

**Comparative Methods  
in International and Comparative Politics**  
GOVT 6053, Spring 2013  
Wednesdays 2:00-4:25pm, Stimson Hall 206  
<http://blackboard.cornell.edu>

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

Office hours: Tuesdays 1:30 – 3:30 pm  
Sign up for office hours at:  
<http://www.wejoinin.com/patel>

**Overview.** This seminar is designed to introduce doctoral students to the study of politics through the procedures of science. It will familiarize students with methodological challenges encountered in research, such as concept formation, theory development and testing, case selection, variable operationalization and measurement, and descriptive and causal inference. Students will learn to assess research designs and causal claims as both consumers and producers of research. 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 to conduct original research for their A paper and dissertation. 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. Class participation will compose 30% of the final grade.
- Write a “peer review” of the research design and causal claims in one paper presented this academic year in the PSAC workshop, which students are strongly encouraged to regularly attend. Write the review as if you were reviewing the manuscript for publication in a journal. Be sure to provide suggestions for improvement. Further details will be distributed in class. Your review is due by May 7<sup>th</sup>, but may be completed at any time during the semester. Your review will count for 10% of the final grade. The PSAC schedule is available at: <http://government.arts.cornell.edu/department/related/psac/calendar/>
- Complete all ten research design assignments described below, and be prepared to discuss these ideas in class. Each assignment typically consists of 1-3 pages of written work. Your memos and research design assignments will be assessed on the quality of thinking that went into the project and research design, rather than the proposed theory. The first nine assignments cumulatively count for 40% of the final grade.
- Before the second assignment is due, the class will be divided 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 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.** Three books are available for purchase at the Cornell Bookstore, Kraftee's, and online. All three are also on reserve in Olin Library. All other 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.
- 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. 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. 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:** Find a puzzle or topic that (a) you think is important and interesting; (b) you think our understanding of is inadequate; and (c) you believe it is possible to collect data or information that would help us better understand it. A puzzle could be variation in an outcome across time or space, a pattern that seems suboptimal or inefficient, or a phenomenon that simply does not “make sense” and you “don’t get.” This could come from something you read in another class or from a particular case. It could be a case that does not fit with what we think we know. Try not to formulate your question as a version of “I want to look at the effect of x on y.” In one page, describe your puzzle without using jargon or suggesting a possible explanation. You might present your puzzle as a brief account of an event, a motivating comparison, an anomaly, a regularity or relationship in statistical data, or some other way. E-mail me a 1-2 page summary by **8 a.m., January 28<sup>th</sup>**, and be prepared to briefly describe your puzzle in seminar on January 30<sup>th</sup>.

**Assignment #2:** Identify and briefly summarize one main and two plausible alternative explanations that might resolve your puzzle. There are different ways to do this. You could develop explanations “off the top of your head” or you might collect several articles or books that examine roughly the same puzzle that you have posed (i.e., have roughly the same dependent variable) and draw out conjectures from those works. 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. Try to think in terms of variables. 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 cannot think of any evidence that would convince you that the proposition is wrong, you need to reformulate the proposition. If it helps, you may 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 11<sup>th</sup>**.

**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. Try to think of observable implications at different levels or units of observation (e.g., individuals, groups, spatial units). 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. Think about what would be ‘ideal’ data with which to assess each conjecture. E-mail me and your group a 2-3 page summary by **8 a.m., February 25<sup>th</sup>**.

**Assignment #4:** First, explicitly define your key independent and dependent variables. Clearly state how your variables vary. Second, describe how you will operationalize these variables consistently 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 4<sup>th</sup>**.

**Assignment #5:** Identify a relevant universe of cases. Be clear about the unit of analysis and what you mean by “case” and “observation.” 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 11<sup>th</sup>**.

**Assignment #6:** Outline a large-N dataset that would produce some statistical test of your theory using cross-national, sub-national, diachronic, or survey data. Develop a research strategy for building this dataset, and provide a few sample “rows.” If possible, describe “coding rules.” State the specific 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. Provide 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 25<sup>th</sup>**.

**Assignment #7, 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. Be specific about the treatment, the unit at which the treatment is applied (e.g., individuals, villages), and how cases will be or were assigned to treatments and controls. E-mail it to me and your group by **8 a.m., April 1<sup>st</sup>**.

**Assignment #7, option b:** Write a 2-3 page memo describing a possible endogeneity problem in your project and how you intend to solve it or minimize the risk of biased inference. E-mail it to me and your group by **8 a.m., April 1<sup>st</sup>**.

**Assignment #7, option c:** If you believe that identification is not a problem for your project, write a 2-3 page memo explaining why endogeneity and sample selection are not issues. E-mail it to me and your group by **8 a.m., April 1<sup>st</sup>**.

**Assignment #8, option a:** 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? E-mail me and your group a 2-3 page summary by **8 a.m., April 8<sup>th</sup>**.

**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?

**Optional:** Describe a “narrative” that you could use to see if actors in the real world condition their behavior on the factors that your formal model highlights.

**Assignment #8, option b:** Describe a case (which might be a country, province, city, piece of legislation, group, individual, etc.) that you intend to use to trace historically and theorize empirically the translation of values on independent variables onto values on dependent variables. How will you use this case to understand process and what inferential leverage might you gain through a close examination of cases (e.g., supporting an argument or ruling out alternative explanations or both)? Finally, how will you know if additional insights gleaned from your “process-tracing” apply to the general question beyond this particular case? E-mail a 2-3 page summary to me and your group by **8 a.m., April 8<sup>th</sup>**.

**Assignment #9, option a:** Pick a country in which you could do field research for your project and write a 2-3 page memo that does two things. First, describe the types of field activities you will conduct (e.g., interviews, participant observation, archival research). Be as specific as possible on the ‘types’ of respondents you would like to observe or speak with, the sorts of events you would like to attend or observe, or the types of non-interactive data and information you would seek to collect. If possible, draft 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, personal safety, 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 16<sup>th</sup>**.

**Assignment #9, option b:** If one of the potential explanations you are investigating can be characterized as an increasing returns or path dependence process (as described by Pierson 2000 or another type described by Page 2006), explain how preceding steps in a particular direction purportedly affect further movement **and** how you plan to test hypotheses

based on that path dependent argument. Be clear on how you could falsify the path dependent argument. If appropriate, briefly explain how not considering the temporal dimensions of this social process might lead to faulty inferences. E-mail a 2-3 page summary to me and your group by **8 a.m., April 16<sup>th</sup>**.

**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 1<sup>st</sup>**. Explain how and why you intend to combine particular methods or approaches. Consider preparing transparencies, PowerPoint slides, or printed handouts.

## Class 1. January 23. Introduction

Keohane, Robert O. 2009. "Political Science as a Vocation." *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 42, 2: 359-363.

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.

Monroe, Kristin Renwick. 2007. "The Perestroika Movement, its Methodological Concerns, and the Professional Implications of These Methodological Issues." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 5, 1.  
<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter5.1.pdf>

Kramnick, Isaac. 2002. "Writing Politics." In Jonathan Monroe, *Writing and Revising the Disciplines*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. pp. 75-89.

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

### Supplemental

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

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

<http://community.apsanet.org/ComparativePolitics/ComparativePoliticsSectionNewsletter>

Much of the discussion on methods has moved to the newsletter of APSA's Organized Section on Qualitative and Multi-Method Research.

[http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/Qualitative\\_Methods\\_Newsletters/Qualitative\\_Methods\\_Newsletters/](http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/moynihan/cqrm/Qualitative_Methods_Newsletters/Qualitative_Methods_Newsletters/)

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.

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

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.

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

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

## Class 2. January 30. Puzzles and questions

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

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

Smith, Rogers M. 2007. "Systematizing the Ineffable: A Perestroika's Methods for Finding a Good Research Topic." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 5, 1.

<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter5.1.pdf>

O'Brien, Kevin J. 2006. "Discovery, Research (Re)design, and Theory Building." In *Doing Fieldwork in China*, eds. Maria Heimer and Stig Thøgersen. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. pp. 27-41.

Lake, David A. 2011. "Why 'isms' are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress." *International Studies Quarterly* 55, 2 (June): 465-480.

Krugman, Paul. 1993. "How I Work."

<http://web.mit.edu/krugman/www/howiwork.html>

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: 362-98. (only read pages 370-374, and focus on Table 1 on p. 372)

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97, 1: 75-90. (only read pages 75-78, and focus on Figure 1 on p. 77)

### 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.

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

### Class 3. February 6. Descriptive inference and how it differs from causal inference

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

Comment on Katzenstein 1985 in Collier & Brady, Chap 7, pp. 119-120

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

Przeworski, Adam, and Henry Tuene. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. John Wiley & sons, Inc. Introduction, Chapters 1 & 2, pp. 3-46.

Nisbett, Richard E., and Dov Cohen. 1996. *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Chapters 1-2 (pp. 1-24)

#### Supplemental

Popper, Karl. 1953. "Science: Conjectures and Refutations." Lecture given at Cambridge.

<http://philosophyfaculty.ucsd.edu/faculty/rarneson/Courses/popperphil1.pdf>

Read sections I, II, VI, and VII.

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.

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

Page, Scott E. 2006. "Path Dependence." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*. 1: 87-115.



**Class 4. February 13. Causality and standards for valid causal inference, part I**

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

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

Collier & Brady, chapters 1-2 (pp. 15-63)

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

Morgan, Stephen L., and Christopher Winship. 2007. *Counterfactuals and Causal Inference: Methods and Principles for Social Research*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.  
Chapters 1-2 (p. 3-57)

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

**Supplemental**

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

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

Lewis, David. 1973. "Causation." *The Journal of Philosophy* 70, 17:556-567.

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

Lebow, Richard Ned. 2010. *Forbidden Fruit: Counterfactuals and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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.

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.

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

## Class 5. February 20. Causality and standards for valid causal inference, part II

Chapters 10 (Bennett) and 12 (Brady) in Collier & Brady, (pp. 207-219, 237-242)

Checkel, Jeffrey T. 2008. "Process-tracing." In Audie Klotz, ed. *Qualitative Methods in International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Beach, Derek, and Rasmus Brun Pedersen. 2011. "What is process tracing actually tracing? The three variants of process tracing methods and their uses and limitations." Paper prepared for presentation at the APSA annual meeting, Seattle, WA, September 1-4.

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

Hedström, Peter. 2008. "Studying Mechanisms: Strengthening Casual Inference in Quantitative Research." In Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

<http://www.nuffield.ox.ac.uk/users/hedstrom/inference.pdf>

Reread KKV on "causal mechanisms", chapter 3.2.1 (pp. 85-86)

Gerring, John. 2010. "Causal Mechanisms: Yes, But..." *Comparative Political Studies* 43, 11:1499-1526.

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

Tannenwald, Nina. 2005. "Stigmatizing the Bomb: Origins of the Nuclear Taboo." *International Security* 29, 4:5-49.

### Supplemental

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

Grzymala-Busse, Anna. 2011. "Time Will Tell? Temporality and the Analysis of Causal Mechanisms and Processes." *Comparative Political Studies* 44, 9 (December): 1267-1297.

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's response, 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 response to his response.

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.

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

## Class 6. February 27. 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. [Assigned in GOVT6353]

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

Goertz, Gary. 2008. "Concepts, theories, and numbers: A checklist for constructing, evaluating, and using concepts or quantitative measures." In Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 97-118.

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. [Assigned in GOVT6353]

Chandra, Kanchan. 2011. "What is an Ethnic Party?" *Party Politics*, forthcoming.  
<http://politics.as.nyu.edu/docs/IO/2587/Chandra2011-Ethnicparty.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.

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.

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)

Lieberman, Evan S. 2010. "Bridging the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide: Best Practices in the Development of Historically Oriented Replication Databases." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13:37-59.

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

### Democracy

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

## Class 7. March 6. Principles of selecting the unit of analysis and cases

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

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.

Gerring, John. 2008. "Case selection for case-study analysis: qualitative and quantitative techniques." In Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp.645-684.

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

Slater, Dan, and Daniel Ziblatt. 2013. "The Enduring Indispensability of the Controlled Comparison." *Comparative Political Studies*. Forthcoming.

<http://cps.sagepub.com/content/early/2013/01/15/0010414012472469>

Levy, Jack S. "Counterfactuals and Case Studies." In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, eds. Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 627-644.

Multiple authors. 2008. "Symposium: Case Selection, Case Studies, and Causal Inference." *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 6, 2.

<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter6.2.pdf>

### 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.

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

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

**Class 8. March 13. Endogeneity, causality and identification: “natural experiments,” instrumental variables, regression-discontinuity...and how “matching” differs**

Reread KKV on endogeneity, chapter 5.4

Malesky, Edmund J. 2008. “Battling Onward: The Debate Over Field Research in Developmental Economics and its Implications for Comparative Politics.” *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 6, 2.  
<http://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter6.2.pdf>

Dunning, Thad. Chapter 14 in Brady & Collier, pp. 273-311.

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. **[Assigned in GOVT6353]**

Iyer, Lakshmi. 2010. “Direct Versus Indirect Colonial Rule in India: Long-term Consequences.” *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 92, 4: 693-713.

Lyall, Jason. 2009. “Does Indiscriminate Violence Incite Insurgent Attacks? Evidence from Chechnya.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53, 3.

Recent blog posts about matching and endogeneity bias:

<http://chrisblattman.com/2010/10/27/the-cardinal-sin-of-matching/>

[http://www.iq.harvard.edu/blog/sss/archives/2010/10/can\\_matching\\_so.shtml](http://www.iq.harvard.edu/blog/sss/archives/2010/10/can_matching_so.shtml)

<http://cyrussamii.com/?p=33>

### **Supplemental**

Angrist, Joshua D., and S. Pischke. 2008. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricists’ Companion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Imbens, Guido W., and Thomas Lemieux. 2007. “Regression Discontinuity Designs: A Guide to Practice.” *Journal of Econometrics* 142, 2:615-635

Butler, Daniel M., and Mathew J. Butler. 2006. “Splitting the Difference? Causal Inference and Theories of Split-party Delegations.” *Political Analysis* 14: 439-455.

Clear and useful description of RDD on pp. 443-446

Joseph Altonji, Todd E. Elder, and Christopher Taber. 2005. “Selection on Observed and Unobserved Variables: Assessing the Effectiveness of Catholic Schools.” *Journal of Political Economy* 113: 151-184.

Hyde, Susan D. 2007. “The Observer Effect in International Politics: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.” *World Politics* 60, 1.

Sekhon, Jasjeet S. 2009. “Opiates for the Matches: Matching Methods for Causal Inference.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 12:487-508.

Gilligan, Michael J., and Ernest J. Sergenti. 2008. “Do UN Interventions Cause Peace? Using Matching to Improve Causal Inference.” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 3, 2: 89-122.

Humphreys, Macartan, and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2007. “Demobilization and Reintegration.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 5, 4: 531-567.

**Class 9. March 27. Experiments...come, try the Kool-Aid!**

Gerber, Alan, and Donald Green. 2012. *Field Experiments: Design, Analysis, and Interpretation*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Chapter 1: [http://media.wwnorton.com/cms/excerpts/Field\\_Experiments\\_Ch01.pdf](http://media.wwnorton.com/cms/excerpts/Field_Experiments_Ch01.pdf)

Stokes, Susan. 2010. "The Opportunities and Limits of Field Experiments." APSA-CP 21, 1.

Dunning, Paluck, and Malesky articles. 2008. "Symposium: Field Experiments and Qualitative Methods" *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research Newsletter* 6, 2 (Fall): 17-34.

Paluck, Elizabeth Levy, and Donald P. Green. 2009. "Deference, Dissent, and Dispute Resolution: An Experimental Intervention Using Mass Media to Change Norms and Behavior in Rwanda." *American Political Science Review*, 103, 4:622-644.

Pepinsky, Thomas B., R.W. Liddle, and Saiful Mujani. 2009. "Testing Islam's Political Advantage: Evidence from Indonesia." APSA Meeting paper.

Malhotra, Neil, and Yotam Margalit. 2009. "Anti-Semitism and the economic crisis." *Boston Review* (May/June).

Dunning, Thad, and Lauren Harrison. 2010. "Cross-cutting Cleavages and Ethnic Voting: An Experimental Study of Cousinage in Mali." *American Political Science Review* 104, 1: 21-39.

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>

Blattman on the discipline and advice: <http://chrisblattman.com/2009/10/16/after-the-surge/>

**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.

Hyde, Susan D. 2010. "The Future of Field Experiments in International Relations." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 628:72-84.

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>

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.

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

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)

Henrich, Joseph, Steven J. Heine, and Ara Norenzayan. 2010. "The weirdest people in the world?" *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 33: 61-135.

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 10. April 3. Formal theories and choice**

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

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

Clarke, Kevin A., and David M. Primo. 2007. "Modernizing Political Science: A Model-Based Approach." *Perspectives on Politics* 5, 4:741-753.

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

Chandra, Kanchan. 2007. "Counting heads: a theory of voter and elite behavior in patronage democracies." In *Patrons, Clients, and Policies: Patterns of Democratic Accountability and Political Competition*, ed. Herbert Kitschelt and Steven I. Wilkinson. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. P. 84-109.

Patel, David S. 2012. "Concealing to reveal: the changing informational role of Islamic dress." *Rationality and Society* 24, 3 (August):295-323.

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**

Morrow, James. 1994. *Game Theory for political scientists*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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.

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.

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 11. April 10. The role(s) of field work**

Definitions used by authors of "Field Research in Political Science project"

<http://www.psfieldresearch.org/definitions>

Kapiszewski, Diane, Lauren M. MacLean, and Benjamin L. Read. *Field Research in Political Science*. Draft manuscript.

Chapter 1. History, Borders, and Varieties of Field Research in Political Science

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

Bernard, H. Russell. 2011. *Research methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, 5<sup>th</sup> edition*. New York: AltaMira Press.  
pp. 256-336 (Chapters 12-14)  
pp. 113-129, 143-186 (Chapters 5, 7, 8).

Collier, David. 1999. "Data, Field Work and Extracting New Ideas at Close Range." *APSA-CP 10*, 1: 1-2, 4-6.

Loaeza, Soledad, Randy Stevenson, and Devra C. Moehler. 2005. "Symposium: Should Everyone Do Fieldwork?" *APSA-CP 16*, 2:8-18.

Lieberman, Evan S. et al. 2004. "Symposium: Field Research," *Qualitative Methods*. 2, 1: 2-14.

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**

Bernard, H. Russell. 2011. *Research methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches, 5<sup>th</sup> edition*. New York: AltaMira Press.

Barrett, Christopher B., and Jeffrey W. Cason. 2010. *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. New York: Routledge.

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

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/>

**Class 12. April 17. "Mixed" or "multi"-method research – different understandings of how and why to integrate methods and data**

Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 2008. "Integrating Qualitative and Quantitative Methods." In Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady, and David Collier. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 756-775.

Multiple authors. 2007. "Symposium: Multi-Method Work, Dispatches from the Front Lines." *Qualitative Methods* 5, 1:9-28.

*QMMR Newsletter* 7:2

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

Tarrow in Brady & Collier 2010, chapter 6 (pp. 101-110)

**Muslim integration in France project**

- Laitin, David. 2008. "Muslim Integration into EU Societies: Comparative Perspectives." NSF proposal.
- Adida, Claire L., David D. Laitin, and Marie-Anne Valfort. 2010. "Identifying barriers to Muslim integration in France." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*.
- Adida, Claire L., David D. Laitin, and Marie-Anne Valfort. 2010. "The Sources of Religious Discrimination: Evidence from a Field Experiment in France." Prepared for delivery at the 2010 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 2-5, 2010.

**Supplemental**

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

Rohlfing, Ingo. 2007. "What You See and What You Get: Pitfalls and Principles of Nested Analysis in Comparative Politics." *Comparative Political Studies* 41 (11): 1492-1514.

Sil, Rudra, and Peter J. Katzenstein. 2010. "Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics: Reconfiguring Problems and Mechanisms across Research Traditions." *Perspectives on Politics* 8, 2:411-431.

Paluck, Levy. 2010. "The Promising Integration of Qualitative Methods and Field Experiments." *Annals of the American Academy of Politics and Social Sciences* 628, 1 (March): 59-71.

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

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.

**Class 13. April 24. The light at the end of the tunnel: dissertation exemplars**

**We will select two dissertations to read and discuss. Here are several possibilities.**

Chauchard, Simon. 2011. "From Political Power To Changing Group Relations? Tracking the Psychological Impact of Political Inclusion in Rural India." Ph.D. Dissertation. New York University.

Scacco, Alexandra. 2010. "Who Riots? Explaining Individual Participation in Ethnic Violence." Ph.D. Dissertation, Columbia University.

Blaydes, Lisa A. 2008. "Competition without Democracy: Elections and Distributive Politics in Mubarak's Egypt." Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA.

Thachil, Tariq. 2009. "The Saffron Wave Meets the Silent Revolution: Why the Poor Vote for Hindu Nationalism in India." Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.

Tudor, Maya. 2010. "Twin Births, Divergent Democracies: The Social and Institutional Origins of Regime Outcomes in India and Pakistan, 1920-1958." Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University.

Adida, Claire Leslie. 2010. "Immigrant Exclusion and Insecurity in Africa." Ph.D. Dissertation. Stanford University.

Hafner-Burton, Emilie Marie. 2003. "Globalizing Human Rights? How International Trade Agreements Shape Government Repression." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Chiozza, Giacomo. 2004. "Love and Hate: Anti-Americanism and the American World Order." Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University.

Margalit, Yotam. 2008. "Globalization's Losers: International Economic Integration and the Politics of Discontent." Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.

Singh, Purna. 2010. "Subnationalism and Social Development: A Comparative Analysis of Indian States." Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University.

**Other possibilities:**

Almond prize winners: <http://www.apsanet.org/media/Gabriel%20A%20Almond%20Award.pdf>

Reid prize winners: <http://www.apsanet.org/media/Helen%20Dwight%20Reid%20Award.pdf>

Schattschneider prize winners: <http://www.apsanet.org/media/E%20E%20Schattschneider%20Award.pdf>

Or winners of organized section dissertation awards: [http://www.apsanet.org/content\\_4113.cfm](http://www.apsanet.org/content_4113.cfm)

Or dissertations that became books used in 6353.

## **Class 14. May 1. 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.

### **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)

Few, Stephen. 2009. *Now You See It: Simple Visualization Techniques for Quantitative Analysis*. Oakland, CA: Analytics Press.

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.

Weingast, Barry R. 2010. "Structuring your papers (CalTech Rules)." Unpublished manuscript.

<http://politicalscience.stanford.edu/faculty/weingast/CALTECHRUL100427printversion.pdf>