

Introduction to Comparative Politics – POL 1060

Spring 2021, January 11 – April 27
University of Cincinnati, Department of Political Science
Synchronous online course
Monday / Wednesday / Friday, 10:10 – 11:05

Instructor: Dr. Andrew A. Szarejko (szarejaa@ucmail.uc.edu)
Office Hours: Wednesday and Friday, 3:30 – 4:30, and by appointment

Course Description & Learning Objectives

This course provides an introduction to the comparative study of political institutions and political behavior in countries around the world. We will focus on “doing” Comparative Politics—using theories to help explain individual cases and using cases to refine our theories of behavior. In the introduction to this course, we will discuss the nature of Political Science and its subfield of Comparative Politics—what makes this a distinct domain of inquiry, and how can we best study it? We will then explore key concepts and theories in Comparative Politics such as the relationship between ideology and action, the articulation of political interests, and group decision-making. We will then use those concepts to help us understand past and present developments in a variety of political settings. We will conclude with a discussion of contemporary debates and emerging themes in Comparative Politics.

Requirements

Attendance & Participation

Due to COVID-19, this course will be conducted online and synchronously. That is, we *will* have mandatory live meetings, and these will be conducted via Microsoft Teams. These will mostly take the form of lectures, but we will also have some discussion-based sessions and some guest talks. My lectures will make use of PowerPoint slides, and I will post the slides on Canvas. I will also record lectures and post them on Canvas. Unless you are asking or responding to a question, you should generally keep your microphone muted during lectures, and you are not required to turn your camera on during lectures. I would encourage it—it’s easier to “read the room” that way—but you will not be penalized for keeping your camera off. I will divide you into assigned groups for some discussions, and I would likewise encourage (but not require) you to turn your cameras on for those interactions. Toward the end of the class, I will ask you to anonymously assess your own participation as well as the participation of others in your group; these assessments may inform the participation grade you receive, but they will not be binding.

Please notify me as soon as possible if any documented medical, family/personal, or religious exceptions are likely to interfere with your regular participation in the course. Emergencies may not allow you time to email in advance; in such cases, just notify me as soon as possible via email. I hope that you all stay well this semester, and I will try to be flexible as exigencies arise.

Attending online class sessions is a necessary but insufficient condition for a high participation grade. Because this course will be conducted synchronously, you will have the opportunity to

engage in in-class discussion that I will use to assess participation. Good participation in this course will thus entail regular attendance as well as making contributions to lectures and group discussions that provide evidence of having done the readings and having paid attention to lectures. It is not the quantity but the quality of your contributions to that will shape your participation grade.

Note that lectures and other class materials should not be disseminated to anyone outside the class.

Readings

I have divided the class into weeks, and each week includes assigned readings. While I will discuss all required materials at least briefly in lectures, the readings and lectures are meant to complement each other. You should complete the assigned readings by Monday of each week, and I highly recommend completing the material in the order it is presented in the syllabus. I will make all materials freely available online through Canvas and/or through a link on the syllabus. Please note that I reserve the right to change any of the readings or assignments listed below, but I will communicate any such changes in advance. If you have any trouble accessing any required or optional materials, please let me know.

Good participation and paper grades alike will require you to have a strong comprehension of the material covered in both the readings and the lectures. I have tried to keep the reading load manageable while also covering essential material. In some cases, I have assigned blog posts or similarly public-facing pieces instead of journal articles to ensure we can cover an appropriate range of material without over-burdening you. I do assign many journal articles, however, and the methods some scholars use may be unfamiliar to you. I will discuss methods used in Comparative Politics in the first week of the course, but you don't need to understand every methodological choice that appears in the readings—you should focus on identifying the core argument of any given piece. If, however, unfamiliarity with methods impedes your understanding of a piece, please feel free to raise the issue in class or in office hours.

In addition to the specific assigned reading for the class, you should be reading the international affairs section of a major national newspaper, such as the *New York Times* or the *Washington Post*, on a daily basis. We will spend much of this course examining governments other than those of the United States, and familiarity with ongoing developments abroad will be useful in approaching the subject.

Book/Article Review

The core assignment in this class is a written review of a peer-reviewed journal article or book on Comparative Politics (but not assigned in this class). The final paper of between 1,250 and 1,750 words will be due in electronic copy by 5:00 PM on April 27. Before the final paper, however, you will also write two shorter, related papers—a memo on the article/book you have selected and a literature review. We will discuss all of these assignments further in class, but you will find deadlines and brief descriptions of each requirement below.

- 1) Article/book selection (Deadline: Friday, February 19, 5:00 PM)
 - a. You must select an article or book to review and include a brief explanation (between 250 and 500 words) as to why you have chosen that book/article. Specifically, you should explain (1) how it fits into the topics discussed in class, (2) what you believe you will learn from writing about it, and (3) why you want to learn more about that topic. You should provide the author(s), title, publisher, and publication date (as well as a link, the volume number, issue number, and page range if a journal article) at the beginning of your submitted file. I will not include this bibliographical information in the word count. You must receive my approval for your chosen book/article before submitting this paper; see below for more guidelines on how to choose a book/article for this project. If you want to review two books/articles, you may do so, but any more pieces than that would become unwieldy in these papers.

- 2) Literature review (Deadline: Friday, March 19, 5:00 PM)
 - a. You must submit a brief explanation of how your selected book or article fits into existing scholarship on Comparative Politics. You will be able to glean this from the article or book itself. On what scholarship are they building? What scholarship are they criticizing? These questions can help guide you in this piece. You ought to put answers to these questions in your own words and rely minimally on direct quotations. For this task, I want to hear (1) what topic the author is addressing (e.g., the causes of democratic backsliding), (2) what work the author is critiquing or complementing (e.g., existing work on democratic backsliding that has previously ignored a set of cases or that is better understood in light of new data), (3) what new thing the author believes they are adding to this literature (e.g., an improved method or a novel theoretical approach), and (4) why the author believes their new contribution to the literature is important (e.g., because it will allow us to more accurately answer the question of when democratic backsliding happens and how to prevent it). You may add whether the author is explicitly or implicitly approaching the question from using any of the theories or concepts we discuss in class. *The second component of this review—what work the author is critiquing or complementing—should identify at least three non-assigned journal articles or books that your author explicitly cites and at least three course readings on which your author’s piece might build (even if they aren’t explicitly citing it.* This should be roughly 750-1,250 words, but you may go up to 1,500 words at your discretion.

- 3) Final paper (Deadline: Tuesday, April 27, 5:00 PM)
 - a. This final paper of 1,250 to 1,750 words (not including the header, title, and footnotes/bibliography) should summarize the argument of your chosen article/book in no more than 200 words. The rest of the paper should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the argument as well as recommendations for future research. You should spend roughly 400 words on the strengths, 600 words on the weaknesses, and another 200 words on the recommendations for future research. *You should identify at least two strengths, at least three weaknesses, and two recommendations for future research.* In discussing the article/book’s strengths,

for example, you might discuss the novelty or rigor of its data or methods, its assessment of competing hypotheses, or any ways in which it usefully speaks to ongoing political or theoretical debates. In discussing the weaknesses, you might mention, e.g., any limitations in the methods or data, any alternative explanations it fails to adequately anticipate and rebut, or any unconvincing assumptions it makes. *On both strengths and weaknesses, you ought to emphasize substance rather than style.* (Clarity of writing may indeed be a strength of a piece, but that's not what I'm looking for here.) In providing recommendations for future research on the topic of your chosen article/book, you might focus on, e.g., additional data that could be gathered, plausible alternative hypotheses that could be tested, or different approaches that could be taken to the same basic question and data. For more ideas on how you might engage with the work, see the section, "A Checklist for Commenting on Papers" in this graduate-level [syllabus](#).

You should submit all of these assignments on Canvas as Word or Pages files (.doc, .docx, or .pages, not as PDFs, please), and the documents should be double-spaced and typed in 12-point Times New Roman font with standard spacing, 1-inch margins, and page numbers in the upper right-hand corner. I ask that you use footnotes as opposed to in-text, author-date citations, and although I prefer the Chicago Manual of Style for citations (see [here](#)), I will not deduct points for citations so long as you consistently provide all relevant bibliographical information. Please note that I will not include headers, titles, page numbers, footnotes, or bibliographies in the word count for your papers (but do not abuse the space in the footnotes, please).

All articles and books you select will be subject to my approval, which means you will want to consult with me before submitting the first assignment on February 19 (you can simply send an email asking if a source is acceptable, or we can discuss it during office hours). Your source should be a peer-reviewed journal article or university-press book on Comparative Politics, and it should be a piece of research that puts forward its own argument (i.e., it should not be a review essay that focuses solely on other works). The goal here is to encourage you to engage deeply with a single academic text rather than, e.g., a piece of journalism or popular writing. You will be well-positioned to do so if you read the assigned readings with a focus not just on the arguments those authors develop but also on the ways those authors engage with other academic work.

If you choose to review an article, you could start by searching for something of interest on [Google Scholar](#) or by looking through some of the following journals: the *American Political Science Review*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Journal of Democracy*, *Democratization*, or *World Politics*. Articles from other journals may be acceptable as well—these are just some of the more prominent journals in the field. Please do not pay for any journal articles—you should have access to them through the UC Library, but if you cannot access them, please let me know.

If you choose to review a book, you will similarly want to look for a book published by an academic through a major university press (such as the university presses of Oxford, Cambridge, Cornell, Princeton, MIT, Harvard, Yale, Stanford, or Michigan). For narrower ideas, you might again consult Google Scholar or book reviews in journals like *Perspectives on Politics* or *International Studies Review*. You can also consult me in office hours for ideas. If you want to

choose a book, I do not expect or require you to purchase it. If you cannot access it through the library, please let me know.

Reading Response Papers

In addition to the review-related papers, I will ask you to complete two reading response papers throughout the course. The course is divided into five sections, and you will need to complete one reading response in two of the three middle sections (i.e., Theories & Concepts in Comparative Politics, Cases in Comparative Politics, and Themes in Comparative Politics). In the two sections of your choice, you will need to pick one week and upload a reading response paper for that week on Canvas by 10 AM that Monday (or on the first class session of that week). So, for example, if you want to write a response paper on the readings for the week on “Ideology, Culture, and Political Action,” your paper should be uploaded on Canvas by 10 AM on Wednesday, January 20. Each reading response should be about 200-300 words. I will ask you to pick one or two readings from that week and explain (1) a new thing you learned from your chosen reading(s), (2) why you found that new thing to be especially important or interesting, and (3) one or two questions you still have about the topic. Use the same formatting guidelines as are described above, but you need not include footnotes and a bibliography for these.

Procedures

Office Hours and Email Etiquette

I will hold virtual office hours on Microsoft Teams twice a week. You are free to come to these office hours to discuss any relevant academic matters with me. I encourage you to come for substantive questions about readings, lectures, and assignments (e.g., the sort of questions that might be difficult to answer briefly via email). I am also happy to discuss related academic matters such as post-graduate plans, internship ideas, and the like. If the stated office hours do not work for you, please send me an email to arrange for an appointment.

I also encourage you to send me questions by email. When doing so, please include POL 1060 in the subject line. If you send me an email and do not receive a reply within 24 hours, feel free to follow up. If it is a time-sensitive matter, you may follow up sooner as well, but keep in mind that we might not reply immediately to emails sent at odd hours.

For technical issues, IT@UC should be your first point of contact.

Green Teaching and Learning

I borrow from American University’s Center for Teaching, Research, and Learning to encourage “green” teaching and learning [practices](#). For this online class, I would encourage you to read this syllabus and all other assigned readings on a laptop or tablet, and I would also encourage you to take notes on a laptop/tablet rather than on paper. That said, [research](#) suggests that hand-writing notes can be better for recall and comprehension, so it’s your call. If you opt for the latter, I would suggest trying to mitigate paper usage by writing on recycled paper and maximizing the amount of writing per page. We will discuss optimal means of taking notes on readings on the first day of class.

Late Assignments

All times in this syllabus are in Eastern Time, but for any of you in other time zones, I am willing to work with you to ensure that paper deadlines occur at a reasonable hour—just send me an email if you think the deadlines will be an issue. Given the state of affairs, I am going to be very lenient with late assignments this semester. You can consider the deadlines listed here to be suggestions designed to keep you on track and to prevent work from piling up. I will only deduct points from papers submitted after 5 PM on April 29. Any papers/projects submit after that will automatically lose 20 points. If you submit your paper less than 48 hours before the grade submission deadline (5 PM on May 3), I may not have time to grade your paper and may mark it as “Incomplete” until I can get to it.

Grading

Grades will be based on the merit of your work; there is no grading “curve” employed in this class. Your final grade will be calculated as follows:

Participation	20%
Reading Response Papers	10%
Article Selection	10%
Literature Review	25%
Final Paper	35%

Each of the above requirements will graded on the following scale:

100 to 95	A	74 to 71	C
94 to 91	A-	70 to 67	C-
90 to 87	B+	66 to 63	D+
86 to 83	B	62 to 59	D
82 to 79	B-	58 to 55	D-
78 to 75	C+	Below 55	F

An “A” grade means that you have demonstrated a genuinely superior level of understanding of the subject and have provided ample evidence of that insight. We will round up for grades at or above *N.5*. I will discuss grading standards further in class. For more information on Cincinnati’s grading policies, see [here](#).

Assignment Feedback

You will receive grades and feedback on the review-related papers within two weeks of the submission of each piece. I will provide all feedback on the Canvas course page, but if at any point you would like to know if your participation has been satisfactory—or if you would like additional feedback beyond what we provide on Canvas—please see me in office hours. Reading response papers will be graded primarily for completion.

Grade Disputes

You are entitled to a satisfactory explanation for why you received the grade you did. If you are not satisfied with the explanation provided via Canvas, you should reach out to me to discuss the

matter. If, after further discussion, you believe your grade does not reflect the grading standards set out in class, you may request that your paper be re-graded, albeit with the understanding that the revised grade may be better, the same, or worse. You may also appeal your final grade on the grounds of a mathematical error, error in grading procedures, or inequity in the application of policies stated in this syllabus.

Part I. Introduction

Monday, January 11 / Wednesday, January 13 / Friday, January 15

Thinking Like a Comparativist

- Amelia Hoover Green, “How to Read Political Science: A Guide in Four Steps” ([2013](#)).
- Atul Kohli and Peter Evans, “The Role of Theory in Comparative Politics: A Symposium,” *World Politics* Vol. 48, No. 1 (1995): 1-10.
- Aristotle, *Politics* (c. 350 BC): [Book I, Parts 1-2](#).
- **Recommended:** Mark Irving Lichbach and Alan S. Zuckerman, “Paradigms and Pragmatism: Comparative Politics during the Past Decade,” in *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, 2nd edition (Cambridge University Press, 2009): 1-17.
- **Recommended:** William Strunk, Jr. and E.B. White, “Elementary Principles of Composition,” in *The Elements of Style* (2000 [[1918](#)], Macmillan Publishing Co.)

Part II. Theories & Concepts in Comparative Politics

Wednesday, January 20 / Friday, January 22

Ideology, Culture, and Political Action

- Karl Marx, “Theses on Feuerbach” ([1845](#)).
- Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* ([1930](#)): Chapters 1-2.
- Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America, Volume 1* ([1835](#)): Introductory Chapter.
- **Recommended:** Ronald Inglehart, “Giving Up on God: The Global Decline of Religion,” *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 99, No. 5 (September/October 2020): 110-118.

Monday, January 25 / Wednesday, January 27 / Friday, January 29

Individual Interests and Group Decision-Making

- Thomas Dietz, Elinor Ostrom, and Paul C. Stern, “The Struggle to Govern the Commons,” *Science* Vol. 302, No. 5,652 (December 12, 2003): 1,907-1,912.
- Richard W. Soudriette and Andrew Ellis, “Electoral Systems Today: A Global Snapshot,” *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (2006): 78-88.
- **Recommended:** Theda Skocpol, “Social Revolutions and Mass Military Mobilization,” *World Politics* Vol. 40, No. 2 (1988): 147-168.

Monday, February 1* / Wednesday, February 3 / Friday, February 5

The Role of Institutions

- Douglass C. North, “Institutions,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* Vol. 5, No. 1 (1991): 97-112.
- David Fortunato and Tessa Provins, “Compensation, Opportunity, and Information: A Comparative Analysis of Legislative Nonresponse in the American States,” *Political Research Quarterly* Vol. 70, No. 3 (2017): 644-656.
- **Recommended:** Arend Lijphart, “Constitutional Choices for New Democracies,” *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 2, No. 1 (1991): 72-84.

- **Recommended:** Jon Elster, “Forces and mechanisms in the constitution-making process,” *Duke Law Journal* Vol. 45, No. 2 (1995): 364-396.

*Guest Talk: Dr. Tessa Provins, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Pittsburgh

Monday, February 8 / Wednesday, February 10 / Friday, February 12*

Democracy, Autocracy, and Political Transitions

- Philippe C. Schmitter and Terry Lynn Karl, “What Democracy Is . . . and Is Not,” *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 2, No. 3 (1991): 75-88.
- Thomas Carothers, “The End of the Transition Paradigm,” *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (2002): 5-21.
- **Recommended:** Jennifer Gandhi and Ellen Lust-Okar, “Elections under Authoritarianism,” *Annual Review of Political Science* Vol. 12 (2009): 403-422.
- **Recommended:** Adam Przeworski and Fernando Limongi, “Modernization: Theories and Facts,” *World Politics* Vol. 49, No. 2 (1997): 155-183.

*Guest Talk: Ms. Zabe Shafi, Senior Program Officer, Middle East and North Africa, National Democratic Institute

Part III. Cases in Comparative Politics

Monday, February 15* / Wednesday, February 17 / Friday, February 19

The United Kingdom & The European Union

- Walter Bagehot, “The House of Commons” and “Its Supposed Checks and Balances” in *The English Constitution* (1867).
- Will Jennings and Martin Lodge, “Brexit, the Tides and Canute: The Fracturing Politics of the British State,” *Journal of European Public Policy* Vol. 26, No. 5 (2019): 772-789.
- **Recommended:** Andrew Moravcsik, “In Defense of the ‘Democratic Deficit’: Reassessing Legitimacy in the European Union,” *Journal of Common Market Studies* Vol. 40, No. 4 (2002): 603-624
- **Recommended:** Andreas Follesdal, and Simon Hix, “Why There is a Democratic Deficit in the EU: A Response to Majone and Moravcsik,” *Journal of Common Market Studies* Vol. 44, No. 3 (2006): 533-562.

*Guest Talk: Dr. Martin Lodge, Professor of Political Science and Public Policy, London School of Economics

Monday, February 22 / Wednesday, February 24 / Friday, February 26*

Russian Politics and the Post-Soviet World

- Ammon Cheskin and Luke March, “State-Society Relations in Contemporary Russia: New Forms of Political and Social Contention,” *East European Politics* Vol. 31, No. 3 (2015): 261-273.
- Alexander Cooley, “Whose Rules, Whose Sphere? Russian Governance and Influence in Post-Soviet States,” *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace* (2017).

- **Recommended:** Roberto Stefan Foa and Grzegorz Ekiert, “The Weakness of Postcommunist Civil Society Reassessed,” *European Journal of Political Research* Vol. 56, No. 2 (2017): 419-439.

*Guest Talk: Dr. Ammon Cheskin, Senior Lecturer in Nationalism and Identity, University of Glasgow

Monday, March 1* / Wednesday, March 3 / Friday, March 5

Chinese Politics

- Yuhua Wang, “China’s State Development in Historical Perspective,” *APSA-Comparative Politics Newsletter* Vol. 29, No. 2 (2019): 50-57.
- Cheng Li, “China in the Year 2020: Three Political Scenarios.” *Asia Policy* Vol. 4, No. 1 (2007): 17-29.

*Guest Talk: Mr. Jonathan Liu, Ph.D. Student, University of Cincinnati.

Monday, March 8 / Wednesday, March 10 / Friday, March 12*

Nigerian Politics

- A. Carl LeVan and Patrick Ukata, “Introduction,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Nigerian Politics* (2018): 1-18.
- Peter Lewis and Darren Kew, “Nigeria’s Hopeful Election,” *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 26, No. 3 (2015): 94-109.
- **Recommended:** Gero Erdmann, “Party Research: Western European Bias and the ‘African Labyrinth.’” *Democratization* Vol. 11, No. 3 (2004): 63-87.
- **Recommended:** Nathan Jensen and Leonard Wantchekon “Resource Wealth and Political Regimes in Africa,” *Comparative Political Studies* Vol. 37, No. 7 (2004): 816-841.

*Guest Talk: Dr. A. Carl LeVan, Professor of Comparative and Regional Studies, American University.

Part IV. Themes in Comparative Politics

Monday, March 15 / Wednesday, March 17 / Friday, March 19*

The Sources of Political Violence

- Stathis N. Kalyvas, “The Ontology of ‘Political Violence’: Action and Identity in Civil Wars,” *Perspectives on Politics* Vol. 1, No. 3 (2003): 475-494.
- Austin C. Doctor and Stephen Bagwell, “Assessing the Risk of Electoral Violence in the United States,” *Political Violence at a Glance* ([October 13, 2020](#)).
- **Recommended:** Brian J. Phillips, “To Understand Political Violence in the US: Think Movements, Not Groups,” *Political Violence at a Glance* ([June 22, 2020](#)).
- **Recommended:** Alexis Leanna Henshaw, “Why Women Rebel: Greed, Grievance, and Women in Armed Rebel Groups,” *Journal of Global Security Studies* Vol. 1, No. 3 (2016).

*Guest Talk: Dr. Austin C. Doctor, Assistant Professor of Government, Eastern Kentucky University.

Monday, March 22 / Friday, March 26*

American Politics in Comparative Perspective

- Juan J. Linz, “The Perils of Presidentialism,” *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 1, no. 1 (1990): 51-69.
- Jordan Butcher and Aaron Kushner, “No, Term Limits Won’t #DrainTheSwamp: We Did the Research,” *The Washington Post* ([May 8, 2018](#)).
- **Recommended:** Byron E. Shafer, “American Exceptionalism,” *Annual Review of Political Science* Vol. 2 (1999): 445-463.
- **Recommended:** Gwen Prowse and Vesla Weaver, “What Does Police Reform Mean?” *The Washington Post* ([June 17, 2020](#)).

*Guest Talk: Dr. Vasabjit Banerjee, Assistant Professor of Political Science and Public Administration, Mississippi State University

Monday, March 29 / Wednesday, March 31* / Friday April 2

Colonial Legacies and Development

- Jim Zarroli, “How Singapore Became One of the Richest Places on Earth,” *National Public Radio* ([March 29, 2015](#)).
- Katie Barker, “Alive and Kicking: Colonial Legacies in Africa,” *Review of African Political Economy* ([August 23, 2018](#)).
- Richard Aidoo, “African countries have started to push back against Chinese development aid. Here’s why.” *The Washington Post* ([October 16, 2018](#)).
- **Recommended:** Jack Paine, “Democratic Contradictions in European Settler Colonies,” *World Politics* Vol. 71, No. 3 (2019): 542-585.
- **Recommended:** Tonio Andrade, “Beyond Guns, Germs, and Steel: European Expansion and Maritime Asia, 1400-1750” *Journal of Early Modern History* Vol. 14 (2010): 165-186.

*Guest Talk: Dr. Richard Aidoo, Professor of Politics, Coastal Carolina University

Monday, April 5 / Wednesday, April 7 / Friday, April 9*

Comparative Utopias: Imagining the Perfect State

- Dominique Gaurier, “Cosmopolis and Utopia,” *The Oxford Handbook of the History of International Law* (2012).
- Megan A. Stewart, “What’s So New about the Islamic State’s Governance?,” *The Washington Post* ([October 7, 2014](#)).

*Guest Talk: Dr. Megan A. Stewart, Assistant Professor of Political Science, American University

Monday, April 12 / Wednesday, April 14* / Friday, April 16

Comparative Politics in Your Neighborhood

- *Constitution of the State of Ohio*, Preamble and Articles I through IV (available [here](#)).

- A. Lee Hannah, “The Politics of Passing and Implementing Medical Marijuana in Ohio,” *Journal of Economics and Politics* Vol. 24, No. 1 (2019).
- **Optional:** Daniel C. Vock, “Pandemic dims prospects for Brent Spence Bridge upgrade,” *Ohio Capital Journal* ([May 14, 2020](#)).
- **Optional:** “Ohio’s businesses were all for mask mandates. Then politics got in the way.” *The Washington Post* ([July 24, 2020](#)).

*Guest Talk: Dr. A. Lee Hannah, Associate Professor of Political Science, Wright State University

Part V - Conclusion

Monday, April 19 / Wednesday, April 21

Whither Comparative Politics?

- Scott L. Greer, Elizabeth J. King, Elize Massard da Fonseca, and Andre Peralta-Santos, “The Comparative Politics of COVID-19: The Need to Understand Government Responses,” *Global Public Health* Vol. 15, No. 9 (2020): 1,413-1,416.
- **Recommended:** Matthew Charles Wilson, “Trends in Political Science Research and the Progress of Comparative Politics,” *PS: Political Science and Politics* Vol. 50, No. 4 (2017): 979-984.