

POS 6933 - 8923
Comparative Qualitative & Mixed Methods

Assistant Professor Staffan I. Lindberg

Office: Anderson Hall 207
Phone: 352-273-2359
Email: sil@ufl.edu
Homepage: <http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/sil/>

Class Meetings: Tue 5-7 (CBD 234)
Office Hours: Wedn 7.30am – 10.30am

*Students **must** also log in to WebCT/E-Learning on regular basis to access additional course information, study materials, and class notes.*

*All written assignments are submitted by students on **Turnitin.com**. The course name is POS6933 Comparative Qualitative & Mixed Methods, Class ID is 246665, and the password is: Thinkers09*

For final papers: a hard copy must also be handed to the professor at a time specified for each assignment.

I. OVERVIEW

Welcome.

This class is dedicated to the techniques, uses, advantages, problems and prospects of scholarly work based on one or a small number of cases. It is a classical issue in comparative politics but has extension far beyond the interest of comparativists only, and for that matter, only those working with small *N*'s. It is also an area that has attracted renewed attention in the last 10 years or so, and methodological advancements have been many by scholars such as Charles Ragin, David Collier, James Mahoney, Paul Pierson, John Gerring, Kathleen Thelen, Gary Goertz, and many others. The standard advise on comparisons based on Mill, and later Lijphart and Przeworski and Teune that shaped generations of scholars has been challenged in numerous ways moving us much further along the path of knowing how to design studies in such a way that gives us causal leverage and avoids pitfalls of claiming too much, or too little. Among other things, this has lead to the recent development of “mixed methods designs” and accordingly the APSA section on Qualitative Methods in 2007 changed its name to “Qualitative and Mixed Methods”. While the central goal of this seminar is to enable students to create and critique methodologically sophisticated ‘macro-qualitative’ case study research designs in the social sciences, we will also emphasize the relationships among these methods, alternative methods, and contemporary debates in the philosophy of science.

The work on how to study and compare single or a smaller number cases, whether cross-national or comparative historical, has thus come far. In my opinion, all students who in some way may confront comparative case study work (in particular any student in comparative politics) must insert themselves firmly in these discussions and really become conversant with the lessons learnt, the debates, and the possibilities.

After a couple of seminars that provides an overview of the main issues, we venture into case study methods proper. A sometimes neglected aspect in this area are the tools in thinking about and forming concepts. Concept formation, disaggregation, operationalization, and re-aggregation has always formed a core aspect of comparative politics and small-N comparisons. This is partly due to the often cited interest in “big questions” often involving complex, multidimensional concepts. It is also partly due to the methodological problems of small-N analysis and how much results are dependent not only of the cases you select, but also on the meaning you give the concepts. Finally, a lot of theoretical generalizations from single and comparative case studies are typology theories relying on ‘thick’ concepts. We will therefore spend a considerable part of the first part of this course learning about and discussing the art of concept formation. It is an art, believe me, requiring just as much skill and training as any art-form.

We will then discuss different forms of causality, causal inference, and theory testing in qualitative case study approaches. With this grounding, the seminar explores core issues in classic qualitative case study research design, including methods of structured and focused comparisons of cases, typological theory, case selection, process tracing, analytical narratives, congruence testing, and the use of counterfactual analysis. Next, the seminar will look at the epistemological assumptions, comparative strengths and weaknesses, and proper domain of case study methods and alternative methods, and address ways of combining these methods in a single research project such as use of nested analysis, experiments, analytical narratives, and qualitative comparative analysis (QCA). It concludes with student presentations of case study research designs and constructive critiques of these designs by seminar participants. Presumably, many students will choose to present research designs for their dissertation project, but final papers could also present a research design for a separate project, article or book chapter.

Perhaps a word on what this class is not about is called for as well. The title could have added “macro” to the qualitative, indicating that in principle we will not discuss methods of collecting and analyzing individual level qualitative data such as in-depth interviews, participants observation, and the like. There are special courses both in political science and in other disciplines for that. We will only discuss them in so far as aspects of various macro-qualitative methods, for example elite interviews in process-tracing. Hence, these methods remain a peripheral part of the course.

Finally, this a class that is designed to help you work directly on concepts, and problems of comparison and analysis that relates to your dissertation. It is quite possible to take this class in your first year assuming you have at least moderately thought through your dissertation topic (that also applies for 2nd and 3rd year students !). When we discuss concepts, you will be asked to contribute with analysis of a key concept in your own work, for example. When we discuss comparative historical analysis, you will be asked to evaluate somebody’s work that is relevant for your dissertation topic, and so on. Topics and theoretical approaches of dissertation topics typically changes - yes, but participating in this seminar may then assist you to find out if you are on the right track.

The *most important requirement* for this course is that we approach the readings, lectures and each other’s contributions with respect, curiosity, patience, and a willingness to learn. I will allow virtually any arguments and thoughts in class encouraging your individual ability to think and be critical, but I will not tolerate anything insulting or any intimidation of dissenting opinions.

COURSE OUTLINE

A. INTRODUCTION

- 1) Overview I: Comparative Method and Qualitative Case Studies
- 2) Overview II: Comparative Method and Qualitative Case Studies
- 3) Critiques and Justifications of Qualitative Case Study Methods

B. CONCEPTUALIZATION AND MEASUREMENT

- 4) Concept Formation, Classification, Typologies
- 5) Qualitative Measurement, Indicators, Levels of Measurement

C. CASE STUDIES AND CAUSAL ASSESSMENT

- 6) Thinking About Causality: Inference, Effects, Mechanisms
- 7) Single Case Studies, Selection, Bias
- 8) Comparative Cross-Case Studies, Selection, Bias
- 9) Longitudinal Case Studies: Process Tracing, Congruence Testing, Counterfactual Analysis
- 10) *Spring Break.....*
- 11) Longitudinal Comparative Analysis: Path-Dependence, Timing, Sequence, Junctures

D. MIXED METHODS AND CAUSAL ASSESSMENT

- 12) Nested Analysis, Experiments and Qualitative Case Studies
- 13) Analytical Narratives Using Formal Models
- 14) Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA)
- 15) *Finish Papers – Due Friday April 17th, at 1.00 pm*

E. STUDENT PAPERS

- 16) Seminar A
- 17) Seminar B

II. COURSE FORMAT and REQUIREMENTS

This course is organized around seminars with components of lectures by the professor; students presentations; discussions; individual studies; weekly papers; and writing of individual term papers.

Background Readings

It is *assumed* that you are already well versed in the following literature (from taking, among other classes, Scope and Epistemology and Conduct of Inquiry):

- King, Keohane, and Verba. 1994. *Design Social Inquiry*. Princeton University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. 2001. *Making Social Science Matter*. Cambridge University Press.
- Brady, Henry E. and David Collier. 2004. (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Rowan & Littlefield
- Gerring, John. 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Critical Framework*. Cambridge University Press.

Required Books for this Class:

- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. *Paradigms and Sandcastles*. University of Michigan Press.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. *The Comparative Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Required Chapters from Books:

- Carr, Edward H. 1987. *What is History?* 2nd ed., Pelican Books, First published by Mcmillan 1961 (Chapters 1, 4, and 5)
- Przeworski, Adam and Hery Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. Krieger Publishing (Chapter 2, 5, and 6)
- Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer (ed.) 2003. *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press (Chapter 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11)
- Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 1998. *Analytical Narratives*. Princeton University Press (Introduction and Chapter 3)
- Gerring, John. 2007. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press (Chapter 2).

All the above readings have been put on the reserve in Library West along with some suggested readings. Other readings include a number of articles and working papers - see reading schedule below – and you find them either on AREAS or on-line at our course website on E-learning. All readings are required except if explicitly listed as recommended.

A word of caution.

If you pay sufficient attention to the instructions below, you notice that you will be doing a certain amount of *individual* reading *outside* of the required list (when you write ‘think-pieces’). And, let me emphasize this: This is a class that will require you to spend A LOT OF TIME on THINKING. Grades will not be give-aways, particularly not the participation and attendance part. Only high-quality contributions that are demonstratively based on sufficient effort of digesting and thinking about the issues at hand, will be rewarded with the higher grades.

Weekly Seminars - Attendance and Participation (30% of final grade)

Students are naturally expected to complete assigned readings before each seminar. I will typically start us off with an introduction of the topic but there will not be the usual “student presentations”. Instead, a portion (depending on class size) of the students will be asked in advance, to write a short paper on the literature. See more on that below.

Each week, the “think pieces” will form the central basis of our discussions along with the required readings. We will start with collectively identifying the main 2, 3 or 4 key issues, questions or methodological problems based on the required readings and the “think piece” papers. Then I will randomly ask one of you (who were not assigned to write a paper that particular week), to start the discussion of each question or issue. That role includes to A) summarize what the think pieces argue regarding this issue, B) point to weaknesses of their argument, and then C) advance your own argument. You will not be in a position to do this adequately if you have not read both the required readings *and the papers*, and taken time

to sit down and THINK about them. I will lead the ensuing discussion and everyone is expected to participate.

Hence, all of you will be required to read these student papers before coming to class. This is very important. It will be considered *unacceptable* for a student not to read the required readings and the student papers, and to sit down to THINK about them, before coming to class. This is an exercise in collective action and I will insist on penalizing instances of free riding.

Learning from mistakes is often the best way of getting a lesson that sticks, but you do not have to make all the mistakes yourself, hence, these weekly exercises. Finally, I will frequently put the required readings into perspective and also give a few remarks about next weeks topic. Lectures *reinforce* materials in required readings but also *add* other materials, new concepts, ideas and interpretations.

Attendance is compulsory. Being late is a disruption to the class and is not acceptable. Respect everyone's time and efforts.

Short papers (30% of final grade)

Each student will thus be asked to write a few short papers, or think-pieces (again, how many depends on the class size). *Please, look closely at the reading schedule before our first meeting so we can distribute these assignments immediately.* The main task in the papers is *not* to summarize the texts, but to pursue an interesting and revealing analysis of the arguments and issues they raise. The papers should show creative but at the same time demonstrate stringent and IN-DEPTH THINKING – your own thinking.

These are thus to be methodological “think pieces” (probably two or three of them for each seminar) that should discuss, critique, and evaluate the main points made in the required readings. Then the papers should put this new knowledge into use by “tearing apart” some scholar's work. This means using your new knowledge to find methodological weaknesses in the work and suggest how an alternative could have improved on the quality of the work and/or led to different substantial findings. What you thus ‘tear apart’ can be an article, a book chapter in an edited volume, or a book, and you can focus on just one part or aspect of it rather than the whole work. The two important things are that 1) the work is either a single or a comparative case study, and 2) that the work you decide to dissect includes sufficient information on empirical methods for you to analyze. Thus, a book might actually be easier to work with than an article. It is perfectly alright to choose a piece of work that you already know but have not analyzed in this way before, or something you have to read carefully for your prospectus, dissertation, or for qualifying exams.

The idea is that we each week get to discuss the conceptual and methodological questions as such in detail, as well as practice how to use this knowledge in evaluating others' work and learn to avoid their mistakes. These short papers are also meant as pieces that can become building blocks for discussions of methodology in your dissertation or other writings.

The ‘think pieces’ should be no shorter than 4 pages and no longer than 8 pages (double spaced, 1” margins). Each short paper must be submitted on turnitin.com, emailed as pdf to everyone in the class, and handed in as hard copy to me. We have class on Tuesdays at 11.45 and the deadline for submitting papers will be each Monday at 12.00 noon so that everyone has a fair chance to read and think about the think pieces as well.

Term paper (40% of final grade):

You have two options for the term paper. Either you do a research design paper for a single or (preferably) comparative case study, or you write a substantive research paper on a methodological issue.

The research design paper should aim to become an integral part of a current research project; your dissertation or an article/book chapter project. This must discuss in detail the literature in the class and make a solid and sophisticated case for your design that can pass a critical examination by a ‘variable-oriented’ scholar. This is a good option for most students who will be doing case studies in their dissertation and are at a relatively advanced stage with regards to their topic, key question and key variables.

The model for a research paper is an academic article published in an established, peer-review journal such as the articles/chapters we have been reading. Your paper should be an essay on methodology, preferably focusing on one core issue or debate. The paper should both pursue a methodological argument and then critique a number of existing works in light of that argument, i.e. of good and not so good examples. If you are smart, you write a paper that is directly tied to your dissertation work or an article project you are working on.

The length should not be less than 7,000 and not exceed 9,000 words exclusive of references. You submit it electronically on Turnitin.com, send it via email to everyone in the class, and hand in a hard copy to me.

Each paper will be examined during our final paper seminars. The exact form of this evaluation may be subject to change depending on class size and other factors but we will try to make the seminars allow for half an hour or so discussion of each paper. A peer student will be the discussant on your paper raising critique and questions and you will be given opportunity to defend your analysis and conclusions. You will also be assigned to be the discussant on one paper. I will grade your paper as well as the quality of your performance both in defending your argument orally, and in your role as a discussant.

III. STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND GRADING

Policy on Make-up and Late Papers

Make-ups will be arranged *only for university accepted excuses*. In the event of an illness, students should *notify the professor prior to the deadline* and provide proper documentation from their physician. In almost any situation, it is possible to pass along a message to the professor via email, phone, a classmate or a family member. If a student misses a class, presentation, or other deadline and *for good reasons* cannot contact me beforehand, it is the student’s responsibility to contact me within 24 hours after the deadline. If the student fails to contact me within the allotted time, or fails to produce acceptable documentation, the student will receive a **zero** on the assignment.

Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism

All students should observe the University of Florida’s standards of academic honesty. Progress in the social sciences is predicated on the principle of open access to theories and results produced by other scholars. We staunchly seek to guard our peers’ intellectual property because that is the only way we can make sure that science as we know it survives. You are expected to participate fully in our efforts. In the event that a student is found cheating or plagiarizing, the student will automatically fail the course and will be reported to Student Judicial Affairs.

Acts of Cheating and Plagiarism include:

- Turning in a paper or any other assignment that was written by someone else (i.e. another student, a research service, a scholar, downloaded off the internet).

- Copying, verbatim, a sentence or a paragraph of text from the work of another author without properly acknowledging the source through a commonly accepted citation style and using quotation marks.
- Paraphrasing (i.e. restating in your own words) text written by another author without citing that author.
- Using an unique idea or concept which you discovered in a specific reading without citing the author.

Finally, one thing: Wikipedia is *not* an acceptable source of information. Anything presented in writing based on Wikipedia will be treated as if no source has been given, hence, will be open to charges of plagiarism.

Grading Scale

A	100-90	C+	79-77
B+	89-87	C	76-70
B	86-80	D	below 70

IV. ELECTRONICA & OFFICE HOURS

You will use email as the regular mode of communication for this class so make sure you check your email frequently, especially before coming to class. I will use the website for our class (you will find it when you log in at E-learning) to post class notes, readings, and related materials. All class notes are the intellectual property of your professor and *can not* be used for any other purpose than completing this course without a written approval from me. I encourage you to take advantage of office hours to pose questions, discuss readings, or explore related topics. All paper submission will be made on Turnitin.com where I have set up our class with its own homepage.

V. DISABILITY POLICY

University of Florida recognizes its responsibility for creating an institutional climate in which students with disabilities can succeed. In accordance with this policy, if you have a documented disability, you may request accommodations to obtain equal access and to promote your learning in this class. Please, contact the Dean of Students Office. The Dean of Students Office will provide documentation to the student who must then provide this documentation to the instructor when requesting accommodation. Anyone with disability should feel free to see me during office hours to make the necessary arrangements.

VI. DETAILED COURSE AND READING SCHEDULE.

*Articles from journals, a few papers, and APSA Newsletters are found on the course website (E-learning)

**Books and book chapters are put on reserve

***A few readings can be downloaded from the reserve (AREAS download)

A. INTRODUCTION

WEEK 1 Overview I: Comparative Method and Qualitative Case Studies Tue 1/6.

Readings (≈ 90 pages):

Lijphart, Arendt. 1971. "Comparative Politics and Comparative Method". *APSR* 65, pp. 682-695.

Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. "Research Designs". Chapter 2 in *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. Krieger Publishing, pp. 31-46.

Lijphart, Arendt. 1975. "The Comparable Cases Strategy in Comparative Research". *Comparative Political Studies* July, pp. 133-177.

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

WEEK 2 Overview II: Comparative Method and Qualitative Case Studies Tue 1/13

Readings (≈ 85 pages):

Collier, David. 1993. "The Comparative Method". in Finifter, Ada (ed.) *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*. American Political Science Association, pp. 105-119. **(ARES download)**

Sartori, Giovanni. 1991. "Comparing and Miscomparing". *Journal of Theoretical Politics*. 3(3): 243-257.

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Case Studies and Theory Development". Chapter 1 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp. 1-36.

Tilly, Charles. 1997. "Means and Ends of Comparison in Macrosociology". *Comparative Social Research* 16, pp. 43-53.

Munck, Gerardo L. 2004. "Research Designs" *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 1-11. **(ARES download)**

Also have a quick look at:

George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Studies that Illustrate Research Design". Appendix in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press.

Recommended Further Reading:

Richard Snyder. 2007. The Human Dimension of Comparative Research. In Gerardo L. Munck and Richard Snyder, eds., *Passion, Craft, and Method in Comparative Politics*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. **(ARES download)**

Goldstone, Jack. 1997. "Methodological Issues in Comparative Macrosociology". *Comparative Social Research* 16, pp. 107-120.

Henry Brady, David Collier, and Jason Seawright, Toward a Pluralistic Vision of Methodology *Political Analysis* 14, No. 3 (2006): 353-368.

Shadish, William R.; Thomas D. Cook; Donald T. Campbell. 2002. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Munck, Gerardo L. 1998. "Canons of Research Design in Qualitative Analysis". *Studies in Comparative International Development* 33(3): 18-45.

WEEK 3 Critiques and Justifications of Case Study Methods

Tue 1/20

Readings (≈ 105 pages):

- Adcock, Robert. 2008. "The Curious Career of 'the Comparative Method': The Case of Mill's Methods". Paper presented at APSA's Annual Meeting, Boston, August 30, pp. 1-22.
- Munck, Gerardo L. 2004. "Ten Fallacies About Qualitative Methodology." *APSA Qualitative Methodology Newsletter* American Political Science Association No. 3.1, pp. 2-5.
- Hall, Peter A. 2003. "Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Politics". Chapter 11 in Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer (ed.) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press, pp. 373-406.
- Ebbinghaus, Bernhard. 2005. "When Less is More: Selection Problems in Large-N and Small-N Cross-National Comparisons". *International Sociology* 20(2): 133-152.
- Jackson, Patrick T. and Daniel Nexon. 2002. "Globalization, the Comparative Method, and Comparing Constructions". Chapter 3 in Green, Daniel M. (ed.) *Constructivism and comparative Politics*. M.E. Sharpe, pp. 88-120.

Recommended Further Reading:

- All articles in *APSA Qualitative Methodology Newsletter* American Political Science Association No. 3.1.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. "Research Design and the Accumulation of Knowledge". Chapter 1 in *Paradigms and Sandcastles*. University of Michigan Press, pp. 1-26.
- Gerring, John. 2007. "What is a Case Study Good For? Case Study versus Large-N Cross-Case Analysis". Chapter 3 in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 37-64.

B. CONCEPTUALIZATION AND QUALITATIVE MEASUREMENT**WEEK 4 Concept Formation, Classification, Typologies**

Tue 1/27

Readings (≈ 175 pages):

- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. "Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics". *APSR* 64(4): 1033-1053 (read mainly 1033-1046).
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1984. "Guidelines for Conceptual Analysis". Chapter 1 in Sartori, Giovanni. ed. *Social Science Concepts: A Systematic Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication, pp. 15-85. **(ARES download)**
- Collier, David, and James E. Jr. Mahon, 1993. "Conceptual 'Stretching' Revisited: Adapting Categories in Comparative Analysis." *American Political Science Review*. 84(4): 845-855.
- Adcock, Robert. 2005. "What is a Concept?" Working Paper No. 1. *International Political Science Association Committee on Concepts and Methods*. pp. 1-32.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. "Big Questions and Little Answers". Chapter 2 in *Paradigms and Sandcastles*. University of Michigan Press, pp. 27-88.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Collier, David, and Robert Adcock. 1999. "Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices about Concepts." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 537-565.

- Collier, David, and Steven Levitsky. 1997. "Democracy with Adjectives: Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research." *World Politics* 49: 430-451.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. "Introduction". Chapter 1 in *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. "Structuring and Theorizing Concepts". Chapter 2 in *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.
- Gerring, John. 2001. "Concepts: General Criteria". Chapter 3 in *Social Science Methodology: A Critical Framework*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, John. 1999. "What Makes a Concept Good?" *Polity* Spring 1999, pp. 357-393.
- Schedler, Andreas. 1998. "What is Democratic Consolidation?" *Journal of Democracy* 9(2): 91-107.
- Schedler, Andreas. 1999. "Conceptualizing Accountability." In Schedler, Andreas, Larry Diamond and Marc F. Plattner. eds. *The Self-Restraining State: Power and Accountability in New Democracies*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

WEEK 5 Qualitative Measurement, Indicators, Levels of Measurement Tue 2/3

Readings (≈ 85 pages):

- Adcock, Robert and David Collier. 2001. "Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research". *APSR* 95(3): 529-546.
- Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. "Measurement in Comparative Research". Chapter 5 in *The Logic of comparative Social Inquiry*. Krieger Publishing, pp. 91-112.
- Przeworski, Adam and Henry Teune. 1970. "Establishing Equivalence". Chapter 6 in *The Logic of comparative Social Inquiry*. Krieger Publishing, pp. 113-131.
- Munck, Gerardo L., and Jay Verkuilen. 2002. "Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices." *Comparative Political Studies* 35(1): 5-34.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Coppedge, Michael, and Wolfgang H. Reinicke 1990. "Measuring Polyarchy." *Studies in Comparative International Development*. 25(1): 51-73.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. "Concept Intension and Extension". Chapter 3 in *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. "Increasing Concept-Measure Consistency". Chapter 4 in *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.
- Schedler, Andreas. 2001a. "Measuring Democratic Consolidation." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 36(1): 66-92.
- Allison, Lincoln. 1994. "On the Gap between Theories of Democracy and Theories of Democratisation" *Democratization* 1(1): 8-26.
- Alvarez, Mike, Jose A. Cheibub, Fernando Limongi, Adam Przeworski. 1996. "Classifying Political Regimes." *Studies in International Comparative Development* 31(2): 3-36.

C. QUALITATIVE CASE STUDIES AND CAUSAL ASSESSMENT

WEEK 6 Thinking About Causality: Inference, Effects, Mechanisms Tue 2/10

Readings (≈ 110 pages):

- Ragin, Charles. 1987. "Heterogeneity and Causal Complexity". Chapter 2 in *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, pp. 19-33.

- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Case Studies and the Philosophy of Science". Chapter 7 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp.127-150.
- Mahoney, James . 2003. "Strategies of Causal Assessment in Comparative-Historical Analysis". Chapter 10 in Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer (ed.) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press, pp. 337-372.
- Tilly, Charles. 2001. "Mechanisms in Political Processes". *Annual Review of Political Science* 4, pp. 21-41.
- Mahoney, James. 1999. "Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macro-Causal Analysis" *American Journal of Sociology* 104(3): 1154-1196 (mainly 1154-1169).
- Beck, Nathaniel. 2006. "Is Causal-Process Observation an Oxymoron?" *Political Analysis* 14(3): 347-352.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Nahid Golafshani, Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research. *The Qualitative Report* 8(4) (December 2003): 597-607.
- Hedstrom, Peter and Richard Swedberg. 1996. "Social Mechanisms", *ACTA Sociologica* 3, pp.281-308.
- Mahoney, Jim. 1999. "Strategies of Causal inference in Small-N Analysis". *Sociological Methods and Research* 28(4): 387-424.
- Gerring, John. 2005. "Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences". *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 17(2): 163-198.
- Gerring, John. 2007. "Preliminaries". Chapter 4 in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. "Concepts and Selecting (on) the Dependent Variable". Chapter 6 in *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. "Negative Case Selection: The Possibility Principle". Chapter 7 in *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.0
- Goertz, Gary. 2006. "Concepts and Choosing Populations". Chapter 8 in *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.
- Dvora Yanow, "Thinking Interpretively: Philosophical Presuppositions and the Human Sciences," and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, "Evaluative Criteria and Epistemic Communities," in Yanow and Schwartz-Shea, *Interpretation and Method*, 5-26 and 89-113 (Sharpe 2006).

WEEK 7 Single Case Studies, Selection, Bias

Tue 2/17

Readings (≈ 140 pages):

- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Phase One: Designing Case Study Research". Chapter 4 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp.73-88.
- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Phase Two: Carrying Out the Case Studies". Chapter 5 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp.89-108.
- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Phase Three: Drawing Out the Implications of Case Findings for Theory". Chapter 6 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp.109-124.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. "How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers you Get". Chapter 3 in *Paradigms and Sandcastles*. University of Michigan Press, pp. 89-130.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 2003. "Can One of a Few Cases Yeild Theoretical Gaines?". Chapter 9 in Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer (ed.) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press, pp. 305-336

Skocpol, Theda. 2003. "Doubly Engaged Social Science: The Promise of Comparative Historical Analysis". Chapter 12 in Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer (ed.) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press, pp. 407-428.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Gerring, John. 2007. "The Condundrum of the Case Study". Chapter 1 in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, John. 2007. "What is a Case Study?". Chapter 2 in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, John and Jason Seawright. 2007. "Techniques for Choosing Cases." Chapter 5 in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Collier, David, James Mahoney, and Jason Seawright. 2004. "Claiming Too Much: Warnings about Selection Bias". Chapter 6 in Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Rowan & Littlefield.
- Ragin, Charles. 2004. "Turning the Tables: How Case-Oriented Research Challenges Variable-Oriented Research". Chapter 8 in Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Rowan & Littlefield.
- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Case-Study Methods and Research on the Interdemocratic Peace". Chapter 2 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press.

WEEK 8 Comparative Cross-Case Studies, Selection, Bias

Tue 2/24

Readings (≈ 125 pages):

- Ragin, Charles. 1987. "Case-Oriented Comparative Methods". Chapter 3 in *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, pp. 34-52.
- Collier, David and James Mahoney. 1996. "Insights and Pitfalls: Selection Bias in Qualitative Research". *World Politics* 49(1): 56-91.
- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison". Chapter 3 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp.67-72.
- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Comparative Methods: Controlled Comparison and Within-Case Analysis". Chapter 8 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp. 151-179.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. "How the Evidence You Use Affects the Answers You Get: Rigorous Use of the Evidence Contained in Case Studies". Chapter 4 in *Paradigms and Sandcastles*. University of Michigan Press, pp. 131-174.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Ragin, Charles. 1987. "The Distinctiveness of Comparative Social Science". Chapter 1 in *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, pp. 1-18.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. "The Variable-Oriented Approach". Chapter 4 in *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press.
- Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman, Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods, *Annual Review of Political Science* 2006, pp. 459-460.
- Gerring, John. 2007. "Internal Validity: An Experimental Template". Chapter 6 in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.

- Gerring, John. 2005. "Comparability: A Key Issue in Research Design". Working Paper No. 4. *International Political Science Association Committee on Concepts and Methods*.
- Brady Henry E., David Collier, and Jason Seawright. 2004. "Refocusing the Discussion of Methodology". Chapter 1 in Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Rowan & Littlefield.
- Collier, David, Jason Seawright, and Gerardo L. Munck. 2004. "The Quest for Standards". Chapter 2 in Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Rowan & Littlefield.
- Brady Henry E., David Collier, and Jason Seawright. 2004. "Critiques, Responses, and Trade-Offs: Drawing Together the Debate". Chapter 12 in Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Rowan & Littlefield.
- Brady Henry E., David Collier, and Jason Seawright. 2004. "Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology". Chapter 13 in Brady, Henry E. and David Collier (eds.) *Rethinking Social Inquiry*. Rowan & Littlefield.

WEEK 9 Longitudinal Case Studies: Process Tracing, Congruence Testing, and Counterfactual Analysis Tue 3/3

Readings (≈ 170 pages):

- Carr, Edward H. 1987. *What is History?* 2nd ed., Pelican Books (first published by Mcmillan 1961), Chapter 1, 4, and 5.
- Lustick, Ian. 1996. "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias". *APSR* September, pp. 605-618.
- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "The Congruence Method". Chapter 9 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp. 181-204.
- George, Alexander and Andrew Bennett. 2005. "Process-Tracing and Historical Explanation". Chapter 10 in *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. MIT Press, pp.205-232.
- Fearon, James. 1991. "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science". *World Politics* 43(2): 169-195.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Carr, Edward H. 1987. *What is History?* 2nd ed., Pelican Books (first published by Mcmillan 1961), all the rest of the book.
- Gerring, John. 2007. "Internal Validity: Process Tracing". Chapter 7 in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron Thies, "A Pragmatic Guide to Qualitative Historical Analysis in the Study of International Relations," *International Studies Perspectives* 3(4) (November) 351-372.

WEEK 10 SPRING BREAK – no class

WEEK 11 Longitudinal Comparative Analysis: Path-Dependence, Timing, Sequence, Junctures Tue 3/17

Outline of term paper due – bring to class!

Readings (≈ 110 pages):

- Pierson, Paul. 2003. "Big, Slow Moving, and ... Invisible: Macrosociological Processes in the Study of Comparative Politics". Chapter 5 in Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer (ed.) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press, pp.177-207.

- Thelen, Kathleen. 2003. "How Institutions Evolve: Insights from Comparative Historical Analysis". Chapter 6 in Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer (ed.) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press, pp. 208-240.
- Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2006. "Complex Causal Relations and Case Study Methods: The Example of Path Dependency". *Political Analysis* 14, pp. 250-267.
- Capoccia, Giovanni and R. Daniel Kelemen. 2007. "The Study of Critical Junctures". *World Politics* 59(April), pp.341-369.
- Goldstone, Jack A. 1998. "Initial Conditions, General Laws, Path Dependence, and Explanation in historical Sociology". *American Journal of Sociology* 104(3): 829-845.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Mahoney, James. 2000. "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology". *Theory and Society* 29, pp.507-548.
- Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer. 2003. "Comparative Historical Analysis: Achievements and Agendas". Chapter 1 in Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschmeyer (ed.) *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* Cambridge University Press, pp.3-38.
- Pierson, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *American Political Science Review* 84(2): 251-267.
- Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics". *Annual Review of Political Science* 2, pp.369-404.
- Goertz, Gary and James Mahoney. 2006. "Concepts in Theories: Two-Level Theories". Chapter 9 in Goertz, Gary. 2006. *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press.
- Bateson, G. 1972. "Space, Time, Space-Time and Society." *Sociological Inquiry* 63(4): 406-424.

D. MIXED METHODS AND CAUSAL ASSESSMENT

Week 12 **Nested Analysis, Experiments and Case Studies** Tue 3/24

Outlines returned in class.

Readings (≈ 110 pages):

- Bennett, Andrew et al. 2007. "Symposium: Multi-Method Work, Dispatches from the Front Lines" *Qualitative Methods: Newsletter of the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Qualitative Methods*. 5(1), several short articles pp. 9-27.
- Lieberman, Evan. 2005. "Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research". *American Political Science Review* 99(3):435-52.
- McDermott, Rose. 2002. "Experimental Methods in Political Science". *Annual Review of Political Science* 5, pp. 31-61.
- Coppedge, Michael. 1999. "Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories: Combining Large-N and Small in Comparative Politics". *Comparative Politics* 31(4): 465-476.
- Kritzer, Herbert M. 1996. "The Data Puzzle: The Nature of Interpretation in Quantitative Research." *American Journal of Political Science* 40(1): 1-32.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Laitin, David. 1986. Appendix: Research Methodology. *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **(ARES download)**

- Schatz, Edward. 2007. "Methods are not Tools: Ethnography and the Limits of Multiple-Methods Research". Working Paper No. 12. *International Political Science Association Committee on Concepts and Methods*.
- Green, Donald and Gerber, Alan S. "Reclaiming the Experimental Tradition in Political Science". In Katznelson, Ira and Helen V. Milner, eds., *Political Science: The State of The Discipline*. New York, W.W. Norton.
- Gerring, John. 2007. "Epilogue: Single Outcome Studies". Chapter 7 in *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerring, John and Rose McDermott. 2007. "Experiments and Observations: Towards a Unified Framework of Research Design". *American Journal of Political Science* 51(3): 688-701.

Examples:

- Smith, Benjamin. 2007. *Hard Times in the Lands of Plenty*. Cornell University Press.
- Leonard Wantchekon, Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin. *World Politics* 55 (April 2003): 399–422.
- Daniel Posner, The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas Are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi. *American Political Science Review* (2004) 98(4):529–45.
- Lisa L. Martin, *Coercive Cooperation: Explaining Multilateral Economic Sanctions*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Marc Morjé Howard and Philip G. Roessler. 2006. "Liberalizing Electoral Outcomes in Competitive Authoritarian Regimes." *American Journal of Political Science* (2006) 50 (2):365-81.
- Julia Lynch, *Age in the Welfare State: The Origins of Social Spending on Pensioners, Workers, and Children*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Evan S. Lieberman, *Race and Regionalism in the Politics of Taxation in Brazil and South Africa*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

WEEK 13 Analytical Narratives Using Formal Models Tue 3/31

Readings (≈ 100 pages):

- Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 1998. "Introduction" in *Analytical Narratives*. Princeton University Press, pp. 3-22.
- Levi, Margaret. 1998. "Conscription: The Price of Citizenship". Chapter 3 in Bates, Robert H., et al. *Analytical Narratives*. Princeton University Press, pp. 109-147.
- Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 2000. "Analytic Narratives Revisited". *Social Science History* 24(4): 685-696.
- Geddes, Barbara. 2003. "How the Approach You Choose Affects the Answers You Get: Rational Choice and Its Uses in Comparative Politics". Chapter 5 in *Paradigms and Sandcastles*. University of Michigan Press, pp. 175-211.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Carpenter, Daniel P. 2000. "What is the Marginal Value of Analytic Narratives?" *Social Science History* 24(4): 653-668.

WEEK 14 Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) Tue 4/7

Readings (≈ 90 pages):

- Ragin, Charles. 1987. "Combined versus Synthetic Comparative Strategies". Chapter 5 in *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, pp. 69-84.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. "A Boolean Approach to Qualitative Comparison: Basic Concepts". Chapter 6 in *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, pp. 85-102.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. "Extensions of Boolean Methods of Qualitative Comparison". Chapter 7 in *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, pp. 103-124.
- Ragin, Charles. 1987. "Applications of Boolean Methods of Qualitative Comparison". Chapter 8 in *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. University of California Press, pp. 125-163.

Recommended Further Reading:

- Goertz, Gary. 2006. "Concepts in Theories: Two-Level Theories". Chapter 9 in *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton University Press (chapter 9)
- Ragin, Charles 2000. *Fuzzy Set Social Science*. University of Chicago, chapters 1-5.
- Rihoux, Benoit and Ragin, Charles, eds. 2009. *Configurational Comparative Methods*. Applied Social Research Methods Series No. 51. Sage Publications.
- Ragin, Charles 2008. *Redesigning Social Inquiry*. University of Chicago.
- Graham R. Gibbs, Susanne Friese, and Wilma C. Mangabeira, The Use of New technology in Qualitative Research. *Forum for Qualitative Social Research* 3(2).
- Jason Wittenberg. 2007. *Peril and Promise: Multi-Method Research in Practice*. *Qualitative Methods* (Spring).

WEEK 15 "Finish Paper Week" – No Class

Final version of Term Papers due Friday April 17th, at 1.00 pm!!!

Submit on Turnitin.com, one hard copy in the box outside my office, and email a pdf-version to your peers.

E. STUDENT PAPER SEMINARS

- | | | |
|-----|------|-----------------|
| Tue | 4/21 | Paper Seminar A |
| Tue | 4/28 | Paper Seminar B |

Literature for the Next Step – From Theory to Practice and Other Considerations:

- David Collier. Data, Field Work and Extracting New Ideas at Close Range. *APSA – CP Newsletter*, Winter 1999, p. 1-6.
- Christopher B. Barrett and Jeffrey W. Cason. *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. Chapter 2: "Identifying a Site and Funding Source" and Chapter 3: "Predeparture Preparations"
- Sheila Carapico, Janine A. Clark, Amaney Jamal, David Romano, Jilian Schwedler, and Mark Tessler. The Methodologies of Field Research in the Middle East. *PS: Political Science and Politics*. Volume XXXIX, No. 3, July 2006.

- David Laitin. *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986, appendix, p. 185-205.
- Elisabeth Wood. Field Methods. In Charles Boix and Susan Stokes (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*. 2007.
- Christopher B. Barrett and Jeffrey W. Cason. "The Logistics of Fieldwork," chapter 5 in *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Joel Aberbach, James D. Chesney and Bert Rockman. 1975. Exploring Elite Political Attitudes: Some Methodological Lessons. *Political Methodology* 2:1-27.
- Oisín Tansey. Process Tracing and Elite Interviewing: A Case for Non-Probability Sampling. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol.40, No.4, October 2007.
- Christopher B. Barrett and Jeffrey W. Cason. "The Challenges of the Field," chapter 6 in *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997. Ben Read, Lauren Morris MacLean, and Melani Cammett, Symposium: Field Research: How Rich? How Thick? How Participatory? *Qualitative Methods* (Fall 2006) 4(2) 9-18.
- S. Sudman and N.M. Bradburn, *Asking Questions: A Practical Guide to Questionnaire Design*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Gubrium and Holstein (eds.) *The Handbook of Interview Research*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002. Teresa Odendahl and Aileen M. Shaw, "Interviewing Elites," p. 299-316. Patricia A. Adler and Peter Adler. "The Reluctant Respondent." p. 515-35.
- Paul Rabinow. "Entering." And "Respectable Information." In *Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco*. Berkeley: UC Press, 1977, p. 70-124.
- Robert Emerson, Rachel Fretz and Linda Shaw. "Processing Fieldnotes: Coding and Memoing." In *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995, p. 142-168.
- Christopher Barrett and Jeffrey W. Cason. "Knowing when to go Home," chapter 7 in *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Anthony J. Onwuegbuzie and Charles Teddlie. 2003. "A Framework for Analyzing Data in Mixed Methods Research." Chapter 13 in Abbas Tashakkori and Charles Teddlie, eds., *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Evan Lieberman, Marc Howard and Julia Lynch, in Symposium: Field Research. *Qualitative Methods* (Spring 2004): 9-18.
- Gubrium and Holstein (eds.) *The Handbook of Interview Research*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2002. • Blake D. Poland. "Transcription Quality," pp. 629-649. • Clive F. Seale. "Computer-Assisted Analysis of Qualitative Interview Data," pp. 651-670.
- Michael Quinn Patton. 1990 and 2001. *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Sage.
- Harry F. Wolcott. 1994. *Transforming Qualitative Data*. Sage.