POP88224: Political Illiberalism
Hilary Term 2024
Day and Time: TBD
Room: TBD

Lecturer: Alexander Held
Email: helda@tcd.ie
Office hours: TBD
Office: TBD

This module is about political illiberalism in advanced industrialized democracies. The module will begin by introducing students to key concepts of political illiberalism and their measurement. It will then focus on both demand-side and supply-side explanations for the increased electoral success of illiberal parties and politicians in advanced industrialized democracies: In a first step, we will explore the extent to which citizens' policy preferences on economic and cultural issues make them more likely to vote for illiberal parties. In a second step, our focus shifts to institutional factors, especially the electoral system, and patterns of party competition. The last part of the module will consider the implications of the recent rise in political illiberalism on political culture and democracy. Discussion of the assigned reading material will consider the strengths and weaknesses of the research design and methodologies employed, and the implications of these empirical results for democratic theory.

There are two important things to emphasize about the focus of this course. First, the course is focused on political illiberalism in advanced industrialized democracies, and thus is not intended to provide a full overview of the various political forms of political illiberalism (e.g., political illiberalism outside of Western Europe and North America) that exist. Second, the primary focus of the course is on identifying the broad factors that may explain the recent rise in political illiberalism across countries in Western Europe and North America, not the detailed analysis of individual countries and their specific forms of political illiberalism. As such, the key focus of this course is on the factors that shape citizen vote choice in elections.

Several readings for this module use quantitative methods. This has not been an issue for students who previously took this module. By the time you are taking this module, you will be well prepared for this, and we will obviously go over the material together in class. If you have any concerns about this, please reach out to me. You may also take a look at some of the readings (see, for example, Goodwin & Heath 2016 [week 1] and Inglehart & Norris 2016 [week 3]) to see if you would enjoy reading them.

Learning outcomes
On successful completion of this module students will be able to:
- Explain and critically evaluate the major factors leading to a rise in political illiberalism in Western Europe and North America
- Understand the relationship between elections, electoral institutions, party competition and support for illiberal parties and politicians

- Construct arguments concerning current debates about rising electoral support for illiberal parties and politicians

Assessment
Participation (20%)
Student participation and discussion is a central aspect of the seminar. This means that it is necessary to do the readings. Students should come prepared with topics of discussion and questions. The assessment of participation will be based on the quality of input into class discussions. To prepare for discussion you should: identify the theory or argument of the readings, identify the method used by the authors in the readings to test their arguments, and evaluate the strength of these method for testing the authors' argument; and you should think of possible extensions or alternatives to the arguments put forward in the readings.

Response Papers (20%)
Students are required to submit two response papers. Each paper should be 800 words long and each will be worth 10%. Each paper should be related to a topic covered in the module (weeks 9-12). Students can choose the two weeks (out of four possible weeks) in which they write their response papers but have to submit them through Turnitin on Blackboard **before the start of class** (i.e., by TBD) in these three weeks. Building on the readings from that week, the response papers should discuss a potential research design that improves on this literature. Please do not write a summary of a particular week's readings. Instead, **identify a weakness or limitation in the articles and offer suggestions on how to improve the research**. The critical evaluation may focus on the empirical or theoretical aspects of the readings or both. In these response papers, the student should:
1. Identify a research question.
2. Provide brief theoretical intuitions that generate one or more hypotheses (for this, you are likely to draw on the readings for a given week – there is no need to draw on outside sources).
3. Describe how they would answer that question. What they propose can be ambitious but should also be feasible for the student to execute.
The purpose of the response papers is to begin brainstorming ideas for potential research projects.

Final Paper (60%)
The research paper is due by **TBD**. It should be 2,500 words in length, including footnotes but not the list of references. I have no preference for any particular citation style, but please make sure you use citation procedures consistently throughout. You should double-space the essay and provide the word count at the beginning. The paper should outline a research design for a larger project, be creative, and also feasible for the student to carry out. The paper should follow a clear structure:
1. What is the motivating question?
2. How does the project relate to existing work?
3. What are the hypotheses? These should flow naturally from good theory.
4. What relevant data are available, or could feasibly be collected?
5. What methods would be used to test the hypotheses? This could include any combination

of comparative case studies, interviews, statistical analysis, etc.

Readings
Details of readings for individual topics are given separately. A very useful resource for this module is the following book, which is available online (uncorrected draft) on the author's website:

> Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. 2019. *Cultural Backlash*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

All chapters (uncorrected draft) are available [online](#) (scroll down the page to download individual chapters). A hardcopy of the book is also available at TCD library. The following items are on specific topics that we will address over the course of the term and are of general relevance and usefulness.

> Edward Fieldhouse, Jane Greene, Geoffrey Evans, Jonathan Mellon, Christopher Prosser, Herrmann Schmitt, and Cees van der Eijk. 2019. *Electoral Shocks: The Volatile Voter in a Turbulent World*. Oxford University Press.
> - Provides an in-depth analysis of recent electoral trends in the UK, with a particular focus on the rise in support for UKIP and Brexit.
>
> Bonnie Meguid. 2008. *Party Competition Between Unequals: Strategies and Electoral Fortunes in Western Europe*. Cambridge University Press.
> - Analyzes how mainstream party strategies have affected the rise of radical right and Green parties since the 1970s.
>
> Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt. 2018. *How Democracies Die: What History Reveals about our Future*. New York: Crown Publishing.
> - Puts the recent rise in political illiberalism in historical perspective; provides an in-depth assessment of the current state of democracy in the U.S.

Academic integrity
Please do not plagiarize. Academic dishonesty is a serious matter, with serious consequences that can result in receiving no credit for an assignment, a failing grade for the module, and even expulsion from the programme. It is never permissible to turn in any work that contains others' ideas without proper acknowledgment. It is your responsibility to make sure that your work meets the standard of academic honesty set forth in the College Calendar (see https://www.tcd.ie/calendar/). Useful information is available at https://libguides.tcd.ie/academic-integrity/. If you are paraphrasing, cite the source. If you are quoting, use quotation marks and appropriate citation. In addition, we strongly recommend that you visit http://www.plagiarism.org/ for more information on what is and is not plagiarism. Lastly, students are required to only submit "new work" in each module, which means work that has not been submitted previously in any other university module. Students who wish to use previously submitted work as part of a new project will need the approval of the lecturer. The Assignment Submission Form available from the Departmental website (https://www.tcd.ie/Political_Science/assets/word/Plagiarism%20cover%20sheet.docx; see

also https://libguides.tcd.ie/academic-integrity/declaration) should be filled out and included as the first page of all your submissions. All written assignments are to be submitted through Turnitin in Blackboard.

Disability policy
Students with a disability are encouraged to register with the Disability Service to seek supports where the disability could affect their ability to participate fully in all aspects of the course.

Course Schedule

PART I: VARIETIES OF POLITICAL ILLIBERALISM
This module will examine both the causes of rising political illiberalism and its consequences for democratic politics. Part I will begin by taking a comparative view and look at different varieties of political illiberalism in advanced industrialized democracies.

Week 1. Concepts and measures; Varieties of political illiberalism

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. 2019. *Cultural Backlash*. New York: Cambridge University Press, chapters 3 and 7 (Classifying parties); available online – see information above.

J. Eric Oliver and Wendy M. Rahn. 2016. 'Rise of the Trumpenvolk.' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 667 (1): 189-206.

Matthew J. Goodwin and Oliver Heath. 2016. 'The 2016 Referendum, Brexit and the Left Behind? An aggregate-level analysis of the result.' *Political Quarterly*, 87(3):323-332.

Further reading (optional):

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. 2019. *Cultural Backlash*. New York: Cambridge University Press, chapters 1, 10, 11.

Margaret Canovan. 1999. *Political Studies,* XLVII:2-16.

Cas Mudde. 2004. *Government and Opposition,* 39(4): 541-563.

Paris Aslanidis. 2016. *Political Studies* 64 (1): 88–104.

Bart Bonikowski and Noam Gidron. 2016. *Social Forces* 94(4) 1593–1621.

Kevin Arceneaux and Stephen P. Nicholson. 'Who wants to have a Tea Party? The who, what, and why of the Tea Party Movement.' *PS: Political Science and Politics* 45, no. 4 (2012): 700-10.

Hanspeter Kriesi. 2014. *West European Politics*, 37(2): 361- 378.

Lorenza Antonucci, Laszlo Horvath, Yordan Kutiyski, and Andre Krouwel. 2017. 'The malaise of the squeezed middle: Challenging the narrative of the 'left behind' Brexiter.' *Competition & Change* 21(3): 211-229.

PART II: DEMAND-SIDE EXPLANATIONS

Part II will inquire into the factors that increase demand among voters for more illiberal policies. Factors that make voters more likely to support the kind of policies that are advocated by illiberal parties and politicians include citizens' policy preferences on economic and cultural issues.

Week 2. Economic issues

Colantone, Italo, and Piero Stanig. 2018. "The trade origins of economic nationalism: Import competition and voting behavior in Western Europe." *American Journal of Political Science* 62 (4): 936-53.

Elizabeth Ivarsflaten. 2008. "What unites right-wing populists in Western Europe? Re-examining grievance mobilization models in seven successful cases." *Comparative Political Studies*, 41: 3 –23.

Luigi Guiso, Helios Herrera, Massimo Morelli and Tommaso Sonno. 2022. "Economic Insecurity and the Demand of Populism in Europe." Working Paper **(skim section 3 - there is no need to worry about the math that they use; focus on their main argument and key findings)**

Autor, David, David Dorn, Gordon Hanson, and Kaveh Majlesi. 2017. "A note on the effect of rising trade exposure on the 2016 presidential election." *MPRA Working Paper* https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/112889/1/MPRA_paper_112863.pdf

Further reading (optional):

Daniel Stockemer. 2017. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies* 25(1): 41-56.

Dani Rodrik. 2018. *Journal of International Business Policy.*

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. 2019. *Cultural Backlash*. New York: Cambridge University Press, chapter 5.

Week 3. Cultural issues

Chou, Winston, Rafaela Dancygier, Naoki Egami and Amaney Jamal. 2021. "Competing for Loyalists?" *Comparative Political Studies* 54 (12): 2226-2260.

Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris. 2016. 'Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash.' HKS Research Paper.

Mutz, Diane. 2018. "Status threat, not economic hardship, explains the 2016 presidential vote." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115(19): E4330-9.

Marc Hooghe and Ruth Dassonneville. 2018. "Explaining the Trump vote: The effect of racist resentment and anti-immigrant sentiments." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51(3): 528-534.

Further reading (optional):

De La O, Ana L. and Jonathan A. Rodden. 2008. "Does Religion Distract the Poor?" *Comparative Political Studies* 41(4-5): 437-476.

Daniel Cox, Rachel Lienesch, and Robert P. Jones, 2017. PRRI/The Atlantic Report.

Eefje Steenvoorden and Eelco Harteveld. 2018. *West European Politics*, 41:1, 28-52.

Tjitske Akkerman. 2015. *Party Politics,* 21(1): 54–67.

Christopher Cochrane and Neil Nevitte. 2014. *Comparative European Politics* 12(1): 1-32.

PART III: SUPPLY-SIDE EXPLANATIONS
Part III will consider the supply-side of the success of illiberal politicians and parties. It will analyze the role of electoral systems and party competition in explaining their recent success.

Week 4. Electoral systems and party competition

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. 2019. *Cultural Backlash*. New York: Cambridge University Press, chapter 9 ("Party Fortunes and Electoral Rules"; draft version available from Pippa Norris' website or at:
https://www.dropbox.com/s/z9j50eltv1ar2dr/Chapter%209%20sgl.pdf?dl=0).

Meguid, Bonnie. 2005. "Competition Between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy in Niche Party Success." *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 347-99.

Krause, Werner, Denis Cohen and Tarik Abou-Chadi. 2022. "Does Accommodation Work?" *Political Science Research and Methods*. Forthcoming.

van Spanje, Joost, and Nan Dirk de Graaf. 2018. "How established parties reduce other parties' electoral support: the strategy of parroting the pariah." *West European Politics* 41 (1): 1-27.

Further reading (optional):

Kedar, Orit. 2005. "When Moderate Voters Prefer Extreme Parties: Policy Balancing in Parliamentary Elections." *American Political Science Review* 99(2): 185-199.

PART IV: CONSEQUENCES
Part IV will investigate the consequences of the recent rise of political illiberalism on political culture and democracy.

Week 5. Impacts on the civic culture; backsliding in liberal institutions, press freedom, and rule of law

Civic culture:
Matthijs Rooduijn, Wouter van der Brug, W and Sarah de Lange. 2016. 'Expressing or fueling discontent?' *Electoral Studies* 43: 32-40.

Backsliding:
Cas Mudde. 2013. 'Three Decades of Populist Radical Right Parties in Western Europe: So What?' *European Journal of Political Research* 52(1): 1-19.

Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way 2002. 'The rise of competitive authoritarianism.' *Journal of Democracy* 13(2): 51-65.

Lieberman, et al. 2019. 'The Trump Presidency and American Democracy: A Historical and Comparative Analysis.' *Perspectives on Politics* 17(2): 470-9.

Further reading (optional):
Bright Line Watch

Democratic Erosion

Agnes Akkerman, Cas Mudde, and Andrej Zaslove. 2014. *Comparative Political Studies* 47:1324–53.

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart. 2019. *Cultural Backlash*. New York: Cambridge University Press, chapter 12 and chapter 13 (especially p. 20-25).

Michael Heaney. 2018. 'Making protest great again.' *Contexts*, 17(1): 42-47.

Crowd Counting Consortium