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**Three Forms of Comprehension from Case Studies**

The first two actually complement AND endorse each other rather than substitute each other.

1. Apprehension (Ethnographers): It formed judgment through experience, mobilized intuition, and yielded insights that lay the foundation for causal argument by immersing social scientists into the sites, the collective memories of the people who we study (see where people are coming from, and decode their verbal expressions and body languages). All empirical studies, including the application of formal modeling, are from fieldwork (Fenno and Congress). This form of comprehension targets at a specific case or event (probably not that systematic). This process sets the ground for discrimination and explanation.
2. Explanation (Formal Theorists): After recording what we have learned, we proceed to the process of exploring "therefore," where we attempt apportion the things now known to be true between  causes and effects (consequences) with a line of logic that connect them (e.g. game theory). The game theory should constructed based on our understandings we acquired thorough our fieldwork (done as sociologists, anthropologists, and even political scientists themselves). We want the behavior what seek to explain is what one must of necessity expect given one's knowledge of political settings (It is more like a dyadic relationship). A game theoretic analysis must demonstrate that "*the actor could credibly expect these choices to yield the best of the outcomes attainable, given what the actor could control.*" In other words, we seek to explore *how people behave based on their rationality of choice and the incentives that shape strategic choices in political settings*. The premise on game theory transforms the gap between the analysts and the subjects and helps us avoid cultural explanations by emphasizing the role of choice in human behavior.
   * Who are the main actors? What the values attached to each action (and the chosen strategies)
   * What are the parameters to be considered?
   * What strategies do they have?
   * What can the possible equilibria?
3. Conviction (Methodologists): Comprehension does not terminate at explanation; instead, it needs the last step: Confirmation - either "small-N" comparisons and the use of "large-N" methods. The confirmation of a theory based on the cases where it is constructed is not strong enough. If the explanations were powerful, then we should have additional opportunities for confirmation.

**Case: Coffee production in Kenya and Uganda**

Instead of using cultural explanations (*Economy of Affection*), which fail to account for the reluctance of coffee producers to maximize their incomes over time, treating this as the product of choice implied that what were the best responses under different states of the world (to explicate why, behaving rationally, they become more willing to produce coffee and why they become more reluctance or even more rebellious).

* Conviction 1: Extension to Latin America (Colombia) Why did not Colombia treat coffee producers in a predatory manner? From a public policy perspective, it is so because bi-party and electoral competition (number is a strong advantage and peasants could extract favorable policies from candidates competing for office), instead of military autocrats or organized interests (disorganized farmers are disadvantaged), dominates the policy process. The roots of policy differences lay in the structure of political institutions (party competition or not).
* Conviction 2: The Large-N Analysis