

The was superior
nature of presidential
rule.

Business



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The idea that brings both the large-N design and case studies together is the practice of small-N studies. Small-N analysis examines a small number of cases in depth, which are all selectively handpicked. One of the main strengths of these types of studies are that they are “ specified, complex models that are sensitive to variations by time and place.” (Coppedge, 1999). “ Perils of Presidentialism” (Linz, 1990) is an example of small-N analysis.

Linz considers the consequence that presidential and parliamentary government types have on states’ democratic ability. Linz’s research was carried out through selected cases (countries) from Western Europe (e. g. Italy, Spain and France), Latin America (such as Chile, Argentina and Brazil) and North America. His hypothesis was based on proving if the nature of parliamentary rule was superior nature of presidential rule. Small-N analysis enabled him to intentionally select case studies that had alike characteristics to aid specific hypothesis testing. The Comparative Method (Collier, 1993) argues that small-N designs such as Linz’s enable the intensive analysis of a few cases with less energy expenditure, financial resources and time. This means that analysis can be more rigorous in small-N studies, unlike statistical analysis in large-N studies.

Small-N studies also save time and resources, as collecting mass data can be extremely difficult due to the size of the study. A benefit of utilising small-N instead of large-N is that the studies can be operationalised at a lower level and consequently the results are likely to be valid as the concepts chosen are being accurately measured. Small-N scientists are critical of the case study method as they believe that patterns must come from theory or

observation which is “ validated by intimate knowledge of the detail, nuance, and history of the small number of cases” (Paul et al.

2013). However, once the number of cases expands, analysts can no longer “ hold all the cases in their head” and the information is too large to be compared holistically and qualitatively without expecting a margin of error. Lijphart argues that this is because small-N analyses can focus on “ comparable cases” that are matched on many variables that are not central to the study. This means that they can effectively ‘control’ these variables. They can then choose countries, which differ in terms of key variables that are the focus of the study, which allows a more reliable assessment of their influence. Yet, small-N analysis has various weaknesses, which make it inferior to its large-N counterpart. Goggin (1986) comments on the nature of small-N analysis, as there are many variables yet a small number of cases.

Therefore, it is more efficient to study more countries and consequently conduct a large-N study instead. Kerlinger (1973) argues that the ideal research design must answer the research question, introduce the element of control for extraneous independent variables and permit the investigator to generalize from their findings. Small-N studies are incapable of fulfilling these criteria. However, Prezworski et.

al in *Democracy and Development* (2000) studies 150 countries over 40 years to achieve a similar objective to Linz. Conversely, unlike Linz’s analysis, this study complies with Kerlinger’s ideal research design as it allows generalisation due to the increased scale of the project and

randomisation of casestudies which conveys the superiority of large-N analysis.