

Research Inconsistencies in Comparative Politics

Belakhdar Taifour

Ibn Khaldoun University - Tiaret (Algeria), belakhdar.taifour@univ-tiaret.dz

Received: 30/09/2021

Accepted: 18/10/2019

Published: 16/12/2020

Abstract:

Comparative politics today is the stage of interconnection with different theoretical perspectives and different topics. Therefore, the revival of discussions during this stage resulted in a series of intertwined cognitive processes. The major successive political events had implications for scholars in terms of theoretical approaches and methods. The new political realities, both internally and externally, as well as the self-examination of the limitations and achievements made comparative politics led to a series of rethinking on the nature of phenomena. Thus, the conceptual and methodological renewal was external and internal, it was an external view in the sense that political scientists have increasingly tried to find fruitful ideas elsewhere. Contrary, were an internal view in the sense that the theoretical and methodological of political science also consisted of an assembly of opposing approaches and attempts to provide a theoretical synthesis.

Keywords: Comparative Politics, Methodological Trends, Political Phenomena, Cognitive Controversies.

Corresponding author: Belakhdar Taifour.

1. INTRODUCTION

Contemporary comparative politics has hopelessly lost the enduring attempts to emulate the natural sciences by searching for abstract knowledge based on the theory of total rationality, it has become quite certain that there is no analogy between the natural and political sciences. Comparative politics has sunk into unlimited interpretations of the pattern of the political phenomenon, which is not found in the natural sciences, as the interpretation is not tolerated by the maze of possibilities, and by virtue of the nature of the distinctive human subject of political phenomena, political scientists are inevitably researchers who provide explanations for the interpretations of others, which creates an ever-changing topic that requires Conducting a permanent dialogue between researchers who carry out studies and even the people who are being studied, which is absolutely not found in the natural and exact sciences where the subjectivity of the researcher is completely separate from the phenomena studied, this position inevitably means that there can be no Coherent theory to comparative politics. Meaning that comparative political studies must give up the dream of building time-tested theories of a stable social and political reality.

Therefore, we present the following research problematic:

What is the nature of epistemic contradictions and methodological problems at the level of comparative politics in the contemporary period?

To answer this problematic we discuss the following axes:

- Research method challenges
- Political Phenomena : Complexity and Problems
- Intersection Points
- Comparative Politics: To Where?

2. Research Method Challenges

Perceptions and concepts of political thought collapsed in the twentieth century under the weight of the successive cognitive blows directed at it by science. This type of studies has been removed from all major universities in the United States of America. Because of the constant

neglect of the theorists of this dialectical thought who wanted through it to build a world as they want it, not as it exists with its problems, wars, ethnic conflicts, grinding identities and other concerns and issues that are the core of the interest of individuals and societies, because we have never lived in the imagined worlds that political thinkers have built. Societies, states, regimes, and various cultures have built institutions, states, and buildings, established economies, tried to communicate with each other, dialogue, established relationships, etc., all of this in order to overcome fear of uncertainty and the inability to control life and all the issues and activities that are practiced within it.

Theoretical innovation in comparative politics has been accompanied by methodological diversity. Continuous discussions have allowed scholars about what constitutes "good political science" to better understand their differences. This clarification, in turn, facilitated dialogue. On the one hand, the convergence of quantitative and qualitative methodologies calmed down one part of the field. more recently, postmodernism has become the new competitor to this Cognitive system, the old divisions in the field still exist, but not as strongly as in earlier stages, instead of witnessing new attempts to demonstrate the superiority of one theoretical approach over the other, political scientists tend to encourage theoretical and methodological dialogue and cooperation between Disciplines, diversity has now become fruitful so that there are attempts to obtain it instead of being a shameful flaw in the field, as political scientists are expressing new ambitions in terms of research agenda and theoretical, methodological and professional orientations (Coman & Morin, 2019, p. 21).

Scholars in the field of comparative politics have recently offered a number of stocktaking exercises (refer to, Lichbach and Zuckerman 1997, 2009, Boix and Stokes 2007, Robinson and Todd Landman 2009). These exercises are useful; indeed, nearly indispensable, given the large amount of literature that is currently being produced on comparative politics. But each individual overview in these edited volumes, as similar overviews published regularly in the Annual Review of Political Science and various handbooks, is actually quite limited in scope. That is, though these essays collectively cover all main topics being

studied in the field of comparative politics, the standard approach is for each essay to focus separately on a certain actor, institution or policy area rather than address the big picture. And, as a result, comparativists essentially focus on their topic of interest and do not engage in a broader discussion about the direction of substantive research in comparative politics as a whole. Indeed, the broadest and most heated debates have focused on methods, both for theorizing (refer to, Green and Shapiro 1994, Gerardo Munck 2001), and for empirical analysis (refer to, King, Keohane and Sydni Verba 1994, Brady and David Collier 2004). But even these debates focus on certain aspects of the research process and have rarely been linked closely with an assessment of substantive research. Indeed, with several important exceptions, discussions of comparative politics have largely failed to focus squarely on the substantive goals, and the associated methodological concerns.

Even though the primary goal of comparativists is to produce knowledge about politics around the world, to reach this goal it is essential that comparativists think about what they do and engage in a reflection about knowledge production in the field of comparative politics as a whole. The development of such meta-knowledge, which should be distinguished from intellectual history, is not always recognized as a key aspect of research. Moreover, a call to focus on “knowledge about knowledge” might meet with some resistance by “practicing” comparativists, all too eager to just get on with their research. After all, particularly for comparativists who see themselves as dealing with “real world problems,” a call to discuss the field of comparative politics rather than do comparative politics might seem like a fruitless diversion of energies. Alternatively, comparativists could argue that any debate about knowledge production is largely irrelevant, because changes in research patterns come about through exemplars, that is, actual works that show how to carry out a certain kind of research, as opposed to more abstract debates about what should be done. But we hope to show that focusing on meta-knowledge helps to bring out into the open and address in explicit terms questions that comparativists carry in their minds but all too often never confront head on, such as: Which, among the alternative

research projects we could undertake, would likely yield the larger contribution to the field of comparative politics? Indeed, as Karl Deutsch wrote, “It is essential that social sciences, and those who work in them, should gain a clearer awareness of their mission and their powers.” And, to that end, it is critical to recognize that meta-reflections are actually fundamental to the successful framing and pursuit of research agendas and should be seen as integral parts of the work of a community of scholars (Munck, 2009, pp. 01-02).

Comparative Politics became the major locus of theory building about domestic dimensions of politics in the US from the 1960s to 1980s. Richard Snyder argues that the most fruitful studies in the realm of political science of the 20th century were inspired, motivated, and guided by comparison. Discussing the human dimension of comparative research, Snyder demonstrates that leading political scientists, such as Gabriel A. Almond, Barrington Moore, Robert A. Dahl, Juan J. Linz, Samuel P. Huntington, Adam Przeworski, David D. Latin, and Theda Skocpol, were asking questions encouraged by comparison and were looking for the answers through comparison. Tracing the history of Comparative Politics, Gerardo L. Munck indicates that although by the end of the 20th century Comparative Politics became “a truly international enterprise,” the dominance of “scholarship produced in the US, by US- and foreign-born scholars, and by US-trained scholars around the world,” still persists. The US academic community quantitatively dominates the literature in the field of Comparative Politics, which allows it to set standards of research (Kuteleva, 2015, p. 86).

As Giovanni Satori rightly points out, comparative politics as a study of politics in foreign countries is meaningless, according to Satori's logic, it is not the subject (what policy do we study?) But the method (how do we study politics?) That defines the comparative politics, the field is distinguished and the comparison is shaped as the orientation. The main analytical and exploratory tool, through comparison, researchers obtain the necessary evidence to make generalizations that enhance the understanding of political phenomena, and therefore the comparison allows scientists to set contexts and classifications of political phenomena, as well as build

general theories by testing hypotheses, and also predict possible outcomes, that is, ontological options. The field of comparative politics was preceded by methodological options, yet comparative politics was initially placed at the fore to study one country, meaning that the comparative analysis of politics was originally driven by the academic community of the United States seeking to explain the “other” from a self-interest point of view. Enlightened awareness and broadening the understanding of “the self” through comparison with “the other,” for example, Almond and Bingham Powell stated that the comparison “deepens our understanding of our institutions.” Insofar as it allows the revelation of a “broader set of political alternatives” and “virtues and shortcomings in our political life,” Almond formulates this more explicitly claiming that a comparative analysis of non-Western systems has led to an “extraordinary enrichment of the field” because the features characteristic of the West is most pronounced in primitive and non-Western contexts.

The postmodernism era stands with a clear difference with its predecessor (stage of modernity), in some respects it denies and challenges all previous patterns of knowledge and understanding, and claims that social facts are social constructs, as such, there can be no universal concept of good or bad, societies. The different political systems differ in terms of their values, everything, and the postmodern driving force has caused many differences in comparative politics as well as in the absence of some specific rules and global standards. It has become very difficult for a comparative researcher to draw any conclusions. Many scholars have felt powerless as theories such as modernity and relativity have opened up a box of Pandora's problems. But no solutions have ever been found, no serious research can be done in absolute relativity, and there are no criteria for comparison and evaluation, and gradually, the research reached an awareness of this imminent danger and sought to achieve a balance with a certain reference point, but at the same time abstaining. Regarding any prejudices and assumptions centered around intellectual and ethnic concentration (Singh & Sharma, 2019, p. 13).

Comparative politics is distinctive as a subfield in political science in that it is defined in terms of its method. Recognizing that methodology lies

close to the core of the field encourages us to re-define the challenge: to see it not as a threat but rather as an opportunity. Insofar as globalization promotes homogenization, it may in fact enhance the prospects for comparative political research. We make comparisons in large part because we cannot conduct experiments. Lacking control over "causal" variables, we instead attempt to control the selection of cases, matching them so as to capture the impact of explanatory variables while controlling for the impact of others that may be of less theoretical interest. In order to employ case selection as a means of causal inference, however, we need to make a key assumption: that the cases are, in fact, homogeneous, in the sense that the expected value of the dependent variable will be the same for each case, when the explanatory variable takes on a particular value. Viewed in this light, the growing homogeneity of the political systems about the globe can be seen as facilitating comparative inquiry and therefore strengthening, rather than weakening our field.

Comparative politics has always stood as a methodologically distinct discipline in political science, but it cannot be considered that research methods are an end in themselves. Realistic and cognitive challenges, in addition to the intensity of changes in the world, lead us to another point about comparative politics, which is the effects of new topics, whether in politics as reality or even in academic research. Therefore, the time has come to turn to fundamental issues, which are the phenomena that we seek to gain insight into or about which we seek real explanations. By doing so, we can begin to return to the topic of globalization. Almost all political economies have been integrated into the global economy and most of them are becoming more and more homogeneous, and the result is a tremendous increase in the possibility of exploring the various founding conditions. Recognizing that increased homogeneity offers methodological advantages encourages us to look beyond the use of such controlled comparisons and small-N case studies and to the greater use of statistical methods. When we do so we realize that we stand at the threshold of important new research (Bates, 1998, pp. 01-02). Another challenge facing the field is the issue of democracy. Many Latin American countries that have been ruled by authoritarian military regimes for years have adopted more democratic

forms of government. It seems that these democracies have become stable and permanent in many regimes despite the many economic and social challenges. The transitions in Eastern and Central Europe have been more dramatic as fragile democracies are created, even countries that were only formally democratic are trying to find ways to increase the involvement of their societies in policymaking.

Through these two examples alone, there will be significant disagreement on at least the marginal elements regarding globalization and democracy, but it is likely that there will be consensus regarding the inclusion of general concepts such as political culture, elites, leadership, power, coercion, political upbringing, political participation, mobilization, political integration, political development and concepts at the level of The system, such as aggregating demands and reactions to pressure, policymaking, political communication, and on a more specific level, party systems, electoral systems, military intervention in politics, types of bureaucracy, forms of opposition, forms of political ideologies and their effects. On the other hand, however, not all identifiable political trends in the world today are very homogeneous, one of these factors is the increase in transnational ethnicity and the expansion of the possibility of ethnic conflict, even if there is no overt ethnic conflict, there are tensions and political mobilization around ethnic issues, some of these Conflicts are the result of increased international migration as tensions arise due to population movement, and these ethnic tensions will require a rethinking of the way governments perform their tasks and deal with their internal tensions; The common homogeneous trends that affect many of the world's governments will make comparative politics more stable in the process of knowledge building, whether intellectually or methodically from an intellectual point of view. On the other hand, the common nature of these trends also makes comparison more difficult given the instability of the variables.

Comparative politics has a habitual interest in change, which greatly affects the course of its development. First, the comparative politics led by the United States reduces the "non-Western" to a subject of study and a source of comparable data sets. The field of comparative politics is

determined by comparing it with Western standards that are institutionalized through its homogeneity and generalization by the academic community in the United States, and it is defined by the variables, concepts and broad shifts in the curricula of the study of policy that have been developed by the academic community in the United States and applied in an experimental way to non-Western politics. Second, politics The US-led comparison reproduces the voices of those who view their evolutionary and modernist path, as it assumes that only rational and measurable neoliberal development discourse is meaningful in an attempt to achieve a certain level of equality and prosperity within the borders of the nation state. As a result, discourses have become The prevailing comparative politics is immersed in the domination and supposedly universal categories, and one of the more extreme examples An illustration of this is the idea of development (Kuteleva, pp. 93-94)

We study comparative politics because we want to develop convincing arguments explaining how and why politics works around the world. Testing hypotheses confronts a series of challenges. Doing comparative research is hard work, because evidence from the world is often unclear or subject to multiple interpretations, and because—in contrast to studying microbiology, physics or chemistry, for example—the objects of study in comparative politics change every day. Peaceful countries erupt into civil war; a dictatorship becomes a democracy; poor countries grow rich within a generation or two. All arguments in comparative politics are necessarily provisional, because research confronts the challenges of separating causation from correlation; identifying causation; and assessing the reliability of “data” not obtained in a lab.

Suppose that after systematically gathering information we discover that civil war is more likely in ethnically diverse societies. What we’ve uncovered is a correlation—a measure of observed association between two variables. However, this is not a complete explanation that is, a correlation between ethnic diversity and civil war does not allow us to say that the former causes the latter. We say that two variables “X and Y” are correlated when change in the value of X is accompanied by change in the value of Y. For example, “as ethnic diversity increases, so does the likelihood of civil

war.” Correlations can be positive—when one variable increases, so does the other—or negative, meaning that when one variable increases, the other decreases. The fact that attributes and outcomes appear to be associated with each other in a predictable way does not mean that one causes the other. Causation is defined as a process or event that produces an observable effect. Observing causation is often difficult.

We can illustrate the difficulty of identifying causation with an example from comparative politics. Even though we do observe a correlation between ethnic diversity and war (the greater the diversity, the higher the likelihood of war), we cannot just conclude that ethnic diversity causes civil war. Constructing a causal argument requires a systematic search for and comparison of relevant examples by marshaling as much reliable evidence as possible, an effort to rule out potential alternative causes, and the development of an explanation for why we observe a relationship between ethnic diversity and war. After all, more than one attribute could be correlated with a particular outcome. For example, suppose we find that both rough terrain and ethnic diversity are correlated with civil war. One attribute could be causally crucial, while the other could be irrelevant. It’s entirely possible that ethnic diversity and war have absolutely nothing to do with each other, even though they occur together frequently. This leads to many challenges facing comparative research (Samuels, 2013, p. 17).

To know whether ethnic diversity really does cause civil war or not, we’d have to develop a plausible argument linking diversity to bloodshed. The fact that a correlation exists raises a series of questions: How does diversity cause animosities? How do animosities cause group mobilization along ethnic lines? How does mobilization turn violent? The problem is that there is no necessary reason why diversity should always cause animosity, or why animosities should always cause mobilization, or why mobilization should always cause bloodshed. If we find a correlation between certain characteristics (such as ethnic diversity) and certain outcomes (such as war), we still need to explain how these things are causally connected—something that may ultimately rely more on logical argument than direct evidence. Confirming a relationship between cause and effect in the social

sciences is different from confirming such relationships in the natural sciences. In the natural sciences, researchers can conduct experiments in controlled, laboratory settings meaning they can fully isolate the causal impact of different attributes. Controlling all the conditions of an experiment is the only true way to isolate causality. Political scientists do not have the luxury of experimenting on or with people or events and in any case, trying to “control” the complexity of politics only makes the research less and less applicable to the real world. Because reasonable people interpret history differently, and because we cannot re-run history like scientists can redo experiments, it is often difficult to reliably compare across cases, much less control for all factors that might affect the outcome we seek to explain. And because political scientists cannot replicate the real world in a lab to test our theories, arguments about causality in the social sciences must rest on scholars’ ability to accumulate evidence and construct a convincing argument that logically holds together.

Causal explanations in comparative politics are hard to pin down, partly because the information we gather as social scientists is fundamentally different from the data that natural scientists produce in a laboratory setting. Social scientists cannot “control” or “isolate” factors to determine causality as chemists might be able to in a lab, nor can they conduct additional experiments to obtain more data. Social scientists have to make do with the information that the world provides—we cannot turn back time, change some social or political attribute and “rewind” the world to see if the outcome would differ. Sometimes, the real world offers very few examples of either the attributes or the outcomes we’re interested in exploring. In addition, information can frequently be ambiguous or even downright confusing. For example, if scholars want to test the relationship between ethnic diversity and civil war, they have to agree on how to define “ethnicity,” “diversity,” and “civil war,” which is not easy. Then, they have to agree on how to measure those concepts, which is even harder. And even if they agree on all of the above, they may find the historical record ambiguous in terms of membership in ethnic groups and the intensity of violence in particular countries.

So, even if scholars agree on definitions and the historical record is

clear, the information needed to test a hypothesis might be difficult or even impossible to obtain. Information on such subjects as corruption, campaign finance, and lobbying activities are often unavailable to researchers. Interviewees are frequently unwilling to speak on sensitive issues such as religion, ethnic prejudice, or gender attitudes; and useful information is sometimes locked away in government archives. Some countries simply prohibit access to social scientists. And even if information is readily available, obtaining it may require months or years of work in the field, and years of preparation to learn a new language. In comparative politics, articulating convincing answers to questions is always difficult and often contentious. The challenges noted in this section make comparing and contrasting across cases difficult—meaning that arguments in comparative politics are never perfect, and never final. The world is a very complicated and rapidly changing place, and sometimes our answers prove unsatisfying. Yet, this does not mean that we simply shrug our shoulders and give up. An unsatisfying answer sparks additional questions, giving scholars reason to go “back to the drawing board” and continue the search for a better answer. And in any case, as we will see in later chapters, in many cases the comparative method succeeds, providing useful answers to questions about our complicated and messy world (Samuels, pp. 18-19).

These important gains in methodological self-consciousness have produced (or been produced by) some diminution in the “class warfare” between quantitative and qualitative political scientists. There is still some sniping going on and some of the former persist in asserting their intrinsic “scientific” superiority over the latter, but there is more and more agreement that many of the problems of design and inference are common to both and that the choice between the two should depend more on what it is the one wishes to explain or interpret than on the intrinsic superiority of one over the other – or, worse, how one happens to have been trained as a graduate student. Indeed, from my recent experience in two highly cosmopolitan institutions, the European University Institute in Florence and the Central European University in Budapest, I have encountered an increasing number of dissertations in comparative politics that make calculated and intelligent use of both

methods – frequently with an initial large N comparison wielding relatively simple quantitative indicators to establish the broad parameters of association, followed by a small N analysis of carefully selected cases with sets of qualitative variables to search for specific sequences and complex interactions to demonstrate causality.

The real challenge currently facing comparative politics, however, comes from a third alternative, namely, “formal modeling” based on rational choice assumptions. Much of this stems from a strong desire on the part of American political scientists to imitate what they consider to be the “success” of the economics profession in acquiring greater status within academe by driving out of its ranks a wide range of dissident approaches and establishing a foundation of theoretical (neoliberalism) and methodological (mathematical modeling) orthodoxy upon which their research is based. This path toward the future would diverge both methodologically and substantively from the previously competing quantitative and qualitative ones. It would involve the acceptance of a much stronger set of limiting initial assumptions, exclusive reliance on the rational calculations of individual actors to provide “micro-foundations,” deductive presumptions about the nature of their interactions and reliance on either “stylized facts” or “mathematical proofs” to demonstrate the correctness of initial assumptions and hypotheses derived from them. The comparative dimension enters into the equations to prove that individual behavior is invariant across units or, where it is not, that institutions (previously chosen rationally) can make a difference (Schmitter, pp. 35-36).

Causality is a complex problem in comparative politics when dealing with known outcomes, where the difficulties of ensuring that all relevant variables are monitored, that differences are identified, and that causation is established are known. Another method is called the scenario approach that seeks to “re-read” the causal process not from one but from a set of imagined results. The complexity of analytical assumptions means that even identifying potential changes in the actions of key variables provides little useful insight regarding their causal effect. In the sense that any large scenario will result from any action, in some cases these narratives contain

a degree of imagined detail that although they are understood as a tool for developing strategic responses in an easy scenario planning process, they include a level of insight that is not justified by the methodology used. The declared predictors of the Cold War years of "thinking about the unimaginable" and blinded them to the possibilities of radical change that actually occurred in 1991, the scenarios themselves have a model that impedes our view of possible future decades.

The future of comparative politics is important for the future of the discipline of political science, but comparative analysis faces an increasing number of challenges. Some of these challenges are intellectual and are concerned with the relationship of theories and methods to the "realities" of national and sub-national politics. The future of the field as a profitable business. There are a number of investment decisions that must be taken. Is it better to invest our scarce academic resources in traditional studies for a single case study or a limited number of cases? Or should our capital be used for more comprehensive, direct and possibly quantitative studies? We need to do both, but which is the best combination? The answer to this question will depend in part on what we think the goals of the comparison should be - to find important similarities in political behavior or an accurate description of individual political systems.

3. Political Phenomena: Complexity and Problems

The challenges to comparative politics also reflect changes in the real world of government and politics. There are significant changes in politics that require rethinking our theories and even our facts. The fall of communism and the attempts at democratic consolidation in Central and Eastern Europe have opened a whole new locale for research. Likewise the development of regional bodies such the European Union, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and ASEAN raise important questions about the relationship of comparative politics and international relations. The linkage between international politics and comparative politics may be strengthened further by the increasing importance of the global marketplace for national economies, with the subsequent argument that governments can no longer govern in the ways to which they had been accustomed for decades (Guy, 1998, p. 214).

The cosmopolitan tendency, the doubts of classical modes of interpretation and the necessity to include history again have led the comparative researcher to renew his approach without there being any possibility to rely on a statement about the renewed comparative tendency. In fact, the latter seeks to build itself through its association with the new paradigms of political science. The new discovery of cultural analysis and the reconstruction of the sociology of action from the emergence of strategic analysis; This intersecting contribution leads to a redefinition of the intent of the comparative method to a more procedural formalization of its endeavor (Badie & Hermet, 2001, p. 60). Theda Skocpol, which is involved in the process of comparative innovation and questions the direction of modern work in this context, has developed correspondences between three trends within modern comparative research, namely: applying a general model to history, searching for causal symmetries, and adopting a historical and interpretive sociology (Badie & Hermet, p. 93).

Comparative politics also reflects the general change in the knowledge structure in general. Under the influence of the economic and intellectual revival of formerly colonized societies, new areas of academic inquiry that focus on examining the contestation and interconnection between Western and non-Western started to develop within the field of Comparative Politics. This challenges Eurocentrism, Western centrism, and other modes of parochialism of mainstream US-led Comparative Politics and encourages scholars to question traditional canons of research and the routinely accepted or sometimes enforced boundaries of the field. While mainstream comparativists seek to offer a better way to study politics within existing epistemological frameworks, post-structural scholars strive for transforming the way the field of Comparative Politics is constituted by calling into question the underlying analytical and conceptual systems that frame comparison. Post-structural turn in Comparative Politics gave rise to critical race and identity studies, “third wave feminism”, post-colonial and post-development approaches. This extremely diverse and heterogeneous studies embraces constructivist ontological perspective and emphasizes the constitutive power and intrinsic forces of ideas and pays close attention to inter subjective meanings and knowledge structures that delineate and

imbue political environment.

For example, for Michel Foucault political processes, institutions, and actors are constructed through dominant discourses that are broadly understood not only in terms of language and ideas but also in terms of practices representing by language and ideas. In his own works, Foucault explores the interplay of discourses and practices, examining how particular social phenomena — mental illnesses and medicine, human science, penal system — are colonized and regulated by hierarchical structures. Foucault's "archaeological method" encourages a philosophical-historical analysis that breaks through the structures of power. Similarly, Jacques Derrida's methodology of socio-linguistic deconstruction and Jean-François Lyotard's "skepticism of metanarratives" inspire many scholars of Comparative Politics to reject formal and rationalist approaches to politics (Kuteleva, pp. 98-99).

Science and its critics of science came to be the way through which societies cross from the shore of imagination to the bank of application and realism in order to build a real reality committed to the preoccupations and interests of those societies, and political studies including comparative politics, did not delay the use of methods and approaches of science and even attempts to benefit from Critical frameworks for social sciences in order to better understand political phenomena and adapt what can be adapted so that politics becomes in service of society, and when it succeeds in doing so, comparative political scientists assume through their research and studies that they live in a world of the kind that they studied and understand its problems and will protect it from the risks that It can fall by developing approaches and theories in order to help them predict most of what is happening in this political world and the world of politics as a whole.

Philippe Schmitter's critical reflections are part of a long tradition in comparative politics, that is, specifying the pragmatics of the subfield and the kinds of issues and problematiques that serve as the meta-basis of comparative analysis, be it single, multiple or large N studies. As he highlights, comparative politics has family ties to sociology, anthropology, history, political theory, and economics. Each of the family ties come, in

many respects, with their own logics. A central problematic of comparative political analysis is how effectively it has subsumed these logics into an encompassing comparative pragmatics. Schmitter has articulated what I am defining as a none “neo-positivist” view. Similar to the neo-positivist view, Schmitter believes that comparative inquiry is about method. However, the method is an analytical one rather than a constitutive logic that can generate universal proposition and empirical falsification criteria (The thesis of theoretical falsification as put forward by Karl Popper). In Schmitter’s view, comparison is an analytical method—probably the best available one—for advancing valid and cumulative knowledge about politics. The analytical comparative method, however, is different from past attempts to identify a distinct epistemic logic to comparative politics. Instead it comes closer to the ontology of politics and that is the study of power by identifying and labeling general relations of power and then examining how they produce variable or invariable effects in otherwise different societies. Obviously, this entails the study of institutions, individual-level dynamics, aggregative dynamics, and complexity. Thus, an analytical method does not lead to the type of general scientific propositions and falsification principles that the neo-positivists sought.

Thus, the discussion between cross-national generalizations and area (case) studies is no longer about multicausality, complexity, and endogeneity. There is a consensus that these elements are central to comparative politics. They are challenges to inferences in studies that focus only on a few cases or in large N studies. The same is true for complexity. The recognition that complexity is inherent to comparative politics accounts for the emergence of mixed methods. In addition to the importance of mixed methods in most research designs of comparative analysis, be they large N or case studies, there is growing emphasis on causal empiricism in comparative politics. Confidence in the external validity of average effects in large N studies has been called into question. That “causal empiricism is an approach that is realistic about the specificity of the causal estimates that we can obtain. This is an implication of the fact that causal identification is difficult to obtain.” The fact causal identification is something difficult to obtain forces comparative politics back to more localized context. In other

words, it brings it back to area (case) studies (Woods, 2016, pp. 420-421).

But in contrast, due to miscalculations in many comparative policy studies, researchers found that they succeeded in reality only in constructing and visualizing facts and phenomena, in general, a world imagined only in their minds, and they committed what they should have avoided and committed the same mistakes of political thinkers, but this time under the pretext of errors of theories and bad He used scientific methods, in fact, they made science a function in the service of science itself. This is the direct reason that they are always surprised by events and facts that they never imagined would happen. They thought and believed that they study a phenomenon and a political world as it exists in its structures and the behavior of its states, systems and societies, but in fact they were studying and modeling according to what produced their own experiences and experiences of their own environment or even what produced by their pure research methods, this is how comparative political scholars found themselves in many of their studies The results are more far from logic, especially in light of their refusal to acknowledge those methodological and cognitive errors, but this did not prevent the existence of many serious attempts to make comparative politics a real science and at the same time a science that is in the service of community issues.

Science must be relevant to society, that is, science must be humanized so that the matter does not escape from the researchers' hands, and their research, instead of removing the ambiguity of the phenomenon, increases its complexity, in this case the researcher becomes blind and does not see except according to what his research and scientific frameworks dictate. On the contrary, the theory has only existed to subject it to experimentation and continuous testing, and to work to deny it is more than to work to prove its credibility, whenever scientists are skeptical and in an ever-critical epistemological position whenever this provides an opportunity for the advancement of comparative politics because falling into the sin of certainty and peremptory will inevitably overthrow all the foundations and justifications of knowledge. On which this field is based, this is the real and actual reason for the development and progress of the field of comparative politics and other subfields in political science in an irregular or planned

way instead of the cumulative and continuous line of knowledge and science that will kill the spirit of cognitive renewal. Hence, the slow death of major. The question of whether comparative politics is able to overcome these problems is an open and controversial issue, but the most important step is the recognition of the existence of such problems and deficiencies, as Bachelard pointed out that science does not progress except through correcting errors, the existence of errors is never a systematic or epistemological flaw. It is always good and useful to determine what the researcher does not know before he decides to decide on what level of certainty are the results of his research and studies. These scientific problems are very difficult, but if they are not confronted, the risk will be dangerous if comparative political scientists ignore them and insist on research methods and mechanisms instead of His standardization, or they insist on the predictive value of their theories without canceling the specificity of the political phenomena being compared.

And if comparative political scientists do this, then the matter of researchers in this field will turn into a model of knowledge or a cognitive group alien to the origins of scientific knowledge and the pattern of its natural development and progress, a group that imagines a world that does not exist except in their minds, they look at it and measure it and spend in it effort and time and predict what is not possible Predicting, a world that exists only on the pages of their research and their dry quantitative figures far from any standard of the behavior of the political phenomenon that will not be separated from it as long as the human being is the main source of that behavior, thus they produce a scientific and intellectual field bound by the methodological conditions that they imposed on themselves instead of being a field Intellectually progressive, they produce knowledge about an unrealistic imagined world and who made their research and knowledge methodology ... Maybe they are right, because the world in reality is only a reflection of what the average person wants and conceives, so what is the case with a researcher who makes what he wants from the concepts and what he is looking for in the structures, methodology and methods Scientific not underestimated in its ability to form political phenomena exactly as desired and in the smallest detail.

Data confirm many of the findings in comparativists showed that the overwhelming majority of studies published were both qualitative and empirical, and most lacked any explicit theoretical framework. Furthermore, that far less than a majority of pieces articulated any explicit hypotheses. The cumulative effect of all this is to beg the question: Should all but a few of the studies be characterized as "social science" at all? This is not meant to disparage the work in question but instead to point to the "curious disjuncture between the rising methodological demands we make of our graduate students and the underlying descriptive nature of much of comparative politics. No one is suggesting that one particular research method is more scientific than another. Instead the majority of work in our data set does not attempt to make any causal inferences, be they quantitative or qualitative, but instead is largely descriptive.

Also, there is no suggestion regarding saying that one method of research is more scientific than others. Instead, the majority of work in comparative political studies does not attempt to make any causal inferences, whether quantitative or qualitative, but rather they are largely descriptive. There is agreement with the views of some scholars on the study of Munck and Snyder (Gerardo & Snyder, 2007, pp. 05-31), when they note that the result of this breakthrough is that comparative politics is a field that regularly claims to be social science but practices something completely different, and although this view is not totally rejected, the claim that the search for causal inferences is absent. It deserves to be called "science," or its applicability remains limited. Nevertheless, there is amazement at the enormous amount of work that at best makes merely descriptive conclusions and at worst a little more than description, so research must be done on why this exists. The flaw, and for the debate about whether the lack of "purely scientific" research represents a weakness (or indeed a strength), not only in comparative analysis from a methodological standpoint, but also in comparative policy areas as a whole (Abbott & Fahey, 2014, p. 131).

4. Intersection Points

Since 1990th, comparative politics takes stock and focuses in particular on developments, a period that might be characterized, along the lines of the behavioral revolution of the mid-1940s to mid-1960s, as a second scientific revolution. There are four distinct products of research: concepts and conceptual systems, theories and theoretical system, descriptions, and explanations. And, in each case, draws attention to the strengths and weaknesses of current practices and the state of knowledge, as well as opportunities and challenges for future research. Thus, it presents a comprehensive evaluation of research on comparative politics, identifying areas where progress has been made as well as the limits of current knowledge, and offering various pointers to orient future research.

It is important that the role of synthesis is not slighted. Though some efforts at synthesis have been made, as identified in the text, comparativist by and large place a greater emphasis on analysis. Normative theory is distinguished from positive theory, theory from empirics, description from explanation, statics from dynamics, micro from macro, and so on. All these distinctions are based on important criteria. And the specialization of research, focused on these different aspects of knowledge, has allowed for important advances in knowledge. But it has also led to a growing problem: the lack of attention to relationships among all these aspects of knowledge and the creation of lots of bits and pieces of knowledge that never quite add up. Thus, comparativists should balance the urge to separate with a deliberately consideration of how distinct parts relate to each other and can be integrated. In short, it is critical that comparativists recognize that the study of politics calls for both analysis and synthesis. a related suggestion is that it is critical that comparativists not disregard the research-praxis nexus. Since 1989, comparativists have made great gains in terms of professionalism and knowledge about methods. These are hugely positive features that should be fully acknowledged and rewarded. But these gains have been somewhat one sided. Indeed, with only a few exceptions, the level of professionalism of comparativists is rarely matched by their level of passion for learning, and the level of methodological knowledge of comparativists

is rarely matched by their substantive knowledge. Thus, comparativists should balance their inward look toward the profession with an outward look toward society. Asking ourselves if the results of our research is of any importance outside of the walls of academia and consciously seeking to break out of the walls of academia can have a very salutary effect. Not only can it bring focus to ones research by clarifying the distinction between the important and the trivial and can be a determining factor in keeping one's passion for knowledge alive. In addition, considering ones research from the perspective of a potential end user outside the walls of academic is probably the quicker, surest way to break down the walls that specialists and camps set up within academic and restore substantive knowledge to its rightful place. Indeed, comparativists would do well to give greater attention than they have to the research praxis nexus (Gerardo, *Comparative Politics: Taking Stock and Looking Forward*, pp. 24-25).

Comparative politics will also never become a true science because political scientists have their own human passions and positions regarding the various debates they study. A biologist might become determined to gain fame or fortune by proving a particular theory, even if laboratory tests don't support it. Biologists, however, neither become normatively committed to finding particular research results nor ask particular questions because of their normative beliefs. Political scientists, however, do act on their normative concerns, and that is entirely justifiable. Normative theories affect political science because our field is the study of people. Our normative positions often influence the very questions we ask. These normative positions do not mean that the evidence can or should be ignored. Good scientists can approach a subject like this with a set of moral concerns but recognize the results of careful empirical research nonetheless, and change their arguments and conclusions in light of the new evidence.

Where does this leave the field of comparative politics? The best comparativists are aware of their own biases but still use various methods to generate the most systematic evidence possible to come to logical conclusions. We approach the subject with our normative concerns, our own ideas about what a "good society" should be, and what role government

should have in it. We try to do research on interesting questions as scientifically and systematically as possible to develop the best evidence we can to provide a solid basis for government policy. Because we care passionately about the issues, we ought to study them as rigorously as possible, and we should be ready to change our normative positions and empirical conclusions based on the evidence we find (Orvis & Carol Ann , 2018, pp. 53-54).

5. Comparative Politics: To Where?

There is a general consensus that Comparative Politics emerged largely as the result of a parochial focus on Western versions of modernity. The early development of Comparative Politics owed much to the efforts of US academia and was profoundly influenced by the ethnocentric biases and political values of US scholars. Mainstream US-led Comparative Politics is focused on problem solving theorizing, and thus is not capable of overcoming its own ethnocentrism and moving far beyond the study of foreign countries. Nevertheless, comparison as an analytical perspective is a comprehensive and powerful tool of analysis and is always open to new approaches. This represents the key strength of Comparative Politics as a field of inquiry. Comparative Politics has undergone important theoretical and normative transformations in recent decades, and its scope has been widening through the introduction of new approaches. I contend that the most promising path forward for Comparative Politics is the dialogue between problem-solving and critical theorizing (Kuteleva, p. 100), Comparative politics should be a central concern of political science. For most research in the discipline there is little or no opportunity for experimentation-citizens are not likely to submit to very much experimentation on matters as crucial as the selection and management of their governments. Even were more experimentation possible for political situations, it is not at all clear that the results would be as beneficial for comparative political research as they might be for other parts of the discipline. Comparative scholars generally can be more productive when attempting to understand political behaviour within its natural context than when trying to analyse it in the artificial settings characteristic of social experimentation (Guy, p. 212).

There are no magic solutions to solve most of the problems in comparative politics. Most comparative research involves a series of trade-offs and difficult decisions. If a project maximizes internal validity then it is almost certain to sacrifice external validity. If a project is able to find important similarities in a range of national experiences then it is less likely to be able to make any definitive points about the individual cases. The fundamental point of these warnings therefore remains that the researcher must be aware of the choices he or she faces, and also be cognizant of the implications of those choices. The trade-offs cannot be avoided; they can only be better understood so that wise choices can be made (Guy, p. 214). It is also a fact that our sophistication in the philosophy of science is such that no matter what approach is being used there always seems to be a gap between what political scientists aspire to as the ideal in methodology and what we end up with as standard practices. The more ambitious our aspirations for the discipline as a science the more frustrated and disappointed we become. Skepticism is so easy to come by questioned whether “a science of comparative politics is possible?”, the argues that any grand, abstract generalization such as those basic to any science is not possible when it comes to the diverse complexities of political systems and cultures. The difficulties in coming up with abstract generalizations that are truly illuminating and not trite truisms has broadened the appeal of work that focuses on the concrete and the specific. The result has been a revival of respect for descriptive analysis—what scholars has called “thick description”—and the practice of comparative histories or “analytic narratives”. The problem of the distinctive and specific also arises in trying to use sample survey questionnaires in different cultural contexts. The cultural contexts can change the meaning of the questions (Goodin & Tilly, 2006, p. 803).

The combination of these problems has given rise to the call for contextualization in all forms of comparative analysis. If the goal is to compare total systems then the historical context of each must be respected and analyzed. If the approach calls for the use of surveys, then attention must be given to the cultural and linguistic contexts that will give different meanings to the questions being posed. The concerns of contextualization

are such as to pull the discipline towards greater respect for what is distinctive and specific and away from broad generalizations. There is now a need to show respect for what was not long ago dismissed as “mere description.” Fortunately the vineyard that political scientists work in is very large, and thus there is space for people to follow all manner of methodological approaches and substantive focuses for their studies. We need to respect diversity and to recognize that different scholars have different talents, and hence will be comfortable in employing different approaches and in seeking answers to different questions (Goodin & Tilly, p. 804).

Many criticized this optimistic view of the ‘new’ comparative politics, yet now, more than ever, the global collection of meaningful data is possible. The tremendous advance in information and communication technologies (ICTs), have made the production, collection, and analysis of global data much easier than in the past. On-line data availability has made large-scale comparative analysis so much easier as has the increase in processing power of computers. But the increase in data availability has also led to a new demand for accountability and replicability in the field, since data sets that provide the evidence base for journal articles and research monographs can (and should) be shared between and among scholars. The demand for sharing, replication, and accountability means that scholars need to develop more systematic ways of collecting, documenting, and diffusing data. Scholars need to explain the sources, coding, problems, and potential areas for error in their data collection efforts. These need to be fully documented in the accompanying codebooks. Moreover, the field, and political science more generally, needs to develop an ethos of replication and data-sharing. Once data have been collected, documented, and analysed, scholars should make them available through the direct or indirect means mentioned above. Replicating and performing secondary analysis on published articles and books provides corroboration, incremental advancement in knowledge, and an excellent way to teach future generations of comparativists. Overall, technology now allows to a greater extent than ever before the development of a networked comparative research community (Landman, 2008, pp. 303-304).

Thus, the presumptuous claim that there should be a more logical and coherent definition of the field of comparative politics has resulted in a proposal for pragmatic reform rather than in a demand for a thorough revolution. All that is hoped for is that the subject, by its alliance with political analysis and its use of concepts as a structural base, might undertake three tasks more successfully: it might thus broaden the student's imaginative range concerning politics; it might increase his capacity for understanding - and formulating - political explanation, via the descriptive, classificatory and generalizing stages of the scientific process; and it might provide him with an improved idea of the relationship of comparative politics to other subject-areas in political science. So, the claim that comparative politics is 'nothing' is disproved; the counter-claim that it is 'everything' is amended: comparative politics is the indispensable foundation for all the other elements of the discipline of political science (Goodin & Tilly, p. 803).

6. CONCLUSION

Thus, we see that one of the greatest contributions of comparative politics lies in raising the value of methodological and topics pluralism, the plurality of methods in which politics operates, and the diversity of alternatives in the world. There is no doubt that the field is mired in a certain cognitive chaos due to the continuous discussions, but this cannot be caught. its future, there are new developments that are gradually unfolding and thus enhancing the field's opportunity to develop, and through the transformation to the reflexive and creative, openness and criticism, scholars and researchers in this field constantly strive to expand our knowledge horizons on the one hand and get to know the political world in its various forms on the other hand. The "conscious thinker" in comparative politics must realize the limits of the comparative method, but he must also realize its potential and make use of it.

- The future of comparative politics, even with a positive outlook, remains in doubt. This field is currently facing a crossroads that determine its nature and role. In this regard, it must be recalled that it must avoid the alternative of continuing to issue one cognitive or methodological aspects with one research logic and with one ontological approach as well. That the

research in this field currently adopts the logic of cognitive complexity in order to escape the risk of slipping into the fluidity of knowledge, and accordingly, the choice of curricula and topics must be modified accordingly without the need to pretend to present a new model or paradigm or a new method, because the natural sciences did not develop through the marginalizing of paradigms of some of them. Rather, it developed with the logic of cognitive accumulation based on continuously improving paradigm performance.

- The structure and trends of comparative politics today are not entirely those previous trends, neither in terms of the method nor from the study of the political reality or the interest in the issues and problems of society. These cognitive trends have established completely different standards regarding political knowledge in general that are currently meaningful.

- Comparative politics is less interested in studying comprehensive theories such as “development” or “modernization,” the same is the case when economics has become studying “the market” instead of examining and comparing a variety of markets, and instead of focusing only on “development” or “modernization” in By themselves, as rigid political patterns that have one regularity. Comparative political studies have become more interested in studying change in certain countries or using concepts such as development or modernization in context-sensitive ways, that is, within their own environment rather than through macro projections, and this is in order to compare change in different countries.

- Future trends in this field will also be less preoccupied with mastering research methods or following it closely in order to build specific knowledge, because in the end it is known that knowledge as knowledge has no interest, by contrast, all knowledge is linked to certain values, so the new approaches to comparative politics will not be specific. Instead, this field will encourage scholars to make use of a wide range of methods from a variety of theoretical perspectives, as well as to combine theory and experimental work in different and cognitively creative ways, all in a dialogue with different effective and not dominant paradigms.

- Political research will be driven by the fundamental problems and

questions of the nature of political phenomena as the essence, and will not be motivated by the method of research or attempts to reveal the typicality of these phenomena.

- New methods will depend on problem-driven and context-sensitive approaches, and comparative policy areas will be open to allow for systematic pluralism and diversity of approaches, and it will be up to researchers to decide which methods will be used as well as methods to address those problems, and new approaches will not adopt their own standards or rely only on alien heads or methods. Isolated research, and there will be no removal of local contexts, because comparative politics is currently tending to be established as a field of knowledge in which researchers from all societies participate. At the same time, you are aware of the risks associated with the open field, as the characteristic of science development is based on certain patterns and not open patterns at all.

- Comparative politics will retain its ability to overcome critical stages of development as it happened before, and yet it will be less interested than the old in Serving certain political purposes with the aim of cognitive building, and the dream of scientific excellence will be abandoned and moved further More towards the achievement of goals aimed at producing socially beneficial knowledge, objective knowledge, independent of political goals and largely concerned with resolving issues of concern to society and the decision maker.

- Comparative politics should not seek to emulate the techniques of the natural sciences, because in such a case of simulation political studies will always fail to explain, as they are seen as incomplete and unable to produce knowledge based on tested theories that can prove the prediction of the phenomena that You study them.

- Comparativists must accept that they are better prepared to produce a different type of knowledge and not necessarily be characterized by scientific superiority, that this different knowledge cannot be taught its techniques in advance, and it is knowledge devoid of prejudices mainly represented in The pursuit of claims of scientific knowledge, and this knowledge can work to build perceptions and concepts of change in ways and methods that are more acceptable.

In addition to many strengths and weaknesses of different comparative methods, there are many new developments in this field that will continue to improve its ability to make strong conclusions about the political world, and these important issues include data collection and analysis as well as going beyond traditional boundaries in research, and developing analytical programs. New and new comparative techniques are less exclusive, and all of these developments are directly related to all the issues raised by comparative politics today.

7. Bibliography List :

- Abbott, Jason., & Fahey, K. (2014). The State and Direction of Asian Comparative Politics: Who, What, Where, How? *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 14. pp 109-134.
- Badie, Bertrand., & Hermet, G. (2001). *la politique comparée*. France, Armand Colin.
- Bates, Robert. (1998). The Future in Comparative Politics . *Journal Chinese Political Science*, 04(02), pp 01-17.
- Coman, Ramona., & Morin, Jean-Frédéric. (2019). *political science in motion*. Bruxelles, Belgique: Ed de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Gerardo, Munck., & Snyder, Richard. (2007, January). Debating the Direction of Comparative Politics: An Analysis of Leading Journals. *Comparative Political Studies*, 40(01), pp.05-31.
- Goodin, Robert., & Tilly, Charles. (2006). *The Oxford Handbooks of contextual political analysis*. United States of America: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Guy, Peter. (1998). *Comparative Politics: Theory and Methods*. London, Uk: Macmillan Press LTD.
- Kuteleva, Av. (2015). A Critical Survey of the Field of Comparative Politics. *RUDN University Journal*, 04, pp 85-107.
- Landman, Todd. (2008). *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction* (3 ed.). United States of America: Routledge.
- Munck, Gerard. (2009). *Comparative Politics : Taking Stock and Looking Forward*. University of Aarhus, Denmark: Working paper were presented earlier at the Department of Political Science.
- Orvis, Stephen., & Carol Ann , D. (2018). *Introducing comparative politics: concepts and cases in context* (4 ed.). Los Angeles, United States of America: CQ Press.

- Samuels, David. (2013). *Comparative politics*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Schmitter, Philippe. (n.d.). The nature and future of comparative politics. *European Political Science Review*, 01(01). pp 33-61.
- Singh, Pushpa., & Sharma, Chetna. (2019). *Comparative Government and Politics*. United states of America: SAGE Publications.
- Woods, Dwayne. (2016, September). The Future of Comparative Politics is its Past. *Chinese Political Science Review*, 01(03), pp 412-424.