



The Comparative Case Study Method

An Annotated Bibliography

Neil O'Reilly
Contractor

The scientific or technical validity of this Contract Report is entirely the responsibility of the Contractor and the contents do not necessarily have the approval or endorsement of Defence R&D Canada.

DRDC CORA CR 2012-229
September 2012

Defence R&D Canada

Centre for Operational Research and Analysis

Strategic Analysis

The Comparative Case Study Method

An Annotated Bibliography

Neil O'Reilly
Royal Military College of Canada
Kingston, Ontario

Prepared By:

Neil O'Reilly
Royal Military College of Canada
Kingston Ontario
RMCC

Contract Project Manager: Ms. Margaret Shepherd
CSA: Heather Hrychuk, Strategic Analyst/ Peter Gizewski, Strategic Analyst

The scientific or technical validity of this Contract Report is entirely the responsibility of the Contractor and the contents do not necessarily have the approval or endorsement of Defence R&D Canada.

DRDC – Centre for Operational Research and Analysis

Contract Report

DRDC CORA CR 2012-229

September 2012

Author

Original Signed By

Neil O'Reilly

Approved for release by

Original Signed By

Dr Gregory Smolynec

Section Head: Strategic Analysis

Approved for release by

Original Signed By

Paul Comeau

Chief Scientist DRDC CORA

© Her Majesty the Queen as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2012

© Sa majesté la reine, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2012

Abstract

The following bibliography is designed as an introduction to the comparative case study research method. This method represents an integral and fundamental tool for the conduct of much analysis in the social sciences; long informing the development of theory, doctrine and policy in a range of disciplines. The works identified here provide an indication of the volume and breadth of literature both on the method itself as well as its application.

Résumé

La bibliographie suivante sert d'introduction à la méthode de recherche comparative fondée sur les études de cas. Cette méthode représente un outil intégral et fondamental permettant d'effectuer de nombreuses analyses en sciences sociales; elle contribue depuis longtemps à l'élaboration de théories, de doctrines et de politiques dans diverses disciplines. Les travaux mentionnés dans la présente bibliographie donnent un aperçu du volume et de l'étendue de la documentation sur la méthode en soi et sur son application.

Executive summary

The Comparative Case Study Method: An Annotated Bibliography

O'Reilly, N.; DRDC CORA CR 2012-229; Defence R&D Canada – CORA; September 2012.

This bibliography is designed to provide an introduction to the comparative case study research method. The comparative method uses a small number of cases (i.e. small- N analysis) to inform and build general conclusions based on common factors and divergent characteristics amongst similar units, with the aim of increasing an understanding of each unit. Comparative case analysis is integral to the conduct of much research and analysis in the social sciences; informing the development of theory, doctrine and policy in a range of disciplines.

The selection of works presented is by no means intended to represent a comprehensive listing of literature on comparative case study analysis. It does, however, provide an indication of the volume and breadth of literature on this method and its application. Indeed, it illustrates the prevalence and ubiquity of comparative case study analysis in the pursuit of social scientific knowledge.

Sommaire

The Comparative Case Study Method: An Annotated Bibliography

O'Reilly, N.; DRDC CORA CR 2012-229; Defence R&D Canada – CORA; septembre 2012.

La présente bibliographie sert d'introduction à la méthode de recherche comparative fondée sur les études de cas. Dans le cadre de la méthode comparative, on utilise un petit nombre de cas (analyse d'un petit nombre de cas) pour documenter et établir des conclusions générales en fonction de facteurs communs et de caractéristiques divergentes au sein d'unités semblables, en vue d'améliorer la connaissance de chaque unité. L'analyse comparative de cas fait partie intégrante de la réalisation de bien des recherches et des analyses dans le domaine des sciences sociales; elle contribue depuis longtemps à l'élaboration de théories, de doctrines et de politiques dans diverses disciplines.

La sélection de travaux présentée ne vise nullement à énumérer de façon exhaustive les documents au sujet de l'analyse comparative fondée sur les études de cas. Elle donne toutefois un aperçu du volume et de l'étendue de la documentation sur cette méthode et son application. En effet, elle illustre la fréquence et l'omniprésence des analyses comparatives fondées sur les études de cas en vue d'acquérir des connaissances en sciences sociales.

Table of contents

Abstract.....	i
Résumé.....	ii
Executive summary	iii
Sommaire.....	iv
Table of contents.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
General Works.....	3
Critiques.....	9
Illustrative Selections.....	15
Conclusion.....	25
Bibliography	27

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Mr. Peter Gizewski, Strategic Analyst DRDC CORA for his direction and guidance in the development and completion of this work.

Introduction

Qualitative research methodology employs techniques to extrapolate meaning, deduce theoretical underpinnings, and provide “explanation(s) and understanding of important social and political phenomena through the comparison of similarities and differences across different units” that bare some existential resemblance.¹ The comparative case study method, as one of the techniques of qualitative research, uses a small number of cases (i.e. small- N analysis) to inform and build general conclusions from common factors and divergent characteristics amongst units that are not identical, but are similar enough that both the divergent and convergent points of comparison allow for an increased understanding of each particular unit.² The method can be traced back to antiquity, with Aristotle employing just such a technique to develop and explain various forms of governance in his treatise “The Politics”.³ Since then, it has become a fundamental tool in understanding social and scientific phenomena. Spurred by the efforts of such noted and influential scholars as Alexander George, Arend Lijphart and Giovanni Sartori in the last four decades, comparative case analysis has come to the fore as an integral approach to social scientific research.⁴ Indeed, as Emile Durkheim, one of the founding fathers of modern social science observes “...there can be no social science which is not comparative.”⁵

This bibliography is by no means intended to be a comprehensive treatment of literature on comparative case study analysis. Rather, it is designed as an introduction to the method. It also provides an indication of the sheer volume and breadth of literature available to those interested in this type of research methodology, how it can be applied to social scientific research in general, and more specifically, how it can be applied to issues of concern to defence and security studies.

The work is divided into three sections. The first ‘General Discussion’ consists of items that are “how to” guides on the nature, development and implementation of comparative and case study research methods. The second, entitled “Critiques,” outlines works that offer a critical perspective on the method, identifying both its strengths and its weaknesses. Finally, the bibliography presents a number of selections on studies of security issues that utilize comparative case analysis, under the heading of “Illustrative Selections.” These items were selected to highlight the utility of the method, in the conduct of research that attempts to formulate theories and/or policy recommendations. Still other works cited reflect a

-
- 1 Lindman, T, Robinson, N., *The SAGE Handbook of Comparative Politics*, Sage: London, 2009, p. 1.
 - 2 Much of the current literature nominally differentiates between *comparative* and *case study* methodology. However, a reading of the material shows that comparative studies are inherently case studies of two or more subjects. Thus the generic term used by the author will be *comparative case study analysis*. Where the referent piece is of a singular or particular case, or specifically references *case study* (the use of one instance or illustrative example) the term *case study* will be used.
 - 3 Aristotle, “The Politics”, trans. Benjamin Jowatt, in Richard McKeon (ed.), *Introduction to Aristotle*, Random House: Toronto, 1947, pp. 553-617.
 - 4 This is to say that while singular cases can employ any method of data collection and analysis from statistics, interviews, rational theory, observation, or any number of other techniques, this does not preclude or void their utility for a comparative analysis with similar cases.
 - 5 Warwick, D., Osherson, S., (eds.) *Comparative Research Methods*, Prentice hall: New Jersey, 1973, p. VII.

combination of explanation and illustrative examples, general discussion and/or critique. These works are cited under the heading “Additional Works” at the conclusion of each section.

Selections provided are intended to aid in the conduct of research. They also serve to illustrate the prevalence and ubiquity of comparative case study analysis in the pursuit of social scientific knowledge.

General Works

Collier, D., Gerring, J., (eds.), *Concepts and Methods in Social Science: The Tradition of Giovanni Sartori*, Routledge: New York, 2009.

David Collier is a Chancellor's Professor of Political science at the University of California, Berkeley. John Gerring is a Professor of Political Science at Boston University where he teaches Methodology and Comparative Politics.

Giovanni Sartori is highly regarded in the field of comparative politics and social science research methodology. The first part of the compendium is a collection of Sartori's own writings on comparative method and analysis. The second section presents a series of essays by noted scholars who have been greatly influenced by his work. They essentially extend the work that has previously been set out by Sartori. The third part of the book includes a one chapter autobiographical essay by Sartori and reflections from former students which detail Sartori's life and influence.

This book is as much an homage to the legacy of Giovanni Sartori as it is a collection of his work and that of the people he has influenced. It offers great insight into the discussions surrounding the use of comparative analysis. The thoughts put forth by Sartori represent a critical examination of the importance of terms and concepts used in comparative methodology. These are in fact the fundamentals which any good research should take into account.

Druckman, D., *Doing Research: Methods of Inquiry for Conflict Analysis*, Sage Publications: London, 2005.

David Druckman is a Professor of Conflict Resolution at George Mason University. He is the 1995 recipient of the Otto Klineberg Award for Intercultural and International Relations, and has approximately 150 publications to his name.

This book is designed for those conducting research in the social sciences, and more specifically, those exploring issues and conducting research on conflict and conflict analysis. The book is divided into eight sections, each of which provides a detailed explanation of the research process and methodologies involved. Part IV (pp. 163-226) in particular deals with case studies and comparative study approaches. This section provides explanations on the various ways to utilize these methodologies

The volume represents a useful tool for social science research; especially for those interested in exploring questions of conflict. Druckman advocates a holistic approach to conducting research, and provides a detailed examination of and guidelines for each method proposed. Samples of the different methods used illustrate how each should (and should not) be employed -- thus offering a useful guide to proper methodological design for student, graduate and professional researchers.

Eckstein, H., "A Perspective on Comparative Politics Past and Present", in Harry Eckstein and David Apter, eds., *Comparative Politics: A Reader*, The Free Press of Glencoe: New York, 1963, pp. 3-32.

Harry Eckstein was a prominent and influential scholar of political science and comparative politics. He taught at Harvard, Princeton, and before his death in 1999, was a Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of California.

In this work, Eckstein characterizes the field of comparative politics as marked by eclecticism, disagreement, and high ambition that precludes satisfactory results on the part of practitioners. This is a highly influential piece on the utilization of comparative case study methodology in Comparative Politics and social science research. Indeed, it is a foundational piece in the field, and recommended reading for anyone wishing to understand both the concepts and the processes of comparative method.

Gangon, Y.C., *The Case Study as Research Method: A Practical Handbook*, Presses de L'Universite Du Quebec: Quebec, 2010.

Yves-C Gagnon holds a Post- Doctorate from in Sociology of Organizations from the University de Lyon, France, and is a Bell Chair in Technology and Organization at the University of Quebec.

Gangon begins by examining the benefits and the shortcomings of case study method in social science research in order to help researchers determine its appropriateness for their work. Successive chapters in the book offer a step by step breakdown of how to conduct a case study. Each chapter describes a stage in the process of conducting research based on the approach, from assessing the usefulness of the methodology to writing a final report.

The volume offers a useful “how to” guide for using the case study method. While acknowledging the benefits of this type of research, it also warns of shortcomings and pitfalls that researchers should seek to avoid. And, the lessons detailed derive heavily from past successes and failures, making it a useful tool for current and future research.

Kaarbo, J., Beasly, R., “A Practical Guide to the Case Study Method in Political Psychology”, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 20, Issue 2, June 1999, pp. 369-391.

Juliet Kaarbo is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Kansas State University. Ryan Beasly is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Baker University.

In this article Kaarbo and Beasly illustrate the benefits of using the comparative case study method in the study of political psychology. Their stated aim is to dispel misconceptions surrounding the comparative method that lead to questions regarding its utility, and they attempt to develop a common understanding of this method to avoid further confusion on the matter.

The benefits of the article are twofold. Political psychological research is essentially the study of the behaviours of, and interactions between, actors, which conforms to the tenants of the social sciences in general. The propositions laid out by Kaarbo and Beasly are thus transferable throughout the spectrum of the social scientific research. Secondly, in detailing a more coherent system for the use of comparative case study method, the authors offer a means of making it more efficient for the conduct of social scientific research.

Landman, T., Robinson, N., *The SAGE Handbook of Comparative Politics*, Sage: London, 2009.

Todd Landman is Reader in the Department of Government and Director of the Centre for Democratic Governance at the University of Essex. Neil Robinson is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Politics and Public Administration at the University of Limerick.

This comprehensive compendium contains a total of twenty-eight essays that explore the field of Comparative Politics from three different angles. The book serves as a comprehensive and far reaching discussion of classical issues, research methods, and contemporary issues in Comparative Politics. The discussions in the first section are easily applicable to other areas of social scientific research. The book, as a whole, will be of use to anyone interested in issues in International Relations and Security in particular, and social scientific research in general.

Mahoney, J., Rueschmeyer, D., (eds.), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2003.

James Mahoney is a Jurkowsky Family Assistant Professor of Sociology at Brown University. Dietrich Rueschmeyer is a Research Professor at Brown's Watson Institute of International Studies.

This compendium of essays on the comparative methodology of social scientific research is divided into three sections. The first examines how knowledge is accumulated through comparative historical research in the social sciences. The second section deals with the analytic tools of comparative research. The third and final section of the book addresses some major questions regarding the methodology of comparative historical analysis. The book takes a somewhat narrative arc by examining past comparative analytic research, current efforts, and what the future might hold for social scientific research.

Of particular interest is the first section of the book, which deals with the accumulation of knowledge brought about by the comparative method over the past thirty years. For those interested in conducting research, the second and third sections provide valuable insight into some of the issues that should be addressed before undertaking a study using comparative method, and the tools that can prove useful in its execution.

Miller, R., Brewer, J., (eds.), *The A-Z of Social Research*, SAGE Publications: London, 2003.

Robert Miller is Senior Lecturer in Sociology in the School of Sociology and Social Policy at Queen's University, Belfast. John Brewer is a professor of Sociology at Queens University, Belfast.

This book is essentially an encyclopaedia of social research including, but not limited to, such diverse topics as methodologies, the use of the Internet in research, statistical testing and the philosophy of social research. Of particular interest to those engaged in comparative case study work are sections on the use of case studies, and comparative analysis.

Notably, the book lacks depth of analysis on topics covered, and should not be used as a definitive guide to the use of comparative case study analysis. However, it is a convenient reference guide in the identifying different methodologies.

Munck, G., Snyder, R., *Passion, Craft and Method in Comparative Politics*, Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 2007.

Gerardo Munck is at the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. Richard Snyder is a Professor of Political Science at Brown University.

This is a collection of interviews with prominent scholars in the field of Comparative Politics. Through personal interviews the discipline of Comparative Politics is discussed, as well as personal experiences in conducting research in the field. This involves in-depth discussions comparing methodologies, and discussing the benefits and drawbacks of certain methodologies in developing an analytic and theoretical framework.

The book not only exposes the reader to the thinking of leading scholars in the field of comparative politics, but also their personal experiences with the tools of the trade, for both better and worse. As such it represents a valuable resource for those interested in getting a sense of how case study and comparative analysis can and has been applied by professionals.

Nye, J. Jr., Lynn-Jones, S., “International Security Studies: A Report of the Conference on the Field”, *International Security*, Vol. 12, No. 4, Spring 1988, pp. 5-27.

Joseph Nye Jr. is a Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard University and a pioneer in International Relations theory. Sean Lynn-Jones is the editor of *International Security*.

This article reviews the state of the discipline and study of international relations. The authors recount advances made in the field, and detail areas in need of improvement. A burgeoning development at the time of publication was a move towards a more historically centered analysis of issues pertinent to the study of international security. The authors identify this as a positive move that promises to compensate for the highly theoretical nature of the study of the field.

This article identifies comparative historical and case analysis as a useful and necessary tool in the study of international security. It allows for formulations of theory and doctrines based on empirical evidence provided in past cases. This suggests the utility of using a comparative analysis methodology in social scientific research.

Odell, J., “Case Study Methods in International Political Economy”, *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 2, Issue 2, May 2001, pp. 161-176.

John Odell is a Professor at the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. He teaches qualitative research design and political economy.

Odell highlights the most recent developments in qualitative research by examining how these apply to theory development and testing. The article details what many other authors, theorists and practitioners are saying about the connections between different methodologies of qualitative research and the development and testing of theories. This issue is of particular importance in fields of research where the number of cases being studied is insufficient for rigorous statistical examination (as is often the case in researching topics that fall into the social sciences).

This is essentially a literature review of methodologies employed in forming and testing theories in social scientific research. Though the article does not inform how such research projects should be undertaken, it exposes the range of opinion that exists in the scholarly community, and many of the issues and points of view involved (while providing an index of who is saying what).

Outhwaite, W., Turner, S., (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Social Science Methodology*, Sage Publications: London, 2007.

William Outhwaite is a Professor of Sociology at Newcastle University, and has published extensively on issues in social science theory and research. Stephen Turner is a Graduate research Professor in Philosophy at the University of South Florida, and has written extensively on methodology.

This compendium deals extensively with methods of research in the social sciences. A vast landscape of research methodologies, and associated theories, are covered over seven sections of the book. Of particular interest to those engaged in comparative case study methodology is Section 2, which contains four essays under the title “Cases, Comparisons and Theory”.

This is an authoritative and comprehensive discussion on methodology in the social science. As such, it is an invaluable tool for understanding the concepts involved in comparative case study analysis, and more importantly, how to use such methodology in social scientific research.

Swanborn, P., *Case Study Research: Why, What and How*, Sage Publications: Washington, 2010.

Peter Swanborn is a sociologist and Professor Emeritus of Methods and Techniques of Social Research at Utrecht University and the University of Amsterdam.

This is essentially a “how to” guide on using the case study as a means of social scientific research. Swanborn begins with an explanation of what a case study is, and proceeds with a step by step analysis of the preparation, execution and analysis of using the case study as a research methodology. Each chapter explores the various components and stages of case study research, and concludes with an analysis of the content of the discussion.

Swanborn's treatment of case study method is highly detailed and instructive. The stages discussed in each chapter are analyzed critically, shortcomings of the method are addressed, and attention is accorded to practices that might undermine the results of research using this method. .

Yin, R., *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Sage Publications: London, 1994.

Robert Yin received a PhD From the department of Brain and Cognitive Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a former member of the RAND Corporation and is president of COSMO, and applied research and social science firm.

This book deals explicitly with the case study as a research strategy. It is an extremely detailed account of the subject, pin-pointing when and how it can be used, and the drawbacks and advantages of its use. The chapters are organized in logical fashion, detailing the steps required for using case study method. In this way the book functions as a “how to” guide on the subject.

The book is not only explanatory and descriptive of the method, but also prescriptive – discussing how it should be used. It is useful as a guide in the preparation, execution and analysis of case studies as a research method.

Additional Sources

Collier, D., “The Comparative Method”, in Ada Finifter, (ed.), *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, Norton: New York, 2002, pp. 105-119.

Etzioni, A., Dubow, F., (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*, Little, Brown and Co.: Boston, 1970.

Lijphart, A., “Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 65, No. 3, September 1971, pp. 682-693.

Oyen, E., (ed.), *Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research*, Sage: London, 1990.

McClesky, E., McCord, D., Leetz, J., Markey, J., “Underlying Reasons for Success and Failure of Terrorist Attacks: Selected Case Studies”, *Homeland Security Institute*, June 4, 2007.

Sartori, G., “Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics”, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 1033-1055.

Sartori, G., (ed.), *Social Science Concepts: A Systemic Analysis*, Sage Publications: London, 1984.

Sprinz, D, Wolinsky- Nahmias, Y., (eds.), *Models, Numbers and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*, University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, 2004.

Van Deth, J., (ed.), *Comparative Politics: The Problem with Equivalence*, Routledge: New York, 1998.

Warwick, D., Osherson, S., (eds.), *Comparative Research Methods*, Prentice Hall Inc.: New Jersey, 1973.

Critiques

Bennet, A, Elman, C., “Case Study Methods in the International Relations Subfield,” *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, February 2007, pp. 170-195.

Andrew Bennett is an Assistant Professor of Government at Georgetown University. Colin Elman is an Assistant Professor of political science at Syracuse University.

In this article, Bennett and Elman illuminate the benefits of case based qualitative studies in the field of security studies in particular, and social science research in general. They defend the practice of comparative and case study analysis against detractors, while acknowledging and addressing criticisms levelled against it. Particularly notable is the use of a series of exemplary cases to defend and promote the methodology.

Bowen, J., Petersen, R., (eds.), *Critical Comparisons in Politics and Culture*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999.

John Bowen is a Professor of Anthropology and Director of the Program in Social Thought and Analysis at Washington University, St. Louis. Roger Petersen is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Washington University.

This compendium deals explicitly with debates surrounding the use of comparative case study methodology as a tool used in social scientific research. A series of articles within the work address various issues and criticisms of the comparative case methodology. The volume is slightly limited in scope. As the book grew out of an attempt to find common ground between the research methods of Anthropologists and Political Scientists, arguments in the debate tend to be informed by those two fields. However, a sense of how a comparative case analysis can be used in these disciplines, and the inherent limitations of such methodology, is evident throughout.

The study of comparative analysis undertaken in this book points to limitations, but also highlights the fundamental utility of using this methodology in social science research. As such, it provides an interested practitioner with an informed blueprint for using this method.

Collier, D., “The Comparative Method”, in Ada Finifter, (ed.), *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, Norton: New York, 2002, pp. 105-119.

David Collier is a Chancellor's Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley. His research focus is on political methodology, including concept analysis, qualitative methods and strategies for multi- method investigation.

Collier examines developments in and facets of comparative methodology in the fields of comparative politics and international relations. He provides a brief history of the development of the comparative method, and provides a synopsis of the thought of Arend Lijphart, a highly influential scholar and proponent of the technique. Collier highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the method, and pays special attention to the question of how to deal with the many variables that can complicate the small

number of cases studied within a comparative analysis. This is followed by a comparison of the comparative, experimental, statistical and the case study method.

Collier advocates for a type of comparative research that is not limited to any particular field, but is an eclectic mix of methodologies to maximize research opportunities. This article is useful in understanding the comparative methodology, but perhaps even more so in exposing and rectifying some of the controversies surrounding its use.

Etzioni, A., Dubow, F., (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*, Little, Brown and Co.: Boston, 1970.

Amitai Etzioni is a Professor at the Elliott School of International Relations at George Washington University and Director of the Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies. Fredric Dubow was an Assistant Professor of Sociology and Urban Affairs at Northwestern University, California, Berkeley.

This is a compendium of essays which considers comparative case study methodology from a number of different perspectives. It includes essays on the theory and utility of, as well as critiques of, comparative methodology. There is an examination of the history of comparative methodology and a chapter containing a series of essays on the different levels of analysis that comparative method can be applied to i.e. from the family unit to the State level. The final part of the book deals with difficulties in dealing with terms, concepts and different languages in comparative studies, and the issue of how to determine cultural bias in a study.

While this work is somewhat dated in terms of developments in comparative case study analysis, it remains useful for understanding the concepts involved, and the expanse and extent to which the comparative case study method can be and has been used. It is useful as a tool in both developing a comparative case study, and perhaps more importantly, in understanding the scope of issues which accompany the method.

Fox-Wolfgramm, S.J., “Towards Developing a Method for Doing Qualitative Research: The Dynamic Comparative Case Study Method”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 13, Issue 4, December 1997, pp. 439-455.

At the time of writing Susan Fox-Wolfgramm was an Associate Professor in the Department of Business Management at San Francisco State University.

This article points to the need for and benefits of a dynamic-comparative case study methodology. According to the author, this method emphasises investigating “historic and contemporary processes and mechanisms that are the basis for actual events.”⁶ The author asserts that this method is effective in the study of new topics, and in understanding organizational phenomena. Comparative case studies not only allow one to understand a situation, but to make judgements and decisions based on the information that such studies provide

This piece addresses some of the concerns researchers might have in employing a comparative case study methodology for social scientific research. However, it also shows how this methodology can be used by

6 Fox-Wolfgramm, S.J., “Towards Developing a Method for Doing Qualitative research: The Dynamic Comparative case Study Method”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. Vol. 13, Issue 4, Dec. 1997, p. 441.a

researchers to explore organizational structures amongst divergent actors. As such the piece holds some utility for the study of complex and/or conflict environments.

Lijphart, A., “Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 65, No. 3, September 1971, pp. 682-693.

Arend Lijphart is a world renowned Political Scientist and Research Professor Emeritus at the University of California, San Diego.

This article provides an examination of the comparative method in social/political scientific research. Lijphart addresses the issues and criticism raised by the method, and designates a section of the article to specifically address its strengths and weaknesses. To explain he compares the comparative method to both the experimental and statistical methods of research, and concludes that the comparative method is suitable where the number of cases is too small for adequate statistical analysis. He asserts that the experimental method is simply not the right tool for social scientific research.

In his explication of comparative method, Lijphart notes the limitations of the methodology, but also offers guidelines on how to overcome them. This article is useful not only for coming to an understanding of what exactly comparative methodology is, but also how it can (and should not) be used.

Maoz, Z., Mintz, A., Morgan, T.C., Palmer, G., Stoll, R., (eds.), *Multiple Paths to Knowledge in International Relations: Methodology in the Study of Conflict Management and Conflict Resolution*, Lexington Books: Toronto, 2004.

Zeev Maoz is a Professor of Political Science at Tel Aviv University. Alex Mintz is a professor of Political Science at Texas A and M University. T. Clifton Morgan is a Professor and Chair of Political Science at Rice University. Glenn Palmer is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University. Richard Stoll is a Professor of Political Science and Associate Dean of Social Science at Rice University.

This book functions as an example and guide for different methodologies of International Relations and social science research dealing with the study of conflict management and resolution. The book is divided into four research methodology areas, including: Rational Choice and Game Theory; Simulation, Experimentation and Artificial Intelligence; Quantitative Approaches; and Case Study Approaches. Though benefits and detriments of each particular method are discussed in detail, emphasis is placed on understanding, comparison and reconciliation of findings between the various methods. Part IV: Case Study Approaches also includes specific examples of method application (e.g. Vietnam and the Crimean Wars).

This book highlights the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches to conducting social science research. It offers both an explanation of, and examples of how different approaches can best be used in research, while pointing out the limitations of such research, and offering alternatives, as per the appropriateness of various approaches.

Oyen, E., (ed.), *Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research*, Sage: London, 1990.

Else Oyen is a Professor of Social Policy at the University of Bergen, Norway. Her area of focus is in comparative social policy, and she has held various positions with the International Sociological Association.

This book is a compendium of essays dedicated to comparative methodology of social scientific research in cross national studies. It is divided into three sections. The first is a discussion of comparison as a research strategy. The second section discusses the theory behind comparative research as a methodology. The third section of the book describes methodological approaches to comparative research.

This book is valuable in its examination of the use of comparative analysis for cross national research. This makes it especially applicable to international security studies. As many of the contributors are from European Universities, it offers a broad and multi-national view of the comparative research method.

Sartori, G., “Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics”, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 1033-1055.

Giovanni Sartori is a scholar in the field of Political Science and has made substantial contributions to the study of Comparative Politics.

This is an early piece by a foundational thinker on the process of comparative analysis in social scientific research. In this essay, Sartori asks why comparison is a useful tool in the study of the political sciences. He argues that a reliance on the use of quantitative measurements is inadequate to explain causal relationships and the interaction of variables that are the subject of political discourse. He asserts that such methods of measurement can in fact mislead a researcher, and result in confused or misinformed conclusions. However, he concludes that without greater agreement on the concepts and terminology that are to be used in comparative analysis, the same types of confusion that accompany pure quantitative data gathering can result.

Sartori’s article is written more as an inquiry into the concepts of comparative analysis, than as an explication of the methodology. It was a foundational piece in the thought of what was an emerging method of social scientific research. Sartori argues for comparative case study analysis by examining the philosophical and analytical underpinnings of why there is a need for such a method. This piece is an examination of the “why”, rather than the “what” or the “how”, of comparative analysis.

Sartori, G., (ed.), *Social Science Concepts: A Systemic Analysis*, Sage Publications: London 1984.

Giovanni Sartori is a scholar in the field of Political Science and has made substantial contributions to the study of Comparative Politics.

The essays in this volume are dedicated to the analysis of concepts as a pre-determining factor of social scientific research. Sartori asserts that there must be agreement upon concepts to ensure the validity of

research, i.e., everybody must agree on the terms of reference so that everybody is referring to the same object. The first part of the book discusses the method employed in the conversation, while the second features a discussion and disambiguation of concepts that have caused confusion and controversy in the social sciences.

This is less a compendium on the comparative case study method than it is a discussion of the necessary conditions of social scientific research. It both warns and informs any interested party of the necessity and utility of ensuring clarity of meaning in conducting research. Sartori strives to make properly conducted qualitative research as irrefutable as quantitative research. His analysis of concepts in methodology is a necessary consideration in meeting this end.

Sprinz, D, Wolinsky- Nahmias, Y., (eds.), *Models, Numbers and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*, University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, 2004.

Detlef Sprinz is a Senior Fellow in the Department of Global Change and Social Systems at the Potsdam Institute of Climate Research and teaches in the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences at the University of Potsdam. Yael Wolinsky-Mahmias is a Senior Lecturer and Associate Chair in the Department of Political Science at Northwestern University.

This book deals with three methods of conducting social science research, with specific reference to International Relations, and the sub-sets of political economy, environmental policy and security studies. Through essays by various scholars the book explores Case Studies, Quantitative Methods, and Formal Methods. Of particular interest is Part I: Case Study Method (pp. 19-125). Within this section, Chapter 5, *Case Studies in International Security Studies*, deals specifically with the benefits and challenges of using the case study in security studies.

This book gives detailed analysis in the design, use and advantages of the case study method, while identifying the drawbacks. It is a valuable tool for researchers of security studies in particular, and the social sciences in general, in how to set up and execute a research project using case study methodology.

Van Deth, J., (ed.), *Comparative Politics: The Problem of Equivalences*, Routledge: New York, 1998.

Jan Van Deth is a Professor of Political Science and International Comparative Social Research at the University of Mannheim. His areas of research are political culture, social change and comparative research methods.

This book is a critical examination of problems that arise in the pursuit of research using comparative case study analysis. Of primary interest to this work is the question of how to examine the same phenomena in different contexts, or how to examine different phenomena within the same context. This leads to the problem of indicators, which, depending on the context, may very well have different meanings and/or give misleading results. This, in turn, leads to a search for equivalent indicators, which itself poses problems. Nine articles in the book address this question.

This book looks beyond basic assumptions of comparative research to critically address a problem that can arise, especially in consideration of cross-cultural, cross-national, or longitudinal studies. The book makes some recommendations in mitigating the problem, and clarifies some of the issues through the diversity of the case studies included.

Warwick, D., Osherson, S., (eds.), *Comparative Research Methods*, Prentice Hall Inc. New Jersey, 1973.

Donald Warwick was a Professor of Sociology at York University, an Institute Fellow of the Harvard Institute for International Development, and authored 12 books and over 100 articles in professional journals. Samuel Osherson is a Professor of Psychology at the Fielding Graduate University.

This compendium is a collection of articles that explores the use of comparative case study method in social scientific research. In chapter one of the book the authors argue (in agreement with the proposition laid out by Emile Durkheim) that “there can be no social science which is not comparative”. Subsequent chapters deal with the problems and issues involved in comparative research. Articles address such issues as cultural bias, the question of equivalence, and the difficulties introduced by linguistics and translations. The concluding section of the book provides illustrative examples of comparative case studies.

Published in 1973, the book is somewhat dated. However, it does provide a very good foundation for understanding comparative analysis. More importantly, it attempts to address and resolve issues that are inherent to the use of comparative case study analysis as a methodology.

Additional Sources

Gangon, Y.C., *The Case Study as Research Method: A Practical Handbook*, Presses de L'Universite Du Quebec: Quebec, 2010.

Kaarbo, J., Beasley, R., “A Practical Guide to the Case Study Method in Political Psychology”, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 20, Issue 2, June 1999, pp. 369-391

Outhwaite, W., Turner, S., (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Social Science Methodology*, Sage Publications: London, 2007.

Resende-Santos, J., *Neorealism, States and the Modern Mass Army*, Cambridge University Press: 2007.

Swanborn, P., *Case Study Research: Why, What and How*, Sage Publications: Washington, 2010

Collier, D., Gerring, J., (eds.), *Concepts and Methods in Social Science: The Tradition of Giovanni Sartori*, Routledge: New York, 2009.

Illustrative Selections

Achen, C.H., Snidel, D., “Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies”, *World Politics*, Vol. 41, No. 2, January 1989, pp. 143-169.

Christopher Achen is a Roger Williams Straus Professor of Social Science in the Department of Politics at Princeton University. Duncan Snidel is an Associate Professor at the Harris School and Department of Political Science and Chair of International Relations at the University of Chicago.

Achen and Williams explore the use of comparative case studies as a tool in the study of deterrence theory. While the primary focus is on the limitations of comparative case studies, they concede that a historical analysis of particular cases, from the Second World War through crisis situations such as Lebanon, have provided a powerful tool in the study and implementation of deterrence policies. They also point out that comparative case analysis, while having shortcomings, does not suffer the same drawbacks as analytic or statistical analysis for this purpose. Though the paper criticizes how case studies are used in practice, they conclude that comparative analysis is essential to the development and testing of social science theory.

This piece, by critiquing comparative case analysis, ultimately shows the strength of the method in developing a theory or deterrence, or any other social scientific theory for that matter. In this regard, Achen and Williams show it to be a valuable tool in studies that draw on historical analysis for the development of ideas for future action.

Amer, R., “The United Nations Reactions to Foreign Military Interventions: A Comparative Case Study Analysis”, *Umea Working Papers in Peace and Conflict Studies*, No. 2, March 16, 2007.

Ramses Amer is an Associate Professor and Senior Lecturer in the in the Department of Political Science at Umea University, Sweden.

In this piece, Amer investigates the reaction of the United Nations (UN) to foreign military interventions, to ascertain whether these reactions to interventions were consistent with the mandate of the UN Charter. The research is undertaken using a comparative case study methodology that considers UN mandated interventions since Jan. 1, 1976. Eight cases of sovereignty violations (both UN mandated and unilateral) are analyzed and then compared with the reaction of the international community *vis a vis* the UN. The author concludes that though all cases provide examples of clear violations of sovereignty, sacrosanct in the UN charter, the reaction of the UN is inconsistent in each case.

Amer's study is a classic example of how to use comparative case study and analysis in the conduct of research pertaining to international relations, and the social sciences in general. The piece informs both an understanding of the UN through its content, and highlights the benefits of comparative case studies for the conduct of such research.

Arreguin- Toft, I., “How to Lose a War On Terror: A Comparative Analysis of a Counterinsurgency Success and Failure”, in Jan Angstrom and Isabelle Duyvesteyn, (eds.), from “*Understanding Victory and Defeat in Contemporary War*”, Routledge: New York, 2008 pp. 142- 167.

Ivan Arreguin-Toft is a PhD. Graduate of the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, and a Visiting Assistant professor at Wesley College. His doctoral dissertation has led to a book on asymmetric conflict entitled *How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

This piece offers comparative case study analysis of how counter insurgency operations were conducted by two different nations. Arreguin-Toft examines the British experience during the Malaya Emergency and the experience of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan from 1979-1989. Each case is followed by an analysis, and conclusions are compared to discern common and particular trends and characteristics. This informs the author's conclusions on the degree of efficacy of measures taken in each case studied, and in turn forms the basis for his recommendations on future endeavours in counter insurgency.

The piece is limited by the small number of case studies compared. Toft's thesis would be strengthened by a greater sampling of material, as one could argue that the general conclusions drawn derive from highly specific examples of diametrically opposite counter insurgency programs involving very different organizational structures and regime types (Democratic UK vs. Totalitarian Soviet Union). Nevertheless, the piece is a useful illustration of how the methodology of comparative case studies can be employed.

Art, R., Waltz, K., (eds.), *The Use of Force: Military Power and International Politics*, VII Ed.”, Roman and Littlefield Publishers: New York, 2009.

Robert Art is a Professor of Politics at Brandeis University. Kenneth Waltz is a leading scholar in the field of International Relations, and an Adjunct Professor at Columbia University.

This is an in depth examination of the use of military power as a political instrument. A series of essays by a variety of experts and scholars develops a comprehensive examination, through comparative case studies and historical analysis, of precedents that have been set regarding the use of force, thus informing future action of political leaders. Of particular interest to those examining comparative case study methodology is Part II: Case Studies in the Use of Force (pp. 119-280). This section offers comparative and historical analysis, in nine separate essays spanning three distinct historical timeframes. Other sections of the book use case studies to examine contemporary issues in global security.

This book is broad in scope and deep in analysis of the issues that affect decision making regarding the use of force. The overall structure of the book is dependent on case study analysis, as this is where lessons learned, historical precedents, and the formulation of practices emanates. It is a valuable tool for any student of international relations, and shows both the practice and necessity of using comparative case study analysis to understand issues in international security.

Bassford, M., Weed, K., Puri, S., Falconer, G., Reding, A., “Strengths and Weaknesses of the Netherlands Armed Forces: A Strategic Survey”, RAND Corporation, September 15, 2010.

Matts Bassford is an Associate Director of the Defence and Security Team at RAND Europe. Kristin Weed is a Senior Analyst on the Defence and Security Team. Gregory Falconer is a researcher and both Anais Reding and Samir Puri are analysts on the team.

This is a report commissioned by the Netherlands Ministry of Defence to identify strengths and weaknesses in the armed forces of the Netherlands. The study team used quantitative and qualitative

methodologies, benchmarked these to the Netherlands military forces, and then compared these on a case by case basis with both NATO countries and Australia. The study included perceptions of coalition partners on the strengths and weaknesses of the Dutch military, as well as interviews and media analysis. These subsequent research methodologies have been subsumed under the banner of a comparative case study analysis in order to identify indicators of relative strengths and weaknesses in the Netherlands military.

The study demonstrates how many different methodologies can be used to develop and use underlying contributing indicators in a comprehensive comparative case study. The study could also be of use to the Canadian Forces, both given its the content as it compares Canadian military indicators to the Netherlands, and as a template by which the Canadian Forces can conduct their own survey.

Bekerman, Z., McGlynn, C., eds., *Addressing Ethnic Conflict Through Peace Education*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2007.

Zvi Bekerman teaches the Anthropology of Education at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and is a Research Fellow at the Hebrew University Truman Institute for the Advancement of Peace. Claire McGlynn is a lecturer in the Continuing Professional Development at the School of Education, Queen's University, Belfast.

Ostensibly this book addresses the issue of conflict mitigation through education. It does this through a series of comparative case studies involving different areas that have been marked by violent conflict, often of an ethnic or sectarian nature. By studying and comparing the use and structures of education in both mitigating, and sometimes promoting, conflict in each particular case, the book examines how education can be and is being used to promote a move towards peace and security in post conflict areas.

This is a study of security issues from the perspective of education in conflict zones, that relies heavily on case studies and comparative case analysis. It shows both the utility and, in this case, the necessity of comparative case studies to provide an overview and understanding of the issues. In so doing it provides an analysis of both the effectiveness and shortcomings of various strategies used to promote a more secure environment. While a detailed examination of the methodology in question may be absent, this book offers an example of how comparative case study analysis can be used to explore security issues and develop effective strategies to address them.

Bennett, A., “Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti: What Went Right, What Went Wrong?”, in Joseph Lepgold and Thomas Weiss, (eds.), *Collective Conflict Management and Changing World Politics*, State University of New York Press: Albany, 1998, pp. 133-155.

Andrew Bennett was the Special Assistant to the Assistant to the Secretary of Defence for International Affairs from 1994-1995. He is Assistant Professor of Government at Georgetown University.

This piece looks at the particular cases of Somalia, Bosnia and Haiti in collective conflict management. Bennett initially looks at lessons learned and analyses the cases of American involvement in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia. These cases are compared, and the lessons learned then applied to a critical analysis of American and Multi National Forces (MNF) in Haiti. A comparison of the case studies analyzed then informs Bennett's conclusions. He uses comparative case study analysis to inform theory,

and to make recommendations for the future implementation of multi-national deterrence and coercive diplomacy, with a slant towards US interests.

This is a strong example of how comparative case study analysis can inform theory and the development of doctrine and policies for future use by governments and militaries. An informative article on past operations, it demonstrates the utility in comparing and analysing previous cases in order to better prepare for future contingencies.

Blaxland, J.C., *Strategic Cousins: Australian and Canadian Expeditionary Forces and the British and American Empires*, McGill- Queen's University Press: 2006.

Colonel John Blaxland is a serving member of the Australian Army and received a PhD from the War Studies department at the Royal Military College of Canada.

In this book Blaxland engages in a comparative analysis of the military histories of Canada and Australia from the days of the British empire to the present. By exploring this topic using comparative case study methodology, the author is able to identify points of convergence and divergence in both the military structures, and by extension, the national security policies of each nation. This allows for the identification of areas for improvement in joint future operations.

As part of his methodology, Blaxland also includes the use of alternative situations to illustrate certain points. While he does not identify the particularities of his methodology in detail, the book clearly relies on case study comparison, and as such offers valuable insight into Canadian military and security policy by examining its relationship and similarities to the Australian military.

Bruneau, T., Trinkunas, H., (eds.), *Global Politics of Defence Reform*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2008.

Thomas Bruneau is a Distinguished Professor of National Security Affairs at the United States Naval Post-Graduate School. Harold Trinkunas is an Associate Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Post- Graduate School.

This compendium is a collection of essays that examines global trends and the impact these trends have on the formation of emerging defence policy.. The second section of the book looks at country case studies of defence reform, based on empirical data. The surveys pay particular attention to the relationship between civilian and military actors, and the evolution of these relationships in the development, or lack thereof, of defence policy.

The crux of this book hinges on the historical case study analysis of the countries in question. Through a comparative case study analysis, an understanding is formed of common factors that contribute to the promotion of defence reform, and also the limits of global influences on reform in the countries studied.

Cimbala, S.J., Forster, P., *Multinational Military Intervention: NATO Policy, Strategy and Burden Sharing*, Ashgate Publishing: Burlington, Vt., 2010.

Stephen Cimbala is a Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Penn State University.

Peter Forster is an associate faculty of the Department of Political Science at Penn State University and represents the department at the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institute.

This book offers a comparative case study analysis of the experience of the US and NATO countries in foreign interventions. The authors consider the cases of Lebanon, the first US-led war in the Persian Gulf, the Balkans situations of the 1990's, and the current NATO mission in Afghanistan. The primary focus of the study is burden sharing in multi-national operations. This is examined through a discussion of the history and context of each case. By comparing each case the authors present an argument for the way in which changes in the international system affect burden sharing amongst NATO member states.

Statistical analysis is offered as supporting evidence of the greater argument, but the conclusions drawn are based upon a comparative analysis of the cases studied, which in turn is designed to inform future policy decisions.

Cohen, S., (ed.), *Democratic Societies and Their Armed Forces*, Frank Cass: London, 2000.

Stuart Cohn is a senior research associate at the BESA Center and a Professor of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University, Israel.

The focus of this work is an examination of the Israeli Defence Force (IDF) as an integrated and ubiquitous component of Israeli society. However, the purpose of the book is to examine the relationship of the IDF to Israeli society through a comparative analysis of the general relationship of a military force to the society it serves within a democratic system of governance. The vast majority of case analysis focus on the civil military relationship and force structuring of the United States military, while other references treat “democratic societies” as a monolithic whole.

The greatest strength of this book is the articulation of the role of the IDF in relation to Israeli society and its comparison to this relationship to that of other armed forces with their own democratic societies. The book works best as vehicle for understanding a particular case (i.e. Israel) through comparison with other democratic countries. In this instance, the case study allows for the formation of an understanding of the particular (IDF to Israeli society) through a comparative analysis of the US in particular, and other democracies in general.

Cope, A., Denny, L., “Defence White Papers in the Americas: A Comparative Analysis”, *Institute for National Strategic Studies*, September 2000 (Rev. April 2002).

John Cope is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS). Laurity Denny is a Senior Research Assistant at the INSS.

This report was developed as a brief for American delegates attending the 2000 meeting of the Defence Ministerial of the Americas. It is a comparative case by case analysis of the development of defence “white papers” of various states in the Western Hemisphere for the purpose of better understanding the development of policy *vis a vis* the United States. Fifteen “white papers” from states around the world were studied, including Canada’s 1994 defence policy statement. The authors conclude that there is no set template applicable to the development of “white papers”, but that the processes by which the policies

are developed provide a benefit to sovereign nations in terms of the national and international research involved.

This is a simple and straightforward example of comparative case study methodology in application for the purpose of security and defence considerations. Given that the study was intended to provide conference delegates with knowledge of the workings of defence policy other nations, it shows the methodology as a practical and effective tool in formulating an understanding of the “other”, and in developing governmental policies.

Crocker, C., Hampson, O.F., Aall, P., *Grasping the Nettle: Analyzing Cases of Intractable Conflict*, United States Institute of Peace Press: Washington, D.C., 2005.

Chester Crocker is a James R. Schlesinger Professor of Strategic Studies at Georgetown University. Fen Olser Hampson is a Professor of International Affairs at and Director of the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University. Pamela Aall is director of the Education Program at the United States Institute of Peace.

This volume provides a comparative case study analysis of so called “intractable” conflicts. The first section of the book (chapters 2- 5) presents a detailed discussion of the terms and concepts involved in the study. The second offers eight case studies of intractable conflicts. The last section of the book is a comprehensive analysis focusing on the implications of these conflicts, and how to deal with them, by third party actors. By examining trends and common elements of each conflict, or common elements between some of the conflicts as compared to others, a greater sense of what is important to each conflict, and thus what possible measures can be taken by third parties to mitigate the conflicts, can be discerned.

The comparative case study analysis offered is grand in scope and detail, and is fundamental to the development of conclusions being drawn. It demonstrates the value of comparative case study analysis as a useful tool in identifying what counts, and what possible steps can be taken to resolve long term inter- and intrastate conflicts.

Fein, R., Vosskuil, B., “Assassination in the United States: An Operational study of Recent Assassins, Attackers and Near Lethal Approaches”, *The Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol.4, No. 2, March 1999.

At the time of writing, Bryan Vosskuil was Executive Director of the National Threat Assessment Center of the United States Secret Service. Robert Fein (PhD.) is a clinical psychologist and served as a consultant to the National Threat Assessment Center.

This piece uses a comparative analytical approach to determine possible future threats against prominent public officials and figures in the United States. The authors based their study on a comparison of the behavioural characteristics of 83 individuals known to have attacked or aggressively approached prominent public figures between the years 1949 and 1999. By comparing various behavioural and characteristic aspects of attackers, they identify indicators of potential attacks, which can serve as a possible means for preventing future attacks.

The study illustrates how the comparative case study method has been and can be used to explore matters of security. By comparing cases the authors have developed a potential means to help mitigate future threats of assassination. .

Franke, V., (ed.), *Security in A Changing World: Case Studies in U.S. National Security Management*, Praeger: Westport, Ct., 2002.

Volker Franke is an Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Studies at Western Maryland College. He also serves as Director and Managing Editor of the Maxwell/SAIS National Security Studies Case Studies Program.

This is a compendium of case studies and exercises developed specifically for National Security Studies (a partnership program between Syracuse University and Johns Hopkins University), funded through the United States Department of Defence. Each particular case study in the volume deals with issues of management, leadership and accountability relevant to US national security interests. The book is designed to aid in the preparation of foreign policy and national security decision makers.

This work illustrates the use of case study methodology as not only a research -- but as a learning tool. Indeed, the case studies presented are designed to inform and train future decision makers in the fields of national security and defence policy. As such, it shows the worth of case study analysis above and beyond a simple research methodology. Additionally, comparison of the cases provides a more holistic view of resources that can be employed for decision making in complex environments.

Frantzen, H.A., *NATO and Peace Support Operations 1991-1999*, Frank Cass: New York, 2005.

Henning A. Frantzen received a Doctorate in the Department of War Studies from King's College London. He works in the Norwegian Ministry of Defence, is a member of the Norwegian Army and has taught at the Norwegian Military academy 1997.

Frantzen provides a comparative case study analysis of the formation of policies and doctrines for North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members actively participating in Peace Support Operations (PSO's). He compares and analyses the "conceptualisation, rationale and priorities of policy and doctrine" within and between Britain, Canada and Denmark. The reason for this comparison is due to both differences and mutual interests of the respective states. Frantzen explores the creation of doctrine by comparing three states that have different histories, security institutions, and national interests, yet are all considered part of the same community and alliance. He discusses the methodology in detail on pages 7-8.

This book is useful as an example of the comparative analytic methodology as applied to a Canadian strategic context. It provides both a case study of Canada compared to its allies, and due to the subject, doubles as a resource in understanding the development of Canadian doctrine and involvement in PSO's.

George, A., Smoke R., *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*, Columbia University Press: New York, 1974.

Alexander George was a leading figure and renowned scholar in the field of International Relations. Richard Smoke was a Professor of Political Science at Brown University and a founder of California's Peace and Common Security Institute. Both men received the 1975 Bancroft Prize for this work.

This book provides an is exploration of deterrence in American foreign policy making after the Second World War. Chapters 4, 16, and the appendix of the book deal extensively with George's and Smoke's

methodology. The authors propose and explain a system of comparative case studies and analysis, as a method of empirical investigation, in order to develop their theory of deterrence. Part two of the book, chapters 5-15, contains the case studies that the authors analyse and compare, with cases ranging from the Berlin blockade of 1948, to the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.

This is an important and influential work in the field of International Relations. The authors' use of comparative case study analysis is fundamental not only to their methodology, but also to the success of their endeavour. Though the intervening years have introduced innumerable and more up to date cases to compare and analyse, the methodology of this seminal work remains a mainstay in thinking about matters of defence and security in international relations.

Godson, R., (ed.), *Comparing Foreign Intelligence: The U.S., the USSR, the U.K. and the Third World*, International Defence Publishers Inc.: New York, 1988.

At the time of publication Roy Godson was an Associate Professor of Government at Georgetown University. He was also coordinator of the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence and program coordinator of the Intelligence Studies Section of the International Studies Section.

This compendium surveys works in the field of intelligence. It is essentially a collection of case studies showcasing methodologies in the field of intelligence studies. The aim is to provide a greater and more systematic comparative analysis of intelligence matters, from a historic, cultural and state specific perspective. More specifically, the inquiry attempts to develop a system of understanding intelligence systems through comparison.

As such the work is not an explicit example either of case study or the comparative case study method. Yet the methodology employed is inherently comparative as it is used as a means by which other intelligence systems can be understood. This, surreptitiously and accidentally, shows the value of comparative case studies in not only understanding similar and opposing systems, but in developing a conceptual framework through which ones own systems may become more intelligible.

Houben, M., *International Crisis Management: The Approach of European States*, Routledge: New York, 2005.

Marc Houben is an officer in the Royal Netherlands Marine Corps. He holds Master's degrees in both Philosophy and Information Management and a Doctorate in Social Sciences.

Houben's aim is to develop a theoretical framework for thinking about cooperation in international crisis management. This is accomplished through an empirical survey of the involvement of nine countries in international crisis response, followed by a comparative analysis of the findings. This is followed by conclusions drawn from a comparative analysis of the cases presented. The author's methodology, research question, and definition of terms and concepts are clearly explained and articulated in the first chapter of the book.

Houben's work is very detailed, and comprehensive in its approach to developing a theory for international cooperation in crisis management. His use of comparative case study analysis is central to the research, and provides a fine example of how this methodology can be used to address practical questions of international importance. This work should be of interest to those interested in how comparative case study can be used, as well as anyone interested in robust international security analysis.

McClesky, E., McCord, D., Leetz, J., Markey, J., “Underlying Reasons for Success and Failure of Terrorist Attacks: Selected Case Studies,” *Homeland Security Institute*, June 4, 2007.

Edward McClesky (Task Lead) is a retired Air Force Intelligence officer and senior analyst at the Homeland Security Institute.

The purpose of this study is to identify factors that lead to either the success or failure of terrorist plots. The authors focus on incidents of terrorist attacks and attempted attacks on both civil aviation and passenger rail services between 1995 and 2006. By analysing the cases studied and identifying common characteristics of each they are able to draw conclusions on the factors that contribute to the success or failure of terrorist schemes. Policy recommendations follow an analysis of their conclusions.

This is a prime example of how comparative case study analysis can be used in the field of security policy and development. Appendix I: Expanded Methodology, provides a very clear and detailed account of the author's method and process of evaluation. The piece should be of interest to those interested in both the methodology of social research as applied to defence issues, and those interested in the phenomenon of terrorism.

Murray, D., Viotti, P., (eds.), *The Defence Policies of Nations*, John's Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD., 1994.

At the time of publication Brigadier General (ret'd) Douglas J. Murray was the head of the Department of Political Science at the U.S. Air Force Academy. Paul Viotti is an Associate Professor and Executive director of the Josef Korbel School of International Studies Institute on Globalization and Security at the University of Denver.

This third edition of the book offers case study comparisons of the international relation and defence policies of various nations. Case studies are divided into five regional sub-categories (i.e. the Americas, Europe, East Asia and the Pacific, South Asia, the Middle East and Africa). The editors, in the first chapter of the book, assert the position that the national security and defence policy of any given state must begin by viewing the context in which that state exists in relation to other actors. This leads to a comparative case study analysis in order to both understand and develop security policy. A number of theoretical perspectives are utilized in the volume of the work (e.g. economic theory and rational actor theory). Yet all ultimately fall under and are made comprehensible by comparative case study analysis.

This book is a comprehensive examination of defence policies across the globe. As the editors note, such a study cannot be undertaken without a comparative analysis of the nations involved. While this opens the work to some criticisms of the methodology employed, it does show that comparative analysis is an essential way to understand the behaviour of states and security policy in the international system.

Ohlsson, L. (ed.), *Case Studies of Regional Conflicts and Conflict Resolution*, Padrigu Papers: Gothenburg, 1989.

Leif Ohlsson taught in the department of Social Sciences at Orebro University, Sweden, and in the Department of Peace and Conflict Studies at Goteborg University, Sweden.

This work examines the question of regional security through analysis of different regional security apparatus'. Through a series of essays by different authors, it examines the idea of regional security

networks through such diverse case studies as Europe, Sweden (in particular), the Palestinian-Israeli security complex, and the Horn of Africa. The essays provide detailed comparative case studies of regional actors and countries examined.

While the overall thrust of the book offers insight into the specific circumstances of regional security complexes, it lacks a concluding chapter tying together common themes and characteristics of each case. There is also no effort made to formulate any theory from the otherwise robust case studies presented. Consequently, while the volume offers some good examples of comparative case study analysis, it ultimately fails to bring it all together for an overarching comprehensive analysis of the whole.

Resende-Santos, J., *Neorealism, States and the Modern Mass Army*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2007.

Joao Resende-Santos is an Associate Professor of Government in the Department of International Relations at Bentley College. His previous teaching positions include the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Pittsburgh and Harvard.

In this book, Resende-Santos explores cross-national military emulation, or, the adoption of another states military systems and practices to enhance the capabilities of ones own. The author conducts his study through a qualitative, case study comparison of historical Argentinean, Brazilian and Chilean militarism. He dedicates pages 41-46 to explaining his research design and methodology. In this section he articulates the benefits of historical case study comparison and analysis, but also makes a point of noting and acknowledging the common criticisms of such methodology. In addressing these issues he consciously limits the explanatory scope of his argument, but strengthens the particular area that is of interest to the book.

This work is valuable in that it not only provides a fine example of comparative case study analyses as a legitimate means of understanding security issues, but also notes the shortcomings of this method. In so doing, the force of the authors arguments are strengthened.

Rietjens, S., *Civil Military Cooperation In Response to Complex Emergency: Just Another Drill?*, Brill publishing: Leiden, The Netherlands, 2008.

Bas Rietjens is a Dutch reserve officer involved in the deployment of Dutch civil-military officers. He received a PhD. In International management from the University of Twente and is an Assistant Professor at the Netherlands Defence Academy.

This book uses a series of case studies to examine the question of Civil Military Cooperation (CIMIC) in theatres of operation by Dutch military forces. Specifically, Rietjens uses a four stage research approach to examine how structures of cooperation can lead to greater gains, and greater respect for the comparative advantages of different actors in the civil-military relationship. Fundamental to his research are the three case studies of the Dutch forces in Kabul, (Afghanistan), Baghlan, (Afghanistan), and Kosovo. The fourth stage of his research involves a comparative analysis of the three cases studies.

This monograph shows case study and comparative case study analysis applied not only to security issues, but in a way that could prove useful to researchers involved in issues of defence and security that are relevant to the Canadian context. Indeed, it offers a valuable tool for understanding CIMIC as conducted by a close and comparable Canadian ally, and for illustrating how comparative case study method can be used to explore issues of relevance in Canadian security and defence.

Roherty, J., (ed.), *Defence Policy Formation: Towards Comparative Analysis*, Carolina Academic Academic Press: Durham, NC, 1980.

At the time of writing James Roherty was a professor in the Department of Government and Politics at the University of North Carolina.

This compendium offers a comparative analysis and assessment of “defence communities” (i.e. public and private individuals and organizations which contribute to the development of security and defence policy). More precisely, it compares the nature of defence policy formulation and implementation, through historical case study and comparative analysis of Australia, South Africa, India, Japan and France, all in juxtaposition of the United States. The purpose of the piece is to derive new perspectives on American defence policy formation through a comparison with other “defence communities.”

The methodology utilized offers a prime example of how comparative case study analysis can be used to both understand and improve upon considerations of defence and security policy formation. The thrust of the book is strengthened by the number of case studies and, though outdated in its content, provides a useful template in the use of comparative case study analysis.

Zanotti, L., *Governing Disorder: UN Peace Operations, International Security, and Democratization in the Post-Cold War Era*, Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, Pa, 2011.

Laura Zanotti is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and University. Previously she was a UN officer deployed to missions in Haiti and Bosnia.

In this monograph, Zanotti explores the “how” of power, through an analysis of international security regimes. She addresses the question of how the ideas of international organizations concerning good governance, security, peace and democracy are developed, how these rationales inform interventions, and how this affects the recipient society of an intervention. To illustrate the point, Zanotti uses two case studies of Haiti and Croatia. These two cases both inform her view and provide evidence for the empirical observations that lead to her conclusions.

Zanotti is forthright in noting that her work derives from a particular theoretical (Foulcauldian) perspective, which some may argue contributes to some degree of bias in the interpretation of the cases examined. The work may also suffer from possible drawbacks inherent in the close connection which the researcher has to the cases being studied. That said such shortcoming do not necessarily invalidate the works overall argument.

Conclusion

Comparative case study analysis is standard practice in every discipline that falls under the banner of social science, and the breadth and depth of discussion of the method, as well as the development of concepts involved in the discussion is constantly expanding and evolving. Indeed, research employing the method, and developments regarding the method itself, are projects in perpetual motion.

While some of the works contained herein are seminal, and some of the authors are iconic in their respective fields, there is much literature currently available that has not been included. The reasons for this are varied, and include the author's subjective preferences and judgment. What is clear however, is that this methodology has proven itself invaluable to informing the development of theory, doctrine and policy in a wide range of disciplines and sub-disciplines in the social sciences.

Bibliography

Aristotle, “The Politics”, trans. Benjamin Jowatt, in Richard McKeon (ed.), *Introduction to Aristotle*, Random House: Toronto, 1947.

UNCLASSIFIED
 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF FORM
 (highest classification of Title, Abstract, Keywords)

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA (Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)		
1. ORIGINATOR (the name and address of the organization preparing the document. Organizations for whom the document was prepared e.g. Establishment Sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, are entered in Section 8). Operational Research Division Department of National Defence Ottawa, Canada, K1A 0K2	2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (overall security classification of the document, including special warning terms if applicable) UNCLASSIFIED (NON-CONTROLLED GOODS) DMC: A REVIEW: GCEC June 2010	
3. TITLE (the complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification should be indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C or U) in parentheses after the title) The Comparative Case Study Method: An Annotated Bibliography		
4. AUTHORS (last name, first name, middle initial) O'Reilly, Neil		
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (month Year of Publication of document) September 2012	6a. NO OF PAGES (total containing information. Include Annexes, Appendices, etc.) 35	6b. NO OF REFS (total cited in document) 53
7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (the category of document, e.g. technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of report e.g. interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.) Contract Report		
8. SPONSORING ACTIVITY (the name of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development. Include the address). Joint: Directorate Future Security Analysis, Directorate Land Concepts and Designs		
9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (if appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.) N/A	9b. CONTRACT NO. (if appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.) N/A	
10a. ORIGINATOR's document number (the official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.) DRDC CORA CR 2012- 229	10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NOS. (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.) N/A	
11. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY (any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments and defence contractors: further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments and Canadian defence contractors; further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to government departments and agencies; further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments; further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):		
12. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT (any limitation to the bibliographic announcement of this document. This will normally correspond to the Document Availability (11). However, where further distribution (beyond the audience specified in 11) is possible, a wider announcement audience may be selected.) Unlimited		

13. ABSTRACT (a brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual).

This bibliography is designed to provide an introduction to the comparative case study research method. The comparative method uses a small number of cases (i.e. small- N analysis) to inform and build general conclusions based on common factors and divergent characteristics amongst similar units, with the aim of increasing an understanding of each unit. Comparative case analysis is integral to the conduct of much research and analysis in the social sciences; informing the development of theory, doctrine and policy in a range of disciplines.

The selection of works presented is by no means intended to represent a comprehensive listing of literature on comparative case study analysis. It does, however, provide an indication of the volume and breadth of literature on this method and its application. Indeed, it illustrates the prevalence and ubiquity of comparative case study analysis in the pursuit of social scientific knowledge.

14. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS (technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g. Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus-identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

Methodology, Social Science Research Methodology, Comparative Method, Case Study Method.



www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca

The Comparative Case Study Method

An Annotated Bibliography

Neil O'Reilly
Royal Military College of Canada
Kingston, Ontario

Prepared By:

Neil O'Reilly
Royal Military College of Canada
Kingston Ontario
RMCC

Contract Project Manager: Ms. Margaret Shepherd
CSA: Heather Hrychuk, Strategic Analyst/ Peter Gizewski, Strategic Analyst

The scientific or technical validity of this Contract Report is entirely the responsibility of the Contractor and the contents do not necessarily have the approval or endorsement of Defence R&D Canada.

DRDC – Centre for Operational Research and Analysis

Contract Report

DRDC CORA CR 2012-229

September 2012

Author

Original Signed By

Neil O'Reilly

Approved for release by

Original Signed By

Dr Gregory Smolynec

Section Head: Strategic Analysis

Approved for release by

Original Signed By

Paul Comeau

Chief Scientist DRDC CORA

© Her Majesty the Queen as represented by the Minister of National Defence, 2012

© Sa majesté la reine, représentée par le ministre de la Défense nationale, 2012

Abstract

The following bibliography is designed as an introduction to the comparative case study research method. This method represents an integral and fundamental tool for the conduct of much analysis in the social sciences; long informing the development of theory, doctrine and policy in a range of disciplines. The works identified here provide an indication of the volume and breadth of literature both on the method itself as well as its application.

Résumé

La bibliographie suivante sert d'introduction à la méthode de recherche comparative fondée sur les études de cas. Cette méthode représente un outil intégral et fondamental permettant d'effectuer de nombreuses analyses en sciences sociales; elle contribue depuis longtemps à l'élaboration de théories, de doctrines et de politiques dans diverses disciplines. Les travaux mentionnés dans la présente bibliographie donnent un aperçu du volume et de l'étendue de la documentation sur la méthode en soi et sur son application.

Executive summary

The Comparative Case Study Method: An Annotated Bibliography

O'Reilly, N.; DRDC CORA CR 2012-229; Defence R&D Canada – CORA; September 2012.

This bibliography is designed to provide an introduction to the comparative case study research method. The comparative method uses a small number of cases (i.e. small- N analysis) to inform and build general conclusions based on common factors and divergent characteristics amongst similar units, with the aim of increasing an understanding of each unit. Comparative case analysis is integral to the conduct of much research and analysis in the social sciences; informing the development of theory, doctrine and policy in a range of disciplines.

The selection of works presented is by no means intended to represent a comprehensive listing of literature on comparative case study analysis. It does, however, provide an indication of the volume and breadth of literature on this method and its application. Indeed, it illustrates the prevalence and ubiquity of comparative case study analysis in the pursuit of social scientific knowledge.

Sommaire

The Comparative Case Study Method: An Annotated Bibliography

O'Reilly, N.; DRDC CORA CR 2012-229; Defence R&D Canada – CARO; septembre 2012.

La présente bibliographie sert d'introduction à la méthode de recherche comparative fondée sur les études de cas. Dans le cadre de la méthode comparative, on utilise un petit nombre de cas (analyse d'un petit nombre de cas) pour documenter et établir des conclusions générales en fonction de facteurs communs et de caractéristiques divergentes au sein d'unités semblables, en vue d'améliorer la connaissance de chaque unité. L'analyse comparative de cas fait partie intégrante de la réalisation de bien des recherches et des analyses dans le domaine des sciences sociales; elle contribue depuis longtemps à l'élaboration de théories, de doctrines et de politiques dans diverses disciplines.

La sélection de travaux présentée ne vise nullement à énumérer de façon exhaustive les documents au sujet de l'analyse comparative fondée sur les études de cas. Elle donne toutefois un aperçu du volume et de l'étendue de la documentation sur cette méthode et son application. En effet, elle illustre la fréquence et l'omniprésence des analyses comparatives fondées sur les études de cas en vue d'acquérir des connaissances en sciences sociales.

Table of contents

Abstract.....	i
Résumé.....	ii
Executive summary	iii
Sommaire.....	iv
Table of contents.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Introduction.....	1
General Works.....	3
Critiques.....	9
Illustrative Selections.....	15
Conclusion.....	26
Bibliography	27

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Mr. Peter Gizewski, Strategic Analyst DRDC CORA for his direction and guidance in the development and completion of this work.

Introduction

Qualitative research methodology employs techniques to extrapolate meaning, deduce theoretical underpinnings, and provide “explanation(s) and understanding of important social and political phenomena through the comparison of similarities and differences across different units” that bare some existential resemblance.¹ The comparative case study method, as one of the techniques of qualitative research, uses a small number of cases (i.e. small- N analysis) to inform and build general conclusions from common factors and divergent characteristics amongst units that are not identical, but are similar enough that both the divergent and convergent points of comparison allow for an increased understanding of each particular unit.² The method can be traced back to antiquity, with Aristotle employing just such a technique to develop and explain various forms of governance in his treatise “The Politics”.³ Since then, it has become a fundamental tool in understanding social and scientific phenomena. Spurred by the efforts of such noted and influential scholars as Alexander George, Arend Lijphart and Giovanni Sartori in the last four decades, comparative case analysis has come to the fore as an integral approach to social scientific research.⁴ Indeed, as Emile Durkheim, one of the founding fathers of modern social science observes “...there can be no social science which is not comparative.”⁵

This bibliography is by no means intended to be a comprehensive treatment of literature on comparative case study analysis. Rather, it is designed as an introduction to the method. It also provides an indication of the sheer volume and breadth of literature available to those interested in this type of research methodology, how it can be applied to social scientific research in general, and more specifically, how it can be applied to issues of concern to defence and security studies.

The work is divided into three sections. The first ‘General Discussion’ consists of items that are “how to” guides on the nature, development and implementation of comparative and case study research methods. The second, entitled “Critiques,” outlines works that offer a critical perspective on the method, identifying both its strengths and its weaknesses. Finally, the bibliography presents a number of selections on studies of security issues that utilize comparative case analysis, under the heading of “Illustrative Selections.” These items were selected to highlight the utility of the method, in the conduct of research that attempts to formulate theories and/or policy recommendations. Still other works cited reflect a

-
- 1 Lindman, T, Robinson, N., *The SAGE Handbook of Comparative Politics*, Sage: London, 2009, p. 1.
 - 2 Much of the current literature nominally differentiates between *comparative* and *case study* methodology. However, a reading of the material shows that comparative studies are inherently case studies of two or more subjects. Thus the generic term used by the author will be *comparative case study analysis*. Where the referent piece is of a singular or particular case, or specifically references *case study* (the use of one instance or illustrative example) the term *case study* will be used.
 - 3 Aristotle, “The Politics”, trans. Benjamin Jowatt, in Richard McKeon (ed.), *Introduction to Aristotle*, Random House: Toronto, 1947, pp. 553-617.
 - 4 This is to say that while singular cases can employ any method of data collection and analysis from statistics, interviews, rational theory, observation, or any number of other techniques, this does not preclude or void their utility for a comparative analysis with similar cases.
 - 5 Warwick, D., Osherson, S., (eds.) *Comparative Research Methods*, Prentice hall: New Jersey, 1973, p. VII.

combination of explanation and illustrative examples, general discussion and/or critique. These works are cited under the heading “Additional Works” at the conclusion of each section.

Selections provided are intended to aid in the conduct of research. They also serve to illustrate the prevalence and ubiquity of comparative case study analysis in the pursuit of social scientific knowledge.

General Works

Collier, D., Gerring, J., (eds.), *Concepts and Methods in Social Science: The Tradition of Giovanni Sartori*, Routledge: New York, 2009.

David Collier is a Chancellor's Professor of Political science at the University of California, Berkeley. John Gerring is a Professor of Political Science at Boston University where he teaches Methodology and Comparative Politics.

Giovanni Sartori is highly regarded in the field of comparative politics and social science research methodology. The first part of the compendium is a collection of Sartori's own writings on comparative method and analysis. The second section presents a series of essays by noted scholars who have been greatly influenced by his work. They essentially extend the work that has previously been set out by Sartori. The third part of the book includes a one chapter autobiographical essay by Sartori and reflections from former students which detail Sartori's life and influence.

This book is as much an homage to the legacy of Giovanni Sartori as it is a collection of his work and that of the people he has influenced. It offers great insight into the discussions surrounding the use of comparative analysis. The thoughts put forth by Sartori represent a critical examination of the importance of terms and concepts used in comparative methodology. These are in fact the fundamentals which any good research should take into account.

Druckman, D., *Doing Research: Methods of Inquiry for Conflict Analysis*, Sage Publications: London, 2005.

David Druckman is a Professor of Conflict Resolution at George Mason University. He is the 1995 recipient of the Otto Klineberg Award for Intercultural and International Relations, and has approximately 150 publications to his name.

This book is designed for those conducting research in the social sciences, and more specifically, those exploring issues and conducting research on conflict and conflict analysis. The book is divided into eight sections, each of which provides a detailed explanation of the research process and methodologies involved. Part IV (pp. 163-226) in particular deals with case studies and comparative study approaches. This section provides explanations on the various ways to utilize these methodologies

The volume represents a useful tool for social science research; especially for those interested in exploring questions of conflict. Druckman advocates a holistic approach to conducting research, and provides a detailed examination of and guidelines for each method proposed. Samples of the different methods used illustrate how each should (and should not) be employed -- thus offering a useful guide to proper methodological design for student, graduate and professional researchers.

Eckstein, H., "A Perspective on Comparative Politics Past and Present", in Harry Eckstein and David Apter, eds., *Comparative Politics: A Reader*, The Free Press of Glencoe: New York, 1963, pp. 3-32.

Harry Eckstein was a prominent and influential scholar of political science and comparative politics. He taught at Harvard, Princeton, and before his death in 1999, was a Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of California.

In this work, Eckstein characterizes the field of comparative politics as marked by eclecticism, disagreement, and high ambition that precludes satisfactory results on the part of practitioners. This is a highly influential piece on the utilization of comparative case study methodology in Comparative Politics and social science research. Indeed, it is a foundational piece in the field, and recommended reading for anyone wishing to understand both the concepts and the processes of comparative method.

Gangon, Y.C., *The Case Study as Research Method: A Practical Handbook*, Presses de L'Universite Du Quebec: Quebec, 2010.

Yves-C Gagnon holds a Post- Doctorate from in Sociology of Organizations from the University de Lyon, France, and is a Bell Chair in Technology and Organization at the University of Quebec.

Gangon begins by examining the benefits and the shortcomings of case study method in social science research in order to help researchers determine its appropriateness for their work. Successive chapters in the book offer a step by step breakdown of how to conduct a case study. Each chapter describes a stage in the process of conducting research based on the approach, from assessing the usefulness of the methodology to writing a final report.

The volume offers a useful “how to” guide for using the case study method. While acknowledging the benefits of this type of research, it also warns of shortcomings and pitfalls that researchers should seek to avoid. And, the lessons detailed derive heavily from past successes and failures, making it a useful tool for current and future research.

Kaarbo, J., Beasly, R., “A Practical Guide to the Case Study Method in Political Psychology”, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 20, Issue 2, June 1999, pp. 369-391.

Juliet Kaarbo is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Kansas State University. Ryan Beasly is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Baker University.

In this article Kaarbo and Beasly illustrate the benefits of using the comparative case study method in the study of political psychology. Their stated aim is to dispel misconceptions surrounding the comparative method that lead to questions regarding its utility, and they attempt to develop a common understanding of this method to avoid further confusion on the matter.

The benefits of the article are twofold. Political psychological research is essentially the study of the behaviours of, and interactions between, actors, which conforms to the tenants of the social sciences in general. The propositions laid out by Kaarbo and Beasly are thus transferable throughout the spectrum of the social scientific research. Secondly, in detailing a more coherent system for the use of comparative case study method, the authors offer a means of making it more efficient for the conduct of social scientific research.

Landman, T., Robinson, N., *The SAGE Handbook of Comparative Politics*, Sage: London, 2009.

Todd Landman is Reader in the Department of Government and Director of the Centre for Democratic Governance at the University of Essex. Neil Robinson is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Politics and Public Administration at the University of Limerick.

This comprehensive compendium contains a total of twenty-eight essays that explore the field of Comparative Politics from three different angles. The book serves as a comprehensive and far reaching discussion of classical issues, research methods, and contemporary issues in Comparative Politics. The discussions in the first section are easily applicable to other areas of social scientific research. The book, as a whole, will be of use to anyone interested in issues in International Relations and Security in particular, and social scientific research in general.

Mahoney, J., Rueschmeyer, D., (eds.), *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2003.

James Mahoney is a Jurkowsky Family Assistant Professor of Sociology at Brown University. Dietrich Rueschmeyer is a Research Professor at Brown's Watson Institute of International Studies.

This compendium of essays on the comparative methodology of social scientific research is divided into three sections. The first examines how knowledge is accumulated through comparative historical research in the social sciences. The second section deals with the analytic tools of comparative research. The third and final section of the book addresses some major questions regarding the methodology of comparative historical analysis. The book takes a somewhat narrative arc by examining past comparative analytic research, current efforts, and what the future might hold for social scientific research.

Of particular interest is the first section of the book, which deals with the accumulation of knowledge brought about by the comparative method over the past thirty years. For those interested in conducting research, the second and third sections provide valuable insight into some of the issues that should be addressed before undertaking a study using comparative method, and the tools that can prove useful in its execution.

Miller, R., Brewer, J., (eds.), *The A-Z of Social Research*, SAGE Publications: London, 2003.

Robert Miller is Senior Lecturer in Sociology in the School of Sociology and Social Policy at Queen's University, Belfast. John Brewer is a professor of Sociology at Queens University, Belfast.

This book is essentially an encyclopaedia of social research including, but not limited to, such diverse topics as methodologies, the use of the Internet in research, statistical testing and the philosophy of social research. Of particular interest to those engaged in comparative case study work are sections on the use of case studies, and comparative analysis.

Notably, the book lacks depth of analysis on topics covered, and should not be used as a definitive guide to the use of comparative case study analysis. However, it is a convenient reference guide in the identifying different methodologies.

Munck, G., Snyder, R., *Passion, Craft and Method in Comparative Politics*, Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, 2007.

Gerardo Munck is at the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. Richard Snyder is a Professor of Political Science at Brown University.

This is a collection of interviews with prominent scholars in the field of Comparative Politics. Through personal interviews the discipline of Comparative Politics is discussed, as well as personal experiences in conducting research in the field. This involves in-depth discussions comparing methodologies, and discussing the benefits and drawbacks of certain methodologies in developing an analytic and theoretical framework.

The book not only exposes the reader to the thinking of leading scholars in the field of comparative politics, but also their personal experiences with the tools of the trade, for both better and worse. As such it represents a valuable resource for those interested in getting a sense of how case study and comparative analysis can and has been applied by professionals.

Nye, J. Jr., Lynn-Jones, S., “International Security Studies: A Report of the Conference on the Field”, *International Security*, Vol. 12, No. 4, Spring 1988, pp. 5-27.

Joseph Nye Jr. is a Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard University and a pioneer in International Relations theory. Sean Lynn-Jones is the editor of *International Security*.

This article reviews the state of the discipline and study of international relations. The authors recount advances made in the field, and detail areas in need of improvement. A burgeoning development at the time of publication was a move towards a more historically centered analysis of issues pertinent to the study of international security. The authors identify this as a positive move that promises to compensate for the highly theoretical nature of the study of the field.

This article identifies comparative historical and case analysis as a useful and necessary tool in the study of international security. It allows for formulations of theory and doctrines based on empirical evidence provided in past cases. This suggests the utility of using a comparative analysis methodology in social scientific research.

Odell, J., “Case Study Methods in International Political Economy”, *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 2, Issue 2, May 2001, pp. 161-176.

John Odell is a Professor at the School of International Relations at the University of Southern California. He teaches qualitative research design and political economy.

Odell highlights the most recent developments in qualitative research by examining how these apply to theory development and testing. The article details what many other authors, theorists and practitioners are saying about the connections between different methodologies of qualitative research and the development and testing of theories. This issue is of particular importance in fields of research where the number of cases being studied is insufficient for rigorous statistical examination (as is often the case in researching topics that fall into the social sciences).

This is essentially a literature review of methodologies employed in forming and testing theories in social scientific research. Though the article does not inform how such research projects should be undertaken, it exposes the range of opinion that exists in the scholarly community, and many of the issues and points of view involved (while providing an index of who is saying what).

Outhwaite, W., Turner, S., (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Social Science Methodology*, Sage Publications: London, 2007.

William Outhwaite is a Professor of Sociology at Newcastle University, and has published extensively on issues in social science theory and research. Stephen Turner is a Graduate research Professor in Philosophy at the University of South Florida, and has written extensively on methodology.

This compendium deals extensively with methods of research in the social sciences. A vast landscape of research methodologies, and associated theories, are covered over seven sections of the book. Of particular interest to those engaged in comparative case study methodology is Section 2, which contains four essays under the title “Cases, Comparisons and Theory”.

This is an authoritative and comprehensive discussion on methodology in the social science. As such, it is an invaluable tool for understanding the concepts involved in comparative case study analysis, and more importantly, how to use such methodology in social scientific research.

Swanborn, P., *Case Study Research: Why, What and How*, Sage Publications: Washington, 2010.

Peter Swanborn is a sociologist and Professor Emeritus of Methods and Techniques of Social Research at Utrecht University and the University of Amsterdam.

This is essentially a “how to” guide on using the case study as a means of social scientific research. Swanborn begins with an explanation of what a case study is, and proceeds with a step by step analysis of the preparation, execution and analysis of using the case study as a research methodology. Each chapter explores the various components and stages of case study research, and concludes with an analysis of the content of the discussion.

Swanborn's treatment of case study method is highly detailed and instructive. The stages discussed in each chapter are analyzed critically, shortcomings of the method are addressed, and attention is accorded to practices that might undermine the results of research using this method. .

Yin, R., *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Sage Publications: London, 1994.

Robert Yin received a PhD From the department of Brain and Cognitive Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a former member of the RAND Corporation and is president of COSMO, and applied research and social science firm.

This book deals explicitly with the case study as a research strategy. It is an extremely detailed account of the subject, pin-pointing when and how it can be used, and the drawbacks and advantages of its use. The chapters are organized in logical fashion, detailing the steps required for using case study method. In this way the book functions as a “how to” guide on the subject.

The book is not only explanatory and descriptive of the method, but also prescriptive – discussing how it should be used. It is useful as a guide in the preparation, execution and analysis of case studies as a research method.

Additional Sources

Collier, D., “The Comparative Method”, in Ada Finifter, (ed.), *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, Norton: New York, 2002, pp. 105-119.

Etzioni, A., Dubow, F., (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*, Little, Brown and Co.: Boston, 1970.

Lijphart, A., “Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 65, No. 3, September 1971, pp. 682-693.

Oyen, E., (ed.), *Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research*, Sage: London, 1990.

McClesky, E., McCord, D., Leetz, J., Markey, J., “Underlying Reasons for Success and Failure of Terrorist Attacks: Selected Case Studies”, *Homeland Security Institute*, June 4, 2007.

Sartori, G., “Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics”, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 1033-1055.

Sartori, G., (ed.), *Social Science Concepts: A Systemic Analysis*, Sage Publications: London, 1984.

Sprinz, D, Wolinsky- Nahmias, Y., (eds.), *Models, Numbers and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*, University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, 2004.

Van Deth, J., (ed.), *Comparative Politics: The Problem with Equivalence*, Routledge: New York, 1998.

Warwick, D., Osherson, S., (eds.), *Comparative Research Methods*, Prentice Hall Inc.: New Jersey, 1973.

Critiques

Bennet, A, Elman, C., “Case Study Methods in the International Relations Subfield,” *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, February 2007, pp. 170-195.

Andrew Bennett is an Assistant Professor of Government at Georgetown University. Colin Elman is an Assistant Professor of political science at Syracuse University.

In this article, Bennett and Elman illuminate the benefits of case based qualitative studies in the field of security studies in particular, and social science research in general. They defend the practice of comparative and case study analysis against detractors, while acknowledging and addressing criticisms levelled against it. Particularly notable is the use of a series of exemplary cases to defend and promote the methodology.

Bowen, J., Petersen, R., (eds.), *Critical Comparisons in Politics and Culture*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1999.

John Bowen is a Professor of Anthropology and Director of the Program in Social Thought and Analysis at Washington University, St. Louis. Roger Petersen is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Washington University.

This compendium deals explicitly with debates surrounding the use of comparative case study methodology as a tool used in social scientific research. A series of articles within the work address various issues and criticisms of the comparative case methodology. The volume is slightly limited in scope. As the book grew out of an attempt to find common ground between the research methods of Anthropologists and Political Scientists, arguments in the debate tend to be informed by those two fields. However, a sense of how a comparative case analysis can be used in these disciplines, and the inherent limitations of such methodology, is evident throughout.

The study of comparative analysis undertaken in this book points to limitations, but also highlights the fundamental utility of using this methodology in social science research. As such, it provides an interested practitioner with an informed blueprint for using this method.

Collier, D., “The Comparative Method”, in Ada Finifter, (ed.), *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, Norton: New York, 2002, pp. 105-119.

David Collier is a Chancellor's Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Berkeley. His research focus is on political methodology, including concept analysis, qualitative methods and strategies for multi- method investigation.

Collier examines developments in and facets of comparative methodology in the fields of comparative politics and international relations. He provides a brief history of the development of the comparative method, and provides a synopsis of the thought of Arend Lijphart, a highly influential scholar and proponent of the technique. Collier highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the method, and pays special attention to the question of how to deal with the many variables that can complicate the small

number of cases studied within a comparative analysis. This is followed by a comparison of the comparative, experimental, statistical and the case study method.

Collier advocates for a type of comparative research that is not limited to any particular field, but is an eclectic mix of methodologies to maximize research opportunities. This article is useful in understanding the comparative methodology, but perhaps even more so in exposing and rectifying some of the controversies surrounding its use.

Etzioni, A., Dubow, F., (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives: Theories and Methods*, Little, Brown and Co.: Boston, 1970.

Amitai Etzioni is a Professor at the Elliott School of International Relations at George Washington University and Director of the Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies. Fredric Dubow was an Assistant Professor of Sociology and Urban Affairs at Northwestern University, California, Berkeley.

This is a compendium of essays which considers comparative case study methodology from a number of different perspectives. It includes essays on the theory and utility of, as well as critiques of, comparative methodology. There is an examination of the history of comparative methodology and a chapter containing a series of essays on the different levels of analysis that comparative method can be applied to i.e. from the family unit to the State level. The final part of the book deals with difficulties in dealing with terms, concepts and different languages in comparative studies, and the issue of how to determine cultural bias in a study.

While this work is somewhat dated in terms of developments in comparative case study analysis, it remains useful for understanding the concepts involved, and the expanse and extent to which the comparative case study method can be and has been used. It is useful as a tool in both developing a comparative case study, and perhaps more importantly, in understanding the scope of issues which accompany the method.

Fox-Wolfgramm, S.J., “Towards Developing a Method for Doing Qualitative Research: The Dynamic Comparative Case Study Method”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 13, Issue 4, December 1997, pp. 439-455.

At the time of writing Susan Fox-Wolfgramm was an Associate Professor in the Department of Business Management at San Francisco State University.

This article points to the need for and benefits of a dynamic-comparative case study methodology. According to the author, this method emphasises investigating “historic and contemporary processes and mechanisms that are the basis for actual events.”⁶ The author asserts that this method is effective in the study of new topics, and in understanding organizational phenomena. Comparative case studies not only allow one to understand a situation, but to make judgements and decisions based on the information that such studies provide

This piece addresses some of the concerns researchers might have in employing a comparative case study methodology for social scientific research. However, it also shows how this methodology can be used by

6 Fox-Wolfgramm, S.J., “Towards Developing a Method for Doing Qualitative research: The Dynamic Comparative case Study Method”, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. Vol. 13, Issue 4, Dec. 1997, p. 441.a

researchers to explore organizational structures amongst divergent actors. As such the piece holds some utility for the study of complex and/or conflict environments.

Lijphart, A., “Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method”, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 65, No. 3, September 1971, pp. 682-693.

Arend Lijphart is a world renowned Political Scientist and Research Professor Emeritus at the University of California, San Diego.

This article provides an examination of the comparative method in social/political scientific research. Lijphart addresses the issues and criticism raised by the method, and designates a section of the article to specifically address its strengths and weaknesses. To explain he compares the comparative method to both the experimental and statistical methods of research, and concludes that the comparative method is suitable where the number of cases is too small for adequate statistical analysis. He asserts that the experimental method is simply not the right tool for social scientific research.

In his explication of comparative method, Lijphart notes the limitations of the methodology, but also offers guidelines on how to overcome them. This article is useful not only for coming to an understanding of what exactly comparative methodology is, but also how it can (and should not) be used.

Maoz, Z., Mintz, A., Morgan, T.C., Palmer, G., Stoll, R., (eds.), *Multiple Paths to Knowledge in International Relations: Methodology in the Study of Conflict Management and Conflict Resolution*, Lexington Books: Toronto, 2004.

Zeev Maoz is a Professor of Political Science at Tel Aviv University. Alex Mintz is a professor of Political Science at Texas A and M University. T. Clifton Morgan is a Professor and Chair of Political Science at Rice University. Glenn Palmer is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University. Richard Stoll is a Professor of Political Science and Associate Dean of Social Science at Rice University.

This book functions as an example and guide for different methodologies of International Relations and social science research dealing with the study of conflict management and resolution. The book is divided into four research methodology areas, including: Rational Choice and Game Theory; Simulation, Experimentation and Artificial Intelligence; Quantitative Approaches; and Case Study Approaches. Though benefits and detriments of each particular method are discussed in detail, emphasis is placed on understanding, comparison and reconciliation of findings between the various methods. Part IV: Case Study Approaches also includes specific examples of method application (e.g. Vietnam and the Crimean Wars).

This book highlights the strengths and weaknesses of various approaches to conducting social science research. It offers both an explanation of, and examples of how different approaches can best be used in research, while pointing out the limitations of such research, and offering alternatives, as per the appropriateness of various approaches.

Oyen, E., (ed.), *Comparative Methodology: Theory and Practice in International Social Research*, Sage: London, 1990.

Else Oyen is a Professor of Social Policy at the University of Bergen, Norway. Her area of focus is in comparative social policy, and she has held various positions with the International Sociological Association.

This book is a compendium of essays dedicated to comparative methodology of social scientific research in cross national studies. It is divided into three sections. The first is a discussion of comparison as a research strategy. The second section discusses the theory behind comparative research as a methodology. The third section of the book describes methodological approaches to comparative research.

This book is valuable in its examination of the use of comparative analysis for cross national research. This makes it especially applicable to international security studies. As many of the contributors are from European Universities, it offers a broad and multi-national view of the comparative research method.

Sartori, G., “Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics”, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 64, No. 4, December, 1970, pp. 1033-1055.

Giovanni Sartori is a scholar in the field of Political Science and has made substantial contributions to the study of Comparative Politics.

This is an early piece by a foundational thinker on the process of comparative analysis in social scientific research. In this essay, Sartori asks why comparison is a useful tool in the study of the political sciences. He argues that a reliance on the use of quantitative measurements is inadequate to explain causal relationships and the interaction of variables that are the subject of political discourse. He asserts that such methods of measurement can in fact mislead a researcher, and result in confused or misinformed conclusions. However, he concludes that without greater agreement on the concepts and terminology that are to be used in comparative analysis, the same types of confusion that accompany pure quantitative data gathering can result.

Sartori’s article is written more as an inquiry into the concepts of comparative analysis, than as an explication of the methodology. It was a foundational piece in the thought of what was an emerging method of social scientific research. Sartori argues for comparative case study analysis by examining the philosophical and analytical underpinnings of why there is a need for such a method. This piece is an examination of the “why”, rather than the “what” or the “how”, of comparative analysis.

Sartori, G., (ed.), *Social Science Concepts: A Systemic Analysis*, Sage Publications: London 1984.

Giovanni Sartori is a scholar in the field of Political Science and has made substantial contributions to the study of Comparative Politics.

The essays in this volume are dedicated to the analysis of concepts as a pre-determining factor of social scientific research. Sartori asserts that there must be agreement upon concepts to ensure the validity of

research, i.e., everybody must agree on the terms of reference so that everybody is referring to the same object. The first part of the book discusses the method employed in the conversation, while the second features a discussion and disambiguation of concepts that have caused confusion and controversy in the social sciences.

This is less a compendium on the comparative case study method than it is a discussion of the necessary conditions of social scientific research. It both warns and informs any interested party of the necessity and utility of ensuring clarity of meaning in conducting research. Sartori strives to make properly conducted qualitative research as irrefutable as quantitative research. His analysis of concepts in methodology is a necessary consideration in meeting this end.

Sprinz, D, Wolinsky- Nahmias, Y., (eds.), *Models, Numbers and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*, University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, 2004.

Detlef Sprinz is a Senior Fellow in the Department of Global Change and Social Systems at the Potsdam Institute of Climate Research and teaches in the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences at the University of Potsdam. Yael Wolinsky-Mahmias is a Senior Lecturer and Associate Chair in the Department of Political Science at Northwestern University.

This book deals with three methods of conducting social science research, with specific reference to International Relations, and the sub-sets of political economy, environmental policy and security studies. Through essays by various scholars the book explores Case Studies, Quantitative Methods, and Formal Methods. Of particular interest is Part I: Case Study Method (pp. 19-125). Within this section, Chapter 5, *Case Studies in International Security Studies*, deals specifically with the benefits and challenges of using the case study in security studies.

This book gives detailed analysis in the design, use and advantages of the case study method, while identifying the drawbacks. It is a valuable tool for researchers of security studies in particular, and the social sciences in general, in how to set up and execute a research project using case study methodology.

Van Deth, J., (ed.), *Comparative Politics: The Problem of Equivalences*, Routledge: New York, 1998.

Jan Van Deth is a Professor of Political Science and International Comparative Social Research at the University of Mannheim. His areas of research are political culture, social change and comparative research methods.

This book is a critical examination of problems that arise in the pursuit of research using comparative case study analysis. Of primary interest to this work is the question of how to examine the same phenomena in different contexts, or how to examine different phenomena within the same context. This leads to the problem of indicators, which, depending on the context, may very well have different meanings and/or give misleading results. This, in turn, leads to a search for equivalent indicators, which itself poses problems. Nine articles in the book address this question.

This book looks beyond basic assumptions of comparative research to critically address a problem that can arise, especially in consideration of cross-cultural, cross-national, or longitudinal studies. The book makes some recommendations in mitigating the problem, and clarifies some of the issues through the diversity of the case studies included.

Warwick, D., Osherson, S., (eds.), *Comparative Research Methods*, Prentice Hall Inc. New Jersey, 1973.

Donald Warwick was a Professor of Sociology at York University, an Institute Fellow of the Harvard Institute for International Development, and authored 12 books and over 100 articles in professional journals. Samuel Osherson is a Professor of Psychology at the Fielding Graduate University.

This compendium is a collection of articles that explores the use of comparative case study method in social scientific research. In chapter one of the book the authors argue (in agreement with the proposition laid out by Emile Durkheim) that “there can be no social science which is not comparative”. Subsequent chapters deal with the problems and issues involved in comparative research. Articles address such issues as cultural bias, the question of equivalence, and the difficulties introduced by linguistics and translations. The concluding section of the book provides illustrative examples of comparative case studies.

Published in 1973, the book is somewhat dated. However, it does provide a very good foundation for understanding comparative analysis. More importantly, it attempts to address and resolve issues that are inherent to the use of comparative case study analysis as a methodology.

Additional Sources

Gangon, Y.C., *The Case Study as Research Method: A Practical Handbook*, Presses de L'Universite Du Quebec: Quebec, 2010.

Kaarbo, J., Beasley, R., “A Practical Guide to the Case Study Method in Political Psychology”, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 20, Issue 2, June 1999, pp. 369-391

Outhwaite, W., Turner, S., (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Social Science Methodology*, Sage Publications: London, 2007.

Resende-Santos, J., *Neorealism, States and the Modern Mass Army*, Cambridge University Press: 2007.

Swanborn, P., *Case Study Research: Why, What and How*, Sage Publications: Washington, 2010

Collier, D., Gerring, J., (eds.), *Concepts and Methods in Social Science: The Tradition of Giovanni Sartori*, Routledge: New York, 2009.

Illustrative Selections

Achen, C.H., Snidel, D., “Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies”, *World Politics*, Vol. 41, No. 2, January 1989, pp. 143-169.

Christopher Achen is a Roger Williams Straus Professor of Social Science in the Department of Politics at Princeton University. Duncan Snidel is an Associate Professor at the Harris School and Department of Political Science and Chair of International Relations at the University of Chicago.

Achen and Williams explore the use of comparative case studies as a tool in the study of deterrence theory. While the primary focus is on the limitations of comparative case studies, they concede that a historical analysis of particular cases, from the Second World War through crisis situations such as Lebanon, have provided a powerful tool in the study and implementation of deterrence policies. They also point out that comparative case analysis, while having shortcomings, does not suffer the same drawbacks as analytic or statistical analysis for this purpose. Though the paper criticizes how case studies are used in practice, they conclude that comparative analysis is essential to the development and testing of social science theory.

This piece, by critiquing comparative case analysis, ultimately shows the strength of the method in developing a theory or deterrence, or any other social scientific theory for that matter. In this regard, Achen and Williams show it to be a valuable tool in studies that draw on historical analysis for the development of ideas for future action.

Amer, R., “The United Nations Reactions to Foreign Military Interventions: A Comparative Case Study Analysis”, *Umea Working Papers in Peace and Conflict Studies*, No. 2, March 16, 2007.

Ramses Amer is an Associate Professor and Senior Lecturer in the in the Department of Political Science at Umea University, Sweden.

In this piece, Amer investigates the reaction of the United Nations (UN) to foreign military interventions, to ascertain whether these reactions to interventions were consistent with the mandate of the UN Charter. The research is undertaken using a comparative case study methodology that considers UN mandated interventions since Jan. 1, 1976. Eight cases of sovereignty violations (both UN mandated and unilateral) are analyzed and then compared with the reaction of the international community *vis a vis* the UN. The author concludes that though all cases provide examples of clear violations of sovereignty, sacrosanct in the UN charter, the reaction of the UN is inconsistent in each case.

Amer's study is a classic example of how to use comparative case study and analysis in the conduct of research pertaining to international relations, and the social sciences in general. The piece informs both an understanding of the UN through its content, and highlights the benefits of comparative case studies for the conduct of such research.

Arreguin- Toft, I., “How to Lose a War On Terror: A Comparative Analysis of a Counterinsurgency Success and Failure”, in Jan Angstrom and Isabelle Duyvesteyn, (eds.), from “*Understanding Victory and Defeat in Contemporary War*”, Routledge: New York, 2008 pp. 142- 167.

Ivan Arreguin-Toft is a PhD. Graduate of the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago, and a Visiting Assistant professor at Wesley College. His doctoral dissertation has led to a book on asymmetric conflict entitled *How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

This piece offers comparative case study analysis of how counter insurgency operations were conducted by two different nations. Arreguin-Toft examines the British experience during the Malaya Emergency and the experience of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan from 1979-1989. Each case is followed by an analysis, and conclusions are compared to discern common and particular trends and characteristics. This informs the author's conclusions on the degree of efficacy of measures taken in each case studied, and in turn forms the basis for his recommendations on future endeavours in counter insurgency.

The piece is limited by the small number of case studies compared. Toft's thesis would be strengthened by a greater sampling of material, as one could argue that the general conclusions drawn derive from highly specific examples of diametrically opposite counter insurgency programs involving very different organizational structures and regime types (Democratic UK vs. Totalitarian Soviet Union). Nevertheless, the piece is a useful illustration of how the methodology of comparative case studies can be employed.

Art, R., Waltz, K., (eds.), *The Use of Force: Military Power and International Politics*, VII Ed.”, Roman and Littlefield Publishers: New York, 2009.

Robert Art is a Professor of Politics at Brandeis University. Kenneth Waltz is a leading scholar in the field of International Relations, and an Adjunct Professor at Columbia University.

This is an in depth examination of the use of military power as a political instrument. A series of essays by a variety of experts and scholars develops a comprehensive examination, through comparative case studies and historical analysis, of precedents that have been set regarding the use of force, thus informing future action of political leaders. Of particular interest to those examining comparative case study methodology is Part II: Case Studies in the Use of Force (pp. 119-280). This section offers comparative and historical analysis, in nine separate essays spanning three distinct historical timeframes. Other sections of the book use case studies to examine contemporary issues in global security.

This book is broad in scope and deep in analysis of the issues that affect decision making regarding the use of force. The overall structure of the book is dependent on case study analysis, as this is where lessons learned, historical precedents, and the formulation of practices emanates. It is a valuable tool for any student of international relations, and shows both the practice and necessity of using comparative case study analysis to understand issues in international security.

Bassford, M., Weed, K., Puri, S., Falconer, G., Reding, A., “Strengths and Weaknesses of the Netherlands Armed Forces: A Strategic Survey”, RAND Corporation, September 15, 2010.

Matts Bassford is an Associate Director of the Defence and Security Team at RAND Europe. Kristin Weed is a Senior Analyst on the Defence and Security Team. Gregory Falconer is a researcher and both Anais Reding and Samir Puri are analysts on the team.

This is a report commissioned by the Netherlands Ministry of Defence to identify strengths and weaknesses in the armed forces of the Netherlands. The study team used quantitative and qualitative

methodologies, benchmarked these to the Netherlands military forces, and then compared these on a case by case basis with both NATO countries and Australia. The study included perceptions of coalition partners on the strengths and weaknesses of the Dutch military, as well as interviews and media analysis. These subsequent research methodologies have been subsumed under the banner of a comparative case study analysis in order to identify indicators of relative strengths and weaknesses in the Netherlands military.

The study demonstrates how many different methodologies can be used to develop and use underlying contributing indicators in a comprehensive comparative case study. The study could also be of use to the Canadian Forces, both given its the content as it compares Canadian military indicators to the Netherlands, and as a template by which the Canadian Forces can conduct their own survey.

Bekerman, Z., McGlynn, C., eds., *Addressing Ethnic Conflict Through Peace Education*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2007.

Zvi Bekerman teaches the Anthropology of Education at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and is a Research Fellow at the Hebrew University Truman Institute for the Advancement of Peace. Claire McGlynn is a lecturer in the Continuing Professional Development at the School of Education, Queen's University, Belfast.

Ostensibly this book addresses the issue of conflict mitigation through education. It does this through a series of comparative case studies involving different areas that have been marked by violent conflict, often of an ethnic or sectarian nature. By studying and comparing the use and structures of education in both mitigating, and sometimes promoting, conflict in each particular case, the book examines how education can be and is being used to promote a move towards peace and security in post conflict areas.

This is a study of security issues from the perspective of education in conflict zones, that relies heavily on case studies and comparative case analysis. It shows both the utility and, in this case, the necessity of comparative case studies to provide an overview and understanding of the issues. In so doing it provides an analysis of both the effectiveness and shortcomings of various strategies used to promote a more secure environment. While a detailed examination of the methodology in question may be absent, this book offers an example of how comparative case study analysis can be used to explore security issues and develop effective strategies to address them.

Bennett, A., “Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti: What Went Right, What Went Wrong?”, in Joseph Lepgold and Thomas Weiss, (eds.), *Collective Conflict Management and Changing World Politics*, State University of New York Press: Albany, 1998, pp. 133-155.

Andrew Bennett was the Special Assistant to the Assistant to the Secretary of Defence for International Affairs from 1994-1995. He is Assistant Professor of Government at Georgetown University.

This piece looks at the particular cases of Somalia, Bosnia and Haiti in collective conflict management. Bennett initially looks at lessons learned and analyses the cases of American involvement in Somalia and the former Yugoslavia. These cases are compared, and the lessons learned then applied to a critical analysis of American and Multi National Forces (MNF) in Haiti. A comparison of the case studies analyzed then informs Bennett's conclusions. He uses comparative case study analysis to inform theory,

and to make recommendations for the future implementation of multi-national deterrence and coercive diplomacy, with a slant towards US interests.

This is a strong example of how comparative case study analysis can inform theory and the development of doctrine and policies for future use by governments and militaries. An informative article on past operations, it demonstrates the utility in comparing and analysing previous cases in order to better prepare for future contingencies.

Blaxland, J.C., *Strategic Cousins: Australian and Canadian Expeditionary Forces and the British and American Empires*, McGill- Queen's University Press: 2006.

Colonel John Blaxland is a serving member of the Australian Army and received a PhD from the War Studies department at the Royal Military College of Canada.

In this book Blaxland engages in a comparative analysis of the military histories of Canada and Australia from the days of the British empire to the present. By exploring this topic using comparative case study methodology, the author is able to identify points of convergence and divergence in both the military structures, and by extension, the national security policies of each nation. This allows for the identification of areas for improvement in joint future operations.

As part of his methodology, Blaxland also includes the use of alternative situations to illustrate certain points. While he does not identify the particularities of his methodology in detail, the book clearly relies on case study comparison, and as such offers valuable insight into Canadian military and security policy by examining its relationship and similarities to the Australian military.

Bruneau, T., Trinkunas, H., (eds.), *Global Politics of Defence Reform*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, 2008.

Thomas Bruneau is a Distinguished Professor of National Security Affairs at the United States Naval Post-Graduate School. Harold Trinkunas is an Associate Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Post- Graduate School.

This compendium is a collection of essays that examines global trends and the impact these trends have on the formation of emerging defence policy.. The second section of the book looks at country case studies of defence reform, based on empirical data. The surveys pay particular attention to the relationship between civilian and military actors, and the evolution of these relationships in the development, or lack thereof, of defence policy.

The crux of this book hinges on the historical case study analysis of the countries in question. Through a comparative case study analysis, an understanding is formed of common factors that contribute to the promotion of defence reform, and also the limits of global influences on reform in the countries studied.

Cimbala, S.J., Forster, P., *Multinational Military Intervention: NATO Policy, Strategy and Burden Sharing*, Ashgate Publishing: Burlington, Vt., 2010.

Stephen Cimbala is a Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Penn State University.

Peter Forster is an associate faculty of the Department of Political Science at Penn State University and represents the department at the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institute.

This book offers a comparative case study analysis of the experience of the US and NATO countries in foreign interventions. The authors consider the cases of Lebanon, the first US-led war in the Persian Gulf, the Balkans situations of the 1990's, and the current NATO mission in Afghanistan. The primary focus of the study is burden sharing in multi-national operations. This is examined through a discussion of the history and context of each case. By comparing each case the authors present an argument for the way in which changes in the international system affect burden sharing amongst NATO member states.

Statistical analysis is offered as supporting evidence of the greater argument, but the conclusions drawn are based upon a comparative analysis of the cases studied, which in turn is designed to inform future policy decisions.

Cohen, S., (ed.), *Democratic Societies and Their Armed Forces*, Frank Cass: London, 2000.

Stuart Cohn is a senior research associate at the BESA Center and a Professor of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University, Israel.

The focus of this work is an examination of the Israeli Defence Force (IDF) as an integrated and ubiquitous component of Israeli society. However, the purpose of the book is to examine the relationship of the IDF to Israeli society through a comparative analysis of the general relationship of a military force to the society it serves within a democratic system of governance. The vast majority of case analysis focus on the civil military relationship and force structuring of the United States military, while other references treat “democratic societies” as a monolithic whole.

The greatest strength of this book is the articulation of the role of the IDF in relation to Israeli society and its comparison to this relationship to that of other armed forces with their own democratic societies. The book works best as vehicle for understanding a particular case (i.e. Israel) through comparison with other democratic countries. In this instance, the case study allows for the formation of an understanding of the particular (IDF to Israeli society) through a comparative analysis of the US in particular, and other democracies in general.

Cope, A., Denny, L., “Defence White Papers in the Americas: A Comparative Analysis”, *Institute for National Strategic Studies*, September 2000 (Rev. April 2002).

John Cope is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS). Laurity Denny is a Senior Research Assistant at the INSS.

This report was developed as a brief for American delegates attending the 2000 meeting of the Defence Ministerial of the Americas. It is a comparative case by case analysis of the development of defence “white papers” of various states in the Western Hemisphere for the purpose of better understanding the development of policy *vis a vis* the United States. Fifteen “white papers” from states around the world were studied, including Canada’s 1994 defence policy statement. The authors conclude that there is no set template applicable to the development of “white papers”, but that the processes by which the policies

are developed provide a benefit to sovereign nations in terms of the national and international research involved.

This is a simple and straightforward example of comparative case study methodology in application for the purpose of security and defence considerations. Given that the study was intended to provide conference delegates with knowledge of the workings of defence policy other nations, it shows the methodology as a practical and effective tool in formulating an understanding of the “other”, and in developing governmental policies.

Crocker, C., Hampson, O.F., Aall, P., *Grasping the Nettle: Analyzing Cases of Intractable Conflict*, United States Institute of Peace Press: Washington, D.C., 2005.

Chester Crocker is a James R. Schlesinger Professor of Strategic Studies at Georgetown University. Fen Olser Hampson is a Professor of International Affairs at and Director of the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University. Pamela Aall is director of the Education Program at the United States Institute of Peace.

This volume provides a comparative case study analysis of so called “intractable” conflicts. The first section of the book (chapters 2- 5) presents a detailed discussion of the terms and concepts involved in the study. The second offers eight case studies of intractable conflicts. The last section of the book is a comprehensive analysis focusing on the implications of these conflicts, and how to deal with them, by third party actors. By examining trends and common elements of each conflict, or common elements between some of the conflicts as compared to others, a greater sense of what is important to each conflict, and thus what possible measures can be taken by third parties to mitigate the conflicts, can be discerned.

The comparative case study analysis offered is grand in scope and detail, and is fundamental to the development of conclusions being drawn. It demonstrates the value of comparative case study analysis as a useful tool in identifying what counts, and what possible steps can be taken to resolve long term inter- and intrastate conflicts.

Fein, R., Vosskuil, B., “Assassination in the United States: An Operational study of Recent Assassins, Attackers and Near Lethal Approaches”, *The Journal of Forensic Sciences*, Vol.4, No. 2, March 1999.

At the time of writing, Bryan Vosskuil was Executive Director of the National Threat Assessment Center of the United States Secret Service. Robert Fein (PhD.) is a clinical psychologist and served as a consultant to the National Threat Assessment Center.

This piece uses a comparative analytical approach to determine possible future threats against prominent public officials and figures in the United States. The authors based their study on a comparison of the behavioural characteristics of 83 individuals known to have attacked or aggressively approached prominent public figures between the years 1949 and 1999. By comparing various behavioural and characteristic aspects of attackers, they identify indicators of potential attacks, which can serve as a possible means for preventing future attacks.

The study illustrates how the comparative case study method has been and can be used to explore matters of security. By comparing cases the authors have developed a potential means to help mitigate future threats of assassination. .

Franke, V., (ed.), *Security in A Changing World: Case Studies in U.S. National Security Management*, Praeger: Westport, Ct., 2002.

Volker Franke is an Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Studies at Western Maryland College. He also serves as Director and Managing Editor of the Maxwell/SAIS National Security Studies Case Studies Program.

This is a compendium of case studies and exercises developed specifically for National Security Studies (a partnership program between Syracuse University and Johns Hopkins University), funded through the United States Department of Defence. Each particular case study in the volume deals with issues of management, leadership and accountability relevant to US national security interests. The book is designed to aid in the preparation of foreign policy and national security decision makers.

This work illustrates the use of case study methodology as not only a research -- but as a learning tool. Indeed, the case studies presented are designed to inform and train future decision makers in the fields of national security and defence policy. As such, it shows the worth of case study analysis above and beyond a simple research methodology. Additionally, comparison of the cases provides a more holistic view of resources that can be employed for decision making in complex environments.

Frantzen, H.A., *NATO and Peace Support Operations 1991-1999*, Frank Cass: New York, 2005.

Henning A. Frantzen received a Doctorate in the Department of War Studies from King's College London. He works in the Norwegian Ministry of Defence, is a member of the Norwegian Army and has taught at the Norwegian Military academy 1997.

Frantzen provides a comparative case study analysis of the formation of policies and doctrines for North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members actively participating in Peace Support Operations (PSO's). He compares and analyses the "conceptualisation, rationale and priorities of policy and doctrine" within and between Britain, Canada and Denmark. The reason for this comparison is due to both differences and mutual interests of the respective states. Frantzen explores the creation of doctrine by comparing three states that have different histories, security institutions, and national interests, yet are all considered part of the same community and alliance. He discusses the methodology in detail on pages 7-8.

This book is useful as an example of the comparative analytic methodology as applied to a Canadian strategic context. It provides both a case study of Canada compared to its allies, and due to the subject, doubles as a resource in understanding the development of Canadian doctrine and involvement in PSO's.

George, A., Smoke R., *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*, Columbia University Press: New York, 1974.

Alexander George was a leading figure and renowned scholar in the field of International Relations. Richard Smoke was a Professor of Political Science at Brown University and a founder of California's Peace and Common Security Institute. Both men received the 1975 Bancroft Prize for this work.

This book provides an is exploration of deterrence in American foreign policy making after the Second World War. Chapters 4, 16, and the appendix of the book deal extensively with George's and Smoke's

methodology. The authors propose and explain a system of comparative case studies and analysis, as a method of empirical investigation, in order to develop their theory of deterrence. Part two of the book, chapters 5-15, contains the case studies that the authors analyse and compare, with cases ranging from the Berlin blockade of 1948, to the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.

This is an important and influential work in the field of International Relations. The authors' use of comparative case study analysis is fundamental not only to their methodology, but also to the success of their endeavour. Though the intervening years have introduced innumerable and more up to date cases to compare and analyse, the methodology of this seminal work remains a mainstay in thinking about matters of defence and security in international relations.

Godson, R., (ed.), *Comparing Foreign Intelligence: The U.S., the USSR, the U.K. and the Third World*, International Defence Publishers Inc.: New York, 1988.

At the time of publication Roy Godson was an Associate Professor of Government at Georgetown University. He was also coordinator of the Consortium for the Study of Intelligence and program coordinator of the Intelligence Studies Section of the International Studies Section.

This compendium surveys works in the field of intelligence. It is essentially a collection of case studies showcasing methodologies in the field of intelligence studies. The aim is to provide a greater and more systematic comparative analysis of intelligence matters, from a historic, cultural and state specific perspective. More specifically, the inquiry attempts to develop a system of understanding intelligence systems through comparison.

As such the work is not an explicit example either of case study or the comparative case study method. Yet the methodology employed is inherently comparative as it is used as a means by which other intelligence systems can be understood. This, surreptitiously and accidentally, shows the value of comparative case studies in not only understanding similar and opposing systems, but in developing a conceptual framework through which ones own systems may become more intelligible.

Houben, M., *International Crisis Management: The Approach of European States*, Routledge: New York, 2005.

Marc Houben is an officer in the Royal Netherlands Marine Corps. He holds Master's degrees in both Philosophy and Information Management and a Doctorate in Social Sciences.

Houben's aim is to develop a theoretical framework for thinking about cooperation in international crisis management. This is accomplished through an empirical survey of the involvement of nine countries in international crisis response, followed by a comparative analysis of the findings. This is followed by conclusions drawn from a comparative analysis of the cases presented. The author's methodology, research question, and definition of terms and concepts are clearly explained and articulated in the first chapter of the book.

Houben's work is very detailed, and comprehensive in its approach to developing a theory for international cooperation in crisis management. His use of comparative case study analysis is central to the research, and provides a fine example of how this methodology can be used to address practical questions of international importance. This work should be of interest to those interested in how comparative case study can be used, as well as anyone interested in robust international security analysis.

McClesky, E., McCord, D., Leetz, J., Markey, J., “Underlying Reasons for Success and Failure of Terrorist Attacks: Selected Case Studies,” *Homeland Security Institute*, June 4, 2007.

Edward McClesky (Task Lead) is a retired Air Force Intelligence officer and senior analyst at the Homeland Security Institute.

The purpose of this study is to identify factors that lead to either the success or failure of terrorist plots. The authors focus on incidents of terrorist attacks and attempted attacks on both civil aviation and passenger rail services between 1995 and 2006. By analysing the cases studied and identifying common characteristics of each they are able to draw conclusions on the factors that contribute to the success or failure of terrorist schemes. Policy recommendations follow an analysis of their conclusions.

This is a prime example of how comparative case study analysis can be used in the field of security policy and development. Appendix I: Expanded Methodology, provides a very clear and detailed account of the author's method and process of evaluation. The piece should be of interest to those interested in both the methodology of social research as applied to defence issues, and those interested in the phenomenon of terrorism.

Murray, D., Viotti, P., (eds.), *The Defence Policies of Nations*, John's Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD., 1994.

At the time of publication Brigadier General (ret'd) Douglas J. Murray was the head of the Department of Political Science at the U.S. Air Force Academy. Paul Viotti is an Associate Professor and Executive director of the Josef Korbel School of International Studies Institute on Globalization and Security at the University of Denver.

This third edition of the book offers case study comparisons of the international relation and defence policies of various nations. Case studies are divided into five regional sub-categories (i.e. the Americas, Europe, East Asia and the Pacific, South Asia, the Middle East and Africa). The editors, in the first chapter of the book, assert the position that the national security and defence policy of any given state must begin by viewing the context in which that state exists in relation to other actors. This leads to a comparative case study analysis in order to both understand and develop security policy. A number of theoretical perspectives are utilized in the volume of the work (e.g. economic theory and rational actor theory). Yet all ultimately fall under and are made comprehensible by comparative case study analysis.

This book is a comprehensive examination of defence policies across the globe. As the editors note, such a study cannot be undertaken without a comparative analysis of the nations involved. While this opens the work to some criticisms of the methodology employed, it does show that comparative analysis is an essential way to understand the behaviour of states and security policy in the international system.

Ohlsson, L. (ed.), *Case Studies of Regional Conflicts and Conflict Resolution*, Padrigu Papers: Gothenburg, 1989.

Leif Ohlsson taught in the department of Social Sciences at Orebro University, Sweden, and in the Department of Peace and Conflict Studies at Goteborg University, Sweden.

This work examines the question of regional security through analysis of different regional security apparatus'. Through a series of essays by different authors, it examines the idea of regional security

networks through such diverse case studies as Europe, Sweden (in particular), the Palestinian-Israeli security complex, and the Horn of Africa. The essays provide detailed comparative case studies of regional actors and countries examined.

While the overall thrust of the book offers insight into the specific circumstances of regional security complexes, it lacks a concluding chapter tying together common themes and characteristics of each case. There is also no effort made to formulate any theory from the otherwise robust case studies presented. Consequently, while the volume offers some good examples of comparative case study analysis, it ultimately fails to bring it all together for an overarching comprehensive analysis of the whole.

Resende-Santos, J., *Neorealism, States and the Modern Mass Army*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2007.

Joao Resende-Santos is an Associate Professor of Government in the Department of International Relations at Bentley College. His previous teaching positions include the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Pittsburgh and Harvard.

In this book, Resende-Santos explores cross-national military emulation, or, the adoption of another states military systems and practices to enhance the capabilities of ones own. The author conducts his study through a qualitative, case study comparison of historical Argentinean, Brazilian and Chilean militarism. He dedicates pages 41-46 to explaining his research design and methodology. In this section he articulates the benefits of historical case study comparison and analysis, but also makes a point of noting and acknowledging the common criticisms of such methodology. In addressing these issues he consciously limits the explanatory scope of his argument, but strengthens the particular area that is of interest to the book.

This work is valuable in that it not only provides a fine example of comparative case study analyses as a legitimate means of understanding security issues, but also notes the shortcomings of this method. In so doing, the force of the authors arguments are strengthened.

Rietjens, S., *Civil Military Cooperation In Response to Complex Emergency: Just Another Drill?*, Brill publishing: Leiden, The Netherlands, 2008.

Bas Rietjens is a Dutch reserve officer involved in the deployment of Dutch civil-military officers. He received a PhD. In International management from the University of Twente and is an Assistant Professor at the Netherlands Defence Academy.

This book uses a series of case studies to examine the question of Civil Military Cooperation (CIMIC) in theatres of operation by Dutch military forces. Specifically, Rietjens uses a four stage research approach to examine how structures of cooperation can lead to greater gains, and greater respect for the comparative advantages of different actors in the civil-military relationship. Fundamental to his research are the three case studies of the Dutch forces in Kabul, (Afghanistan), Baghlan, (Afghanistan), and Kosovo. The fourth stage of his research involves a comparative analysis of the three cases studies.

This monograph shows case study and comparative case study analysis applied not only to security issues, but in a way that could prove useful to researchers involved in issues of defence and security that are relevant to the Canadian context. Indeed, it offers a valuable tool for understanding CIMIC as conducted by a close and comparable Canadian ally, and for illustrating how comparative case study method can be used to explore issues of relevance in Canadian security and defence.

Roherty, J., (ed.), *Defence Policy Formation: Towards Comparative Analysis*, Carolina Academic Academic Press: Durham, NC, 1980.

At the time of writing James Roherty was a professor in the Department of Government and Politics at the University of North Carolina.

This compendium offers a comparative analysis and assessment of “defence communities” (i.e. public and private individuals and organizations which contribute to the development of security and defence policy). More precisely, it compares the nature of defence policy formulation and implementation, through historical case study and comparative analysis of Australia, South Africa, India, Japan and France, all in juxtaposition of the United States. The purpose of the piece is to derive new perspectives on American defence policy formation through a comparison with other “defence communities.”

The methodology utilized offers a prime example of how comparative case study analysis can be used to both understand and improve upon considerations of defence and security policy formation. The thrust of the book is strengthened by the number of case studies and, though outdated in its content, provides a useful template in the use of comparative case study analysis.

Zanotti, L., *Governing Disorder: UN Peace Operations, International Security, and Democratization in the Post-Cold War Era*, Pennsylvania State University Press: University Park, Pa, 2011.

Laura Zanotti is an Associate Professor of Political Science at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and University. Previously she was a UN officer deployed to missions in Haiti and Bosnia.

In this monograph, Zanotti explores the “how” of power, through an analysis of international security regimes. She addresses the question of how the ideas of international organizations concerning good governance, security, peace and democracy are developed, how these rationales inform interventions, and how this affects the recipient society of an intervention. To illustrate the point, Zanotti uses two case studies of Haiti and Croatia. These two cases both inform her view and provide evidence for the empirical observations that lead to her conclusions.

Zanotti is forthright in noting that her work derives from a particular theoretical (Foulcauldian) perspective, which some may argue contributes to some degree of bias in the interpretation of the cases examined. The work may also suffer from possible drawbacks inherent in the close connection which the researcher has to the cases being studied. That said such shortcoming do not necessarily invalidate the works overall argument.

Conclusion

Comparative case study analysis is standard practice in every discipline that falls under the banner of social science, and the breadth and depth of discussion of the method, as well as the development of concepts involved in the discussion is constantly expanding and evolving. Indeed, research employing the method, and developments regarding the method itself, are projects in perpetual motion.

While some of the works contained herein are seminal, and some of the authors are iconic in their respective fields, there is much literature currently available that has not been included. The reasons for this are varied, and include the author's subjective preferences and judgment. What is clear however, is that this methodology has proven itself invaluable to informing the development of theory, doctrine and policy in a wide range of disciplines and sub-disciplines in the social sciences.

Bibliography

Aristotle, “The Politics”, trans. Benjamin Jowatt, in Richard McKeon (ed.), *Introduction to Aristotle*, Random House: Toronto, 1947.

UNCLASSIFIED
 SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF FORM
 (highest classification of Title, Abstract, Keywords)

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA (Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall document is classified)		
1. ORIGINATOR (the name and address of the organization preparing the document. Organizations for whom the document was prepared e.g. Establishment Sponsoring a contractor's report, or tasking agency, are entered in Section 8). Operational Research Division Department of National Defence Ottawa, Canada, K1A 0K2	2. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION (overall security classification of the document, including special warning terms if applicable) UNCLASSIFIED (NON-CONTROLLED GOODS) DMC: A REVIEW: GCEC June 2010	
3. TITLE (the complete document title as indicated on the title page. Its classification should be indicated by the appropriate abbreviation (S, C or U) in parentheses after the title) The Comparative Case Study Method: An Annotated Bibliography		
4. AUTHORS (last name, first name, middle initial) O'Reilly, Neil		
5. DATE OF PUBLICATION (month Year of Publication of document) September 2012	6a. NO OF PAGES (total containing information. Include Annexes, Appendices, etc.) 35	6b. NO OF REFS (total cited in document) 53
7. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (the category of document, e.g. technical report, technical note or memorandum. If appropriate, enter the type of report e.g. interim, progress, summary, annual or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is covered.) Contract Report		
8. SPONSORING ACTIVITY (the name of the department project office or laboratory sponsoring the research and development. Include the address). Joint: Directorate Future Security Analysis, Directorate Land Concepts and Designs		
9a. PROJECT OR GRANT NO. (if appropriate, the applicable research and development project or grant number under which the document was written. Please specify whether project or grant.) N/A	9b. CONTRACT NO. (if appropriate, the applicable number under which the document was written.) N/A	
10a. ORIGINATOR's document number (the official document number by which the document is identified by the originating activity. This number must be unique to this document.) DRDC CORA CR 2012- 229	10b. OTHER DOCUMENT NOS. (Any other numbers which may be assigned this document either by the originator or by the sponsor.) N/A	
11. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY (any limitations on further dissemination of the document, other than those imposed by security classification.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlimited distribution <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments and defence contractors: further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments and Canadian defence contractors; further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to government departments and agencies; further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Distribution limited to defence departments; further distribution only as approved <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify):		
12. DOCUMENT ANNOUNCEMENT (any limitation to the bibliographic announcement of this document. This will normally correspond to the Document Availability (11). However, where further distribution (beyond the audience specified in 11) is possible, a wider announcement audience may be selected.) Unlimited		

13. ABSTRACT (a brief and factual summary of the document. It may also appear elsewhere in the body of the document itself. It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified documents be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall begin with an indication of the security classification of the information in the paragraph (unless the document itself is unclassified) represented as (S), (C), or (U). It is not necessary to include here abstracts in both official languages unless the text is bilingual).

This bibliography is designed to provide an introduction to the comparative case study research method. The comparative method uses a small number of cases (i.e. small- N analysis) to inform and build general conclusions based on common factors and divergent characteristics amongst similar units, with the aim of increasing an understanding of each unit. Comparative case analysis is integral to the conduct of much research and analysis in the social sciences; informing the development of theory, doctrine and policy in a range of disciplines.

The selection of works presented is by no means intended to represent a comprehensive listing of literature on comparative case study analysis. It does, however, provide an indication of the volume and breadth of literature on this method and its application. Indeed, it illustrates the prevalence and ubiquity of comparative case study analysis in the pursuit of social scientific knowledge.

14. KEYWORDS, DESCRIPTORS or IDENTIFIERS (technically meaningful terms or short phrases that characterize a document and could be helpful in cataloguing the document. They should be selected so that no security classification is required. Identifiers, such as equipment model designation, trade name, military project code name, geographic location may also be included. If possible keywords should be selected from a published thesaurus, e.g. Thesaurus of Engineering and Scientific Terms (TEST) and that thesaurus-identified. If it is not possible to select indexing terms which are Unclassified, the classification of each should be indicated as with the title.)

Methodology, Social Science Research Methodology, Comparative Method, Case Study Method.



www.drdc-rddc.gc.ca