

**PS 720: Theoretical and Methodological Issues of Comparative Politics**  
*standing in this semester for*  
**Political Science 715: Introduction to Comparative Politics I**  
Fall 2007

**Scheduled:** Mondays, 7:00-9:40 PM, Curtin 303

**Actual meeting time/place:** Monday evenings TBA; time for compatibility with PS 816; room for maximum attainable convenience

**Instructor:** Jenny Smith (jksmith@uwm.edu)

Bolton Hall 664 (office phone 229-5010)

Office hours: M 2:00-3:00, W 11:00-12:00 and by appointment

**Aims of the course**

As implied above, this seminar is a new graduate course (PS715, Introduction to Comparative Politics I) temporarily appearing, for administrative reasons, under an older course number and title (PS720, Theoretical and Methodological Issues of Comparative Politics). The content and intentions of the two courses are different, although not entirely so. As we will see early on, arguably the most basic question about ‘comparative politics’ – the question of what the subfield *is* – already raises a host of ‘theoretical and methodological issues.’ (Is comparative politics, for example, simply the study of political systems outside the United States? Or does ‘comparison’ have to be involved somehow? If so, what sort of comparison? Etc.)

This course is the first semester of a two-semester graduate introduction to comparative politics. Taken together, the two courses are intended to provide a foundation in the subfield for students interested in comparative research and to help prepare students for the preliminary examination in comparative politics. The two semesters are distinctive: this course focuses on questions of methodology and approach (strategies of comparison; case-study methods; rational-choice and historical institutionalisms; etc) and on classic themes in the subfield (states; nations; markets), while next semester’s seminar will proceed topic-by-topic through the major empirical literatures of contemporary comparative politics (electoral systems and party systems; regime type and transition; democracy and development; etc). However, the two courses are also intended to work together: the analytic tools acquired this semester will be consistently applied in the spring, and many of the topics to be addressed next semester will be previewed this fall. For this reason, students completing PS720(715) are encouraged to take PS716 in the spring, and students are even more strongly encouraged to complete PS720(715) now if they intend to enroll in PS716 next term.

**Structure and assignments**

This is a reading and discussion seminar. Its purpose is to introduce a subfield and its ways of thinking and writing, rather than to serve as a context for the preparation of student research projects. You will be expected to keep up with the weekly reading load and to complete regular written and oral assignments, as follows:

**[a] Discussion papers:** Each week, you will have the option of submitting a 3-4 page paper analyzing the readings for that week. A total of **eight** such papers will be included in your final

grade. It is up to you to decide whether to submit eight papers only or to turn in extra papers and drop your lowest grade(s). (There are a total of twelve sessions with reading assignments). You must, however, turn in **at least five** of these papers before the first take-home exam. Papers are **due in my mailbox no later than 2 pm on Monday**. If coming to campus before class is a major hardship for you, we can discuss electronic submission of your papers. (Note: Suggestions for many of the short papers are included in the course outline below. Feel free to ask me for advice if you have difficulty with these papers – or with anything else in the course.)

**[b] Class presentations:** During our regular sessions, each reading assignment will be introduced by a brief presentation from one student in the class. Each week's presentations will be assigned the week before, and I will make sure that responsibility for this assignment rotates among students. Presentations should summarize the main points of the article/chapter(s) in question, offer a critical (which does not necessarily mean 'negative') assessment of the author's argument, and last no more than five minutes. N.B.: It is *always* your responsibility to come to class prepared and to participate actively in the group discussion, presentation or no.

**[c] Take-home exams:** This class will include two take-home exams, one about two-thirds of the way along and the other (scheduling TBA) at the end of the semester. Since one important goal of this course is to help prepare interested students for the comparative-politics prelim, the questions on these exams will be like prelim questions – although, unlike the prelim, they will be open-book, and you will have time to plan and revise your answers. After the first take-home, we will take one class session to discuss the essay questions and students' responses.

Course grades will be calculated on the following basis:

**40%:** Discussion papers (eight @ 5% each)

**15%:** First take-home exam

**25%:** Take-home final exam

**20%:** Attendance, presentations, and participation in group discussion

## **Materials**

The reading for this course is a mixture of books and articles, but we will not read any books in their entirety. As a result, the substantial majority of the course reading *either* can be found on electronic reserve (for book chapters or articles in journals not held at UWM) *or* is accessible online through the library's journal databases (for most journal articles). Many of the articles we'll read are available through JSTOR, which has full-text access to certain journals, although never to brand-new issues. For non-JSTOR journals, my personal preference is to look up articles on the Web of Science and then click the 'find it!' link.

I've also ordered four books to the bookstore. The first is 'KKV'; we will read too much of this book for the excerpts to go on e-reserve (given copyright law), and I think it's worth owning in any case, if you don't already have a copy:

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Depending on its procedure with recommended readings, the bookstore may also stock the three following titles. Brady and Collier is an edited volume that's substantially a reaction to KKV;

the chapters we'll read from it will also be on e-reserve, but the book is being widely discussed by qualitative comparativists at the moment. Popkin and Scott we'll look at in the last week of class, and I'll do my best to make the excerpts as available as possible. If you can scare up library copies or cheap used ones, though, that may be worth your while.

Brady, Henry E., and David Collier, eds. 2004. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Popkin, Samuel. 1979. *The Rational Peasant: The Political Economy of Rural Society in Vietnam*. Berkeley: U of California P.

Scott, James A. 1977. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale UP.

Note that the course outline refers to the following journals by abbreviated titles:

<i>AJPS</i>	Amer. Journal of Political Science	<i>JTP</i>	Journal of Theoretical Politics
<i>APSR</i>	American Political Science Review	<i>IO</i>	International Organization
<i>CPS</i>	Comparative Political Studies		

### **Other matters**

Any student with special needs resulting from a physical or learning disability should contact me as soon as possible. I will make every effort to see that your needs are accommodated.

You can access links to UWM's policies on religious observances, incompletes, academic misconduct, appealing a grade, final exams, students called to military service, discriminatory conduct, and complaint procedures at [www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/SyllabusLinks.pdf](http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/SyllabusLinks.pdf).

## **COURSE OUTLINE AND READING ASSIGNMENTS**

*Note:* In most cases, I have listed the readings for each week in a suggested order for purposes of understanding (sometimes but not necessarily chronological). The additional reading is provided for your future notice rather than your present attention. It may be of particular interest to those who later prepare for the prelim in comparative politics.

### **I. INTRODUCTORY**

#### **September 10: Course introduction**

#### **September 17: Comparative politics – field or method?**

*In this group of articles, five comparativists – all of them prominent scholars – address basic questions about what defines comparative politics, what makes for good comparative work, and how 'comparative politics' relates (or ought to relate) to other things – to a 'comparative method,' to 'area studies,' etc. At this stage, these pieces raise more questions for us than answers. What are those questions? Are the newer questions different from the older ones? Of the answers proposed or hinted at here, do any strike you as particularly compelling?*

- Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics. *APSR* 64: 1033-53.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1971. Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method. *APSR* 65: 682-93.
- Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley: U of California P. Read chapter 1 (“The Distinctiveness of Comparative Social Science”), pp 1-18.
- Sartori, Giovanni. 1991. Comparing and Miscomparing. *JTP* 3(3): 243-57.
- Przeworski, Adam. 1995. [AP’s contribution to] The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium. *World Politics* 48(1): 16-21.
- Bates, Robert H. 1997. Area Studies and the Discipline: A Useful Controversy? *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30(2): 166-69.

*Additional Related Reading*

- Hall, Peter A. 2003. Aligning Ontology and Methodology in Comparative Research. In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge UP), pp 373-404.
- [The remainder of this symposium.] Kohli, Atul, Peter Evans, Peter J. Katzenstein, Adam Przeworski, Susanne Hoeber Rudolph, James C. Scott and Theda Skocpol. 1995. The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium. *World Politics* 48(1): 1-49.
- Lichbach, Mark Irving, and Alan S. Zuckerman. 1997. Research Traditions and Theory in Comparative Politics: An Introduction. In Lichbach and Zuckerman, eds., *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure* (New York: Cambridge UP), pp 3-16.
- Weber, Max. 1946 [1919]. Science as a Vocation. In H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds. and trans., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford UP), pp 129-56.

## II. COMPARATIVE POLITICS: CLASSIC THEMES

*Much of the material we’ll cover in the next three weeks could be labeled “classic” in the sense “a nice way to say ‘old.’” That said, however, the older books and ideas in these sections are impressive for their staying power in a changing discipline. What makes these works – and themes – “classic”? What, if anything, makes them old-fashioned? And how is the newer work in these sections similar or different (or similar and different) to/from the older work?*

### September 24: States and state-building

*What is the State?*

- Weber, Max. 1946 [1919]. [Definition of the state; three forms of domination, from:] Politics as a Vocation. In H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds. and trans., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford UP), pp 77-80. [The first 4-5 pages of this essay give a basic statement of Weber’s view of the state.]

Poggi, Gianfranco. 1990. *The State: Its Nature, Development, and Prospects*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP. Read chapter 2 (“The Nature of the Modern State”), pp 19-33.

“*Bringing the State Back In*”: *Theory*

Skocpol, Theda. 1985. Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research. In Peter B. Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, eds., *Bringing the State Back In* (New York: Cambridge UP), pp 3-37.

“*Bringing the State Back In*”: *Practice*

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions*. New York: Cambridge UP. Read chapters 1 and 4 (“Explaining Social Revolutions: Alternatives to Existing Theories” and “What Changed and How: A Focus on State Building”), pp 3-43 and 161-73.

Ertman, Thomas. 1997. *Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. New York: Cambridge UP. Read the introduction and conclusion, pp 1-34 and 317-24.

*Additional Related Reading*

Almond, Gabriel A. 1988. The Return to the State. *APSR* 82(3): 853-74.

Anderson, Perry. 1974. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. New York: Verso.

Centeno, Miguel. 2002. *Blood and Debt: War and Nation-State in Latin America*. University Park, PA: Penn State UP.

Evans, Peter B., Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, eds. 1985. *Bringing the State Back In*. New York: Cambridge UP. [Note especially the chapters by Weir and Skocpol and by Tilly.]

Giddens, Anthony. 1987. *The Nation-State and Violence*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P.

Herbst, Jeffrey. 2000. *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Migdal, Joel S. 1988. *Strong Societies and Weak States: State-Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics. *APSR* 85(1): 77-96.

Moore, Jr., Barrington. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon.

Nettl, J.P. 1968. The State as a Conceptual Variable. *World Politics* 20(4): 559-92.

Scott, James A. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale UP.

Tilly, Charles. 1992. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Trimberger, Ellen Kay. 1978. *Revolution from Above: Military Bureaucrats and Development in Japan, Turkey, Egypt, and Peru*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Waldner, David. 1999. *State Building and Late Development*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.

Young, Crawford. 1994. *The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective*. New Haven: Yale UP.

## October 1: Markets and development

*None of the reading for this week is especially contemporary. Do these pieces/arguments raise questions or present answers of enduring interest? How so? How (if at all) do these authors' arguments connect to one another – and to the literature about the state?*

### *The Development of Market Economies: Classics*

Weber, Max. 1958 [1904-5]. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Read the Author's Introduction and Chapter 5 ("Asceticism and the Spirit of Capitalism"), pp 13-31 and 155-83.

Gerschenkron, Alexander. 1962. *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap/Harvard UP. Read chapter 1, pp 5-30.

### *Modernization (Theory) and One Critic*

Deutsch, Karl W. 1961. Social Mobilization and Political Development. *APSR* 45(3): 493-514.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale UP. Read chapter 1 ("Political Order and Political Decay"), pp 1-92.

*The theories of political and economic 'modernization' that attained prominence in the 1950s and 1960s have been criticized in a variety of ways. Huntington's book lays out one line of attack. Another came from 'dependency theory,' of which some examples can be found in the additional reading. Dependency theorists (most of whom came from Latin America and/or studied Latin American political economies) drew on a Marxian 'world-systems' perspective to argue that the pattern of economic development in the world's 'periphery' (which took the form of 'dependent development') differed fundamentally from the earlier development of the 'core.'*

### *Additional Related Reading*

[For the more recent (and enormous) literature(s) on politics and the economy, see next semester's syllabus.]

Almond, Gabriel A. 1987. The Development of Political Development. In Myron Weiner and Samuel P. Huntington, eds., *Understanding Political Development* (Boston: Little, Brown), pp 437-90.

Apter, David E. 1965. *The Politics of Modernization*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

Cardoso, Fernando Henrique, and Enzo Faletto. 1979. *Dependency and Development in Latin America*, trans. Marjory Mattingly Urquidí. Berkeley: U of California P.

Evans, Peter. 1979. *Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

[No less 'classic' than Weber and Gerschenkron above.] Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon.

[An exchange of sorts.] Smith, Tony. 1979. The Underdevelopment of Development Literature: The Case of Dependency Theory. *World Politics* 31(2): 247-88. **and** Caporaso, James A. 1980. Dependency Theory: Continuities and Discontinuities in Development Studies. *IO* 35(4): 605-28. **and** Smith, Tony. 1981. The Logic of Dependency Theory Revisited. *IO* 35(4): 755-61.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 387-415. [Wallerstein's magnum opus, however, is the multi-volume *The Modern World-System*.]

## October 8: Nations and nationalism

*What is a nation? Where do nations come from – and why do they matter? How do these nation-centered arguments connect to the state- and market-centered ones we've already encountered?*

Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP. Read chapter 1 ("Definitions"), pp 1-7, and pp 39-43 of chapter 4 ("The Transition to an Age of Nationalism").

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, 2<sup>nd</sup> revised ed. New York: Verso. Read chapters 1-3 ("Introduction," "Cultural Roots," and "The Origins of National Consciousness"), pp 1-46.

Smith, Anthony D. 1986. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. Read chapters 1 and 6 ("Are Nations Modern?" and "The Formation of Nations"), pp 6-18 and 129-52.

Greenfeld, Liah. 1992. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. Read the introduction, pp 3-26.

Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. Read the introduction and chapters 1, 7, and 8 ("Traditions of Nationhood in France and Germany," "Citizenship as Social Closure," "Immigration and the Politics of Citizenship in France in the 1980s," and "Continuities in the German Politics of Citizenship"), pp 1-34, 138-78.

*Like the state, the theme of the nation has European roots, both historically and in the academic literature. We will return to the subjects of nationalism, ethnicity, and ethnic conflict, this time from a more global point of view, next semester.*

### *Additional Related Reading*

[The theme of the nation also connects to enormous literatures we'll see more of next semester.]

Deutsch, Karl W. 1953. The Growth of Nations: Some Recurrent Patterns of Political and Social Integration. *World Politics* 5(2): 168-95.

Smith, Anthony D. 1983. *State and Nation in the Third World: The Western State and African Nationalism*. New York: St. Martin's.

Soysal, Yasemin Nuhoğlu. 1994. *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2002. *Nationalist Exclusion and Ethnic Conflict: Shadows of Modernity*. New York: Cambridge UP.

### III. METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS

#### October 15: The problem of causal inference

*What's an explanation? How do social scientists go about explaining things? Is the enterprise of political science always/only/ultimately a causal or explanatory one?*

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP. Read chapters 2-3 ("Descriptive Inference" and "Causality and Causal Inference"), pp 34-114. [If you haven't read KKV before, also look over chapter 1.]

Elster, Jon. 1999. *Alchemies of the Mind: Rationality and the Emotions*. New York: Cambridge UP. Read chapter 1 ("A Plea for Mechanisms"), pp 1-47.

Brady, Henry E. 2004. Doing Good and Doing Better: How Far Does the Quantitative Template Get Us? In Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield), pp 53-67.

**And:** *Pick an empirical book or article we've looked at so far this semester, state its argument in causal terms (are there mechanisms involved?), and explain where the author succeeds and/or fails in making a convincing case for causality.*

#### *Additional Related Reading*

Brady, Henry E., and Jason Seawright. 2004. Framing Social Inquiry: From Models of Causation to Statistically Based Causal Inference. APSA manuscript [available online].

Fearon, James. 1991. Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science. *World Politics* 43: 169-95.

Gerring, John. 2005. Causation: A Unified Framework for the Social Sciences. *JTP* 17(2): 163-98.

[A reply to critics. The critics' views precede this piece in this issue of the APSR.] King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba. 1995. The Importance of Research Design in Political Science. *APSR* 89(2): 475-81.

Mahoney, James. 2003. Strategies of Causal Assessment in Comparative Historical Analysis. In Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York: Cambridge UP), pp 337-72.

Mill, John Stuart. 1969 [1846]. Two Methods of Comparison. Reprinted in Amitai Etzioni and Fredric L. DuBow, eds., *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods* (Boston: Little, Brown), pp 205-13.

Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P.

## **October 22: The case study method (or ‘case study method’?)**

*What is a case study? (What is a ‘case’?) Is there a ‘case study method’? What should a well-designed case-study project look like?*

KKV, chapters 4 (“Determining What to Observe”) and 5 (“Understanding What to Avoid”), pp 115-207. [Don’t get bogged down in the math. Focus on the message.]

McKeown, Timothy J. 2004. Case Studies and the Limits of the Quantitative Worldview. In Henry E. Brady and David Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield), pp 139-67.

Gerring, John. 2004. What is a Case Study and What is it Good For? *APSR* 98(2): 341-54.

George, Alexander L., and Andrew Bennett. 2005. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Read chapter 1 (“Case Studies and Theory Development”), pp 3-36.

**And:** *Pick a piece we’ve read so far this semester that relies for its empirics on one or more case studies. Drawing on the readings for today, assess the strengths and/or weaknesses of the author’s use of cases (as far as what we’ve read allows).*

### *Additional Related Reading*

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

Collier, David, James Mahoney and Jason Seawright. 2004. Claiming Too Much: Warnings About Selection Bias. In Brady and Collier, eds. (cited above), pp 85-102.

Dion, Dennis. 1998. Evidence and Inference in the Comparative Case Study. *Comparative Politics* 30(2): 127-42.

Eckstein, Harry. 1975. Case Study and Theory in Political Science. In Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, eds., *Handbook of Political Science*, vol. 7 (Reading, MA: Addison Wesley), pp 79-132.

Geddes, Barbara. 1990. How the Cases You Choose Affect the Answers You Get: Selection Bias in Comparative Politics. *Political Analysis* 2: 131-50.

Gerring, John. 2006. *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*. New York: Cambridge UP.

Lijphart, Arend. 1975. The Comparable Cases Strategy in Comparative Research. *CPS* 8(2): 158-77.

Mahoney, James, and Gary Goertz. 2004. The Possibility Principle: Choosing Negative Cases in Comparative Research. *APSR* 98(4): 653-69.

Przeworski, Adam, and Henry Teune. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley.  
[Especially pp 17-46; the source of 'most similar' and 'most different' case analyses.]

Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 2003. Can One or a Few Cases Yield Theoretical Gains? In Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, eds. (cited above), pp 305-36.

[There was a time when serious effort was devoted to refuting the claim that statistical work in comparative politics is a bad thing. For historical interest, note for example:] Jackman, Robert W. 1985. Cross-National Statistical Research and the Study of Comparative Politics. *AJPS* 29(1): 161-82.

## **October 29: Theory meets practice: Field research in comparative politics**

### *Field Research: Principle*

Rubin, Herbert J., and Irene S. Rubin. 2005. *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Read chapters 1-3 ("Listening, Hearing, and Sharing Social Experiences," "Why We Do What We Do," and "Design"), pp 1-63.

Weiss, Robert S. 1994. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York: Free Press. Read chapters 1 and 4 ("Introduction" and "Interviewing"), pp 1-14 and 61-119.

[multiple authors] 2002. Symposium: Interview Methods in Political Science. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 35(4): 663-688. Read the contributions by Beth L. Leech (pp 665-8), Kenneth Goldstein (669-72), Joel D. Aberbach and Bert A. Rockman (673-6), Jeffrey M. Barry (679-82), and Sharon Werning Rivera et al (683-8).

*In addition to thinking about their concrete suggestions, consider whether these authors make a convincing general case for the sort of research they are describing. (How) does what they have to say apply to (comparative) political science? (How) do their suggestions/recommendations fit (or not) with the methodological principles we've discussed for the past two weeks?*

### *Field Research: Practice*

Laitin, David. 1986. *Hegemony and Culture: Politics and Religious Change among the Yoruba*. Chicago: U of Chicago P. Read the Preface and Chapter 1 ("The Two Faces of Culture") and the "Appendix: Research Methodology," pp ix-xi, 1-20, and 185-205.

Lin, Ann Chih. 2000. *Reform in the Making: The Implementation of Social Policy in Prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP. Read the Introduction and Appendices 1 and 2, pp 4-14 and 175-94.

**And:** *When you're finished the first set of readings, choose **one** of the above books and read its methodological appendix/appendices and enough of the main text to get an idea of the author's general argument. (I've had excerpts put on e-reserve, but I'll also make library copies of both books available on the reserve shelf.) Write a quick review of the book that addresses the*

*following issues: What is this author's research question(s), and how did he/she go about answering this question in practice? Do the field-research choices made by the author seem appropriate given the nature of the project? Would there have been better ways of investigating this research question in the field?*

*Additional Related Reading*

[With the exception of the Geertz essay, none of these books is necessarily intended for reading straight through. Think of them as potential sources of reference dealing with different aspects of social-science fieldwork.]

Barrett, Christopher B., and Jeffrey W. Cason. 1997. *Overseas Research: A Practical Guide*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP.

Bernard, H. Russell. 2005 [earlier editions available]. *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. 2003 [earlier edition also available]. *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz and Linda L. Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: U of Chicago P.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture. In Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books), pp 3-30.

Lareau, Annette, and Jeffrey Shultz, eds. 1996. *Journeys Through Ethnography: Realistic Accounts of Fieldwork*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Lofland, John, David Snow, Leon Anderson and Lyn Lofland. 2005 [earlier editions available]. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

**November 5: Mixing methods [FIRST TAKE-HOME EXAM DISTRIBUTED IN CLASS]**

*Mixing Methods: Theory*

Bennett, Andrew, and Bear Braumoeller. 2006. Where the Model Frequently Meets the Road: Combining Statistic[al,] Formal and Case Study Methods. APSA manuscript.

Collier, David, Henry E. Brady and Jason Seawright. 2004. Critique, Responses, and Trade-Offs: Drawing Together the Debate (chapter 12) **and** Sources of Leverage in Causal Inference: Toward an Alternative View of Methodology (chapter 13) in Brady and Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield), pp 195-266.

*Mixing Methods: Practice*

**And:** Choose **one** of the following books (both on reserve) and read/skim enough of it to get a sense of the author's general argument and of how the research was done. Then write a critical analysis of the book from a research-methods perspective. Is this a true mixed-method study (here, in the sense qualitative/quantitative)? More broadly, is it a good study from a methodological perspective? Why or why not? How could it be improved?

Lieberman, Evan S. 2003. *Race and Regionalism in the Politics of Taxation in Brazil and South Africa*. New York: Cambridge UP.

Straus, Scott. 2006. *The Order of Genocide: Race, Power, and War in Rwanda*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP.

*Additional Related Reading*

Adcock, Robert, and David Collier. 2001. Measurement Validity: A Shared Standard for Qualitative and Quantitative Research. *APSR* 95(3): 529-46.

[A critical response to Collier, Brady, and Seawright.] Beck, Nathaniel. 2006. Is Causal-Process Observation an Oxymoron? *Political Analysis* 14(3): 347-52.

Braumoeller, Bear F. 2003. Causal Complexity and the Study of Politics. *Political Analysis* 11(3): 209-33.

Coppedge, Michael. 1999. Thickening Thin Concepts and Theories: Combining Large N and Small in Comparative Politics. *Comparative Politics* 31(4): 465-76.

Gerring, John. 2001. *Social Science Methodology: A Criterial Framework*. New York: Cambridge UP.

Lieberman, Evan S. 2005. Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research. *APSR* 99(3): 435-52.

**November 12: In-class discussion of first take-home exam**

No reading for this week.

**IV. INSTITUTIONALISMS AND CLASSIC THEMES REVISITED**

**November 19: Economic models of choice in political science**

Becker, Gary S. 1976. *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*. Chicago: U of Chicago P. Read chapter 1 ("The Economic Approach to Human Behavior"), pp 3-14.

Riker, William H. 1990. Political Science and Rational Choice. In James E. Alt and Kenneth A. Shepsle, eds., *Perspectives on Positive Political Economy* (New York: Cambridge UP), pp 163-81.

Shepsle, Kenneth A., and Mark S. Bonchek. 1997. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior, and Institutions*. New York: Norton. Read chapters 1-4, pp 5-81.

Shepsle, Kenneth A. 1986. Institutional Equilibrium and Equilibrium Institutions. In Herbert F. Weisberg, ed., *Political Science: The Science of Politics* (New York: Agathon), pp 51-81.

Green, Donald P., and Ian Shapiro. 1994. *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP. Read chapters 1-3, pp 1-46. [Also of interest are chapters 8 and – given the Shepsle pieces above – 6.]

*Additional Related Reading*

Arrow, Kenneth J. 1951 [2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1963]. *Social Choice and Individual Values*. New York: Wiley.

Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books. [Especially pp 3-69.]

Downs, Anthony. 1957. *An Economic Theory of Democracy*. New York: HarperCollins. [Coming next semester.]

[Reactions to *Pathologies* – some critical, some not – with a Green/Shapiro response.] Friedman, Jeffrey, ed. 1996. *The Rational Choice Controversy: Economic Models of Politics Reconsidered*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP.

Johnson, Chalmers. 1997. Preconception vs. Observation, or the Contributions of Rational Choice Theory and Area Studies to Contemporary Political Science. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30(2): 170-74.

Knight, Jack. 1995. Models, Interpretations, and Theories: Constructing Explanations of Institutional Emergence and Change. In Jack Knight and Itai Sened, eds., *Explaining Social Institutions* (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P), pp 95-120.

Levi, Margaret. 1997. A Model, a Method, and a Map: Rational Choice in Comparative and Historical Analysis. In Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, eds., *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure* (New York: Cambridge UP), pp 19-41.

Lustick, Ian S. 1997. The Disciplines of Political Science: Studying the Culture of Rational Choice as a Case in Point. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 30(2): 175-79.

Olson, Jr., Mancur. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP. [Also coming next semester.]

North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change, and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge UP. [Especially chapters 1-8.]

Sen, Amartya. 1979. Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory. In Henry Harris, ed., *Scientific Models and Man* (Oxford: Clarendon), pp 1-25.

Shepsle, Kenneth A., and Barry R. Weingast. 1981. Structure-Induced Equilibrium and Legislative Choice. *Public Choice* 37(3): 503-19. [Also: Shepsle. 1979. Institutional Arrangements and Equilibrium in Multidimensional Voting Models. *AJPS* 23(1): 27-59.]

Simon, Herbert A. 1976. From Substantive to Procedural Rationality. In Spiro J. Latsis, ed., *Method and Appraisal in Economics* (New York: Cambridge UP), pp 129-48.

Tversky, Amos, and Daniel Kahneman. 1981. The Framing of Decisions and the Psychology of Choice. *Science* 211: 453-58.

## **November 26: Economic models of choice, II: Explaining outcomes of political interest**

*How effectively do these authors deliver on the promise of rational-choice analysis in explaining political phenomena? How are their arguments like or unlike the discussions of similar topics we read in the early weeks of the course?*

North, Douglass C., and Barry R. Weingast. 1989. Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth-Century England. *Journal of Economic History* 49(4): 803-32.

Levi, Margaret. 1988. *Of Rule and Revenue*. Berkeley: U of California P. Read chapters 1-3 (“Introduction,” “The Theory of Predatory Rule” (with appendix), and “Creating Compliance”), pp 1-70.

Bates, Robert H. 1984. *Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P. Read the introduction and chapters 5-7, pp 1-8 and 81-118.

#### *Additional Related Reading*

[There are many, many examples of rational-choice work in comparative politics. I point out *Analytic Narratives* and its critics because (a) we won’t read it next semester and (b) Bates, Levi, and Weingast are among the authors. And (c) it was seen as a very important book at the time.]

Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 1998. *Analytic Narratives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

Bates, Robert H., Avner Greif, Margaret Levi, Jean-Laurent Rosenthal, and Barry R. Weingast. 2000. The Analytic Narrative Project. [Reply to Elster, below.] *APSR* 94(3): 696-702.

Dessler, David. 2000. Analytic Narrative: A Methodological Innovation in Social Science? [Review of *Analytic Narratives*] *International Studies Review* 2(3): 176-79.

Elster, Jon. 2000. Rational Choice History: A Case of Excessive Ambition. [Review of *Analytic Narratives*] *APSR* 94(3): 685-95.

Milgrom, Paul R., Douglass C. North and Barry R. Weingast. 1990. The Role of Institutions in the Revival of Trade: The Medieval Law Merchant, Private Judges, and the Champagne Fairs. *Economics and Politics* 2: 1-23.

### **December 3: Historical institutionalism**

Hall, Peter A., and Rosemary C.R. Taylor. 1996. Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms. *Political Studies* 44(5): 936-57.

Pierson, Paul. 2000. Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics. *APSR* 94(2): 251-67.

Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 369-404.

[Two contributions from an American-politics-focused panel discussion.] Skocpol, Theda. 1995. Why I am an Historical Institutional. *Polity* 28(1): 103-6 **and** Fiorina, Morris. 1995. Rational Choice and the New(?) Institutionalism. *Polity* 28(1): 107-15.

*Choose an empirical piece we’ve read this semester that you would consider an example of ‘historical institutionalism.’ What makes this piece historical-institutional in nature? Is it an*

*example of good political-science research? (Why or why not?) Finally, is the author's approach fundamentally at odds with that of rational-choice institutionalism, or not so much?*

*Additional Related Reading*

[There are a tremendous number of implicitly or explicitly historical-institutionalist studies in comparative politics. Those that follow are *about* historical institutionalism, rather than examples of the type.]

Hall, Peter A., and Rosemary C.R. Taylor. 1998. The Potential of Historical Institutionalism: A Response to Hay and Wincott. *Political Studies* 46(5): 958-62.

[Response to Hall and Taylor (1996).] Hay, Colin, and Daniel Wincott. 1998. Structure, Agency, and Historical Institutionalism. *Political Studies* 46(5): 951-7.

Pierson, Paul. 2004. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions and Social Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP.

[On a different 'new institutionalism'] Shepsle, Kenneth A. 1989. Studying Institutions: Some Lessons from the Rational Choice Approach. *JTP* 1(2): 131-47.

[Not identical to Thelen (1999) above.] Thelen, Kathleen, and Sven Steinmo. 1992. Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics. In Steinmo, Thelen, and Frank Longstreth, eds., *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (New York: Cambridge UP), pp 1-32.

**December 10: Explaining collective action: Case(s) in point**

*The most common way to understand these two classic (old!) books is to see them as offering fundamentally different (e.g. incompatible) explanations of the peasant societies they observe. Others have argued, however, that these two authors' perspectives are actually more similar than they are different – certainly more similar than the authors imagine. Which position do you take, and why? And which scholar wrote the better book?*

Scott, James A. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southeast Asia*. New Haven: Yale UP. Read the introduction and chapters 1, 2, and 6 (“The Economics and Sociology of the Subsistence Ethic,” “Subsistence Security in Peasant Choice and Values,” and “Implications for the Analysis of Exploitation”), pp 1-55 and 157-92.

Popkin, Samuel. 1979. *The Rational Peasant: The Political Economy of Rural Society in Vietnam*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P. Read pages ix-xii of the preface and chapters 1-3 (“The Rational Peasant,” “The Political Economy of Peasant Society,” and “Precolonial Vietnam”), pp 1-132.

*Additional Related Reading*

[A review of Bates and Popkin (and others).] Colburn, Forrest D. 1982. Current Studies of Peasants and Rural Development: Applications of the Political Economy Approach. *World Politics* 34(3): 437-49.