Narratives*, 109-148.

Michael Ross, 2008. "Oil, Islam and Women," *APSR* 102 (1): 107-23.

"Symposium: Cautionary Perspectives on Multi-Method Research." 2009. *Qualitative and Multi-Method Research* (Fall), 7:2, pp. 2-22.

Michael Piore, "Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Tools." Ch. 7, pp. 143-158, in Pereceman and Curran, ed., A Handbook for Social Science Research.

13. Dec. 2 Qualitative Comparative Analysis (Michael Rich)

~ Dirk Berg-Schlosser, Gisele de Meur, Benoit Rihoux and Charles Ragin. In Rihoux and Ragin, *Configurational Comparative Methods: Qualitative Comparative analysis (ACA) and Related Techniques*. Sage, pp. 1-18.

~ Michael Rich.... TBA

~ Alejandro Portes and Lori D. Smith. 2010. "Institutions and national development in Latin America: A comparative study." *Socio-Economic Review*. 8, 585-621.

Supplementary

Alex Hicks. 1994. "Qualitative Comparative Analysis and Analytical Induction: The Case of The Emergence of the Social Security State." *Sociological Methods Research*, 23, pp. 86-113.

"Symposium: Qualitative Comparative Analysis." 2004. *Qualitative Methods*. (Fall) 2:2,2-25.

14. Dec. 9 RCTs, Survey, Field Experiments (Prof. Danielle Jung)

~Danielle Jung. 2014. "Experimental Evidence on the Effects of Electoral Inking on Turnout in a Transitional Democracy.

~Esther Duflo. 2006. "Field Experiments in Development Economics." In Richard Blundell, Whitey Newer, and Torsten Persson, eds., *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Ninth World Congress*. Cambridge U. Press. And online at <http://economics.mit.edu/files/800>

~Michael Woolcock. 2013. "Using case studies to explore the external validity of 'complex' development interventions." *Evaluation*. 9 (3), pp. 229-248

Supplementary

Danielle Jung. 2014. "Scalable Information and Communications Technology Reduces Electoral Fraud in Fragile Democracies."

Dani Rodrik, 2009. "The New Development Economics: We Shall Experiment, but How Shall We Learn." Ch. 2 (pp. 24-54) in Cohen and Easterly, eds., *What Works in Development? Thinking Big and Thinking Small*. (Brookings: 2009).