



POLITIC4139: Democratisation, The Rise and Fall of Democracy

Semester 2, 2018/2019

Course Handbook

Seminars:

Mondays 10:00 – 12:00,
Room 122, 25 Bute Gardens

or

Mondays 13:00 – 15:00,
Room 709A/B, Boyd Orr

Lecturer:

Dr Christopher Claassen

christopher.claassen@glasgow.ac.uk

(0141) 330-3313

Room 1305, Adam Smith Building

Consultation and feedback time: Thursdays 13:00-15:00 (or by email appointment)

Table of Contents

1	Description.....	2
2	Intended Learning Outcomes	2
3	Structure of Course.....	3
4	Assessment	3
4.1	Case Summary.....	3
4.2	Essay.....	4
5	Coursework Submission Procedures.....	5
6	Extensions and Penalties.....	6
7	Plagiarism and Urkund	6
8	Feedback.....	7
9	Course Schedule and Deadlines.....	7
10	Required Readings.....	8

1 Description

In the 1970s, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a United States Senator, argued that ‘democracy is where the world was, not where the world is going’. Yet just 20 years later the ‘third wave’ of democratisation had swept the globe, bringing democratic political systems to countries as diverse as Taiwan, Brazil, South Africa, Poland and Spain. Indeed, the rise of democracy seemed so inexorable that in 1989 Francis Fukuyama declared that humanity had reached ‘the end of history’, which is to say that liberal democracy had ‘won’.

The mood has darkened again. Scholars and analysts now claim that ‘democracy is in decline’, with autocrats in China and Russia resurgent on the world stage, and authoritarian populists in government in many democracies.

This course examines the rise and fall of democratic systems of government. In other words, we focus on the questions of why countries transition from autocracy to democracy, or take the reverse path, from democracy to autocracy. The course considers a wide variety of different explanations for these transitions, including levels of economic development, political culture, competing class interests, and foreign influence. These theoretical processes will be illustrated through discussion of historical and contemporary cases.

2 Intended Learning Outcomes

By the end of this course students will be able to:

- Understand and critically evaluate the concepts of democracy and autocracy;
- Understand and critically evaluate the processes of democratisation and consolidation of democracy;
- Interpret and apply quantitative and qualitative measures of democracy;
- Describe the dynamics of democratisation and/or democratic consolidation in one or more countries;
- Critically evaluate theories of democratisation and democratic consolidation;
- Critically apply theories of democratisation and democratic consolidation to explain historical or contemporary cases.

3 Structure of Course

The course comprises a two-hour seminar (tutorial) every week. Seminars are designed to help you engage with, and critically analyse, the week's topic. They rely heavily on small group and plenary discussions. They will also be based on the week's assigned readings, so these should be read beforehand. The lecturer will circulate readings questions the week before each class: these can be used to guide your reading.

Please note that course materials are for students' own personal use and can only be used in relation to students' studies. Any unauthorised distribution of course materials, including uploading them onto public websites or social media such as YouTube or Course Hero, will be considered in breach of the code of conduct and will be subject to disciplinary action.

4 Assessment

In this course, you will receive grades for the following:

- 1) A written case summary, 1,250 to 1,500 words in length, worth one-third (33%) of the total course grade, and due on Monday, 11 February 2019
- 2) A written essay, 3,000 to 3,500 words in length, worth two-thirds (67%) of the total course grade, and due on Monday, 15 April 2019.

The requirements for each are described in some detail below.

4.1 Case Summary

You should research and write a case summary on an example relevant to the course.

There are four types of cases:

- 1) Successful democratisation
- 2) Autocratic persistence or unsuccessful democratisation
- 3) Successful consolidation of democracy
- 4) Democratic failure / backsliding or unsuccessful consolidation

Appropriate examples include (this list is not exhaustive and students may choose another case, provided they check with the lecturer):

- 1) Successful democratisation
 - England 19th to early 20th century
 - Spain 1970s
 - South Korea 1980s
 - Brazil 1980s
 - Philippines 1980s
 - Taiwan 1990s
 - South Africa 1990s
 - Poland 1990s
 - Tunisia 2010
- 2) Autocratic persistence or unsuccessful democratisation
 - China
 - Singapore
 - Saudi Arabia
 - Egypt
- 3) Successful consolidation of democracy
 - UK, USA, France, Germany, etc.

4) Democratic failure / backsliding or unsuccessful consolidation

- Argentina 1966, 1976
- Venezuela 2000s
- Russia 2000s
- Thailand 2014
- Turkey 2010s
- Hungary 2010s

The case summary should (1) describe the trajectory of democracy in the country over a relevant period of time, making use of quantitative measures and noting key moments where the system changed or resisted disruption; (2) identify elites and other actors who played important roles in these key moments; (3) provide an overview of the contextual factors which might be of interest (social, demographic, economic, international).

Useful sources of information for the case summary include Freedom House (<https://freedomhouse.org>) – who provide reports for every country from 1998 to 2018 – and the *Journal of Democracy* (<https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/>) – who often have theoretically-informed country reports.

4.2 Essay

You should write an essay on one of the following topics:

- 1) ***Critically apply one or two theories of democratisation to a particular case. To what extent does this theory (or theories) explain why the country transitioned to democracy or remained an autocracy? In what ways does the case depart from the theoretical explanation?***
- 2) ***Critically apply one or two theories of consolidation to a particular case. To what extent does this theory (or theories) explain why the country remained a democracy or reverted to autocratic rule? In what ways does the case depart from the theoretical explanation?***

The essay therefore follows on from the case summary. It uses the same case but now critically evaluates one or two plausible explanation for why the country experienced political change (or not). The first essay topic is appropriate for case types (1) and (2) described above; the second essay topic is appropriate for case types (3) and (4).

You should only apply one or two theories in your essay. Theories generally correspond with particular weeks of the course. However, you may focus more narrowly, on one strand of the theory as presented in class, i.e., not the entire week's material. You need not argue that your selected theories are the "only ones" that matter. If you choose to apply two theories you must also explain how the theories can be integrated to provide a fuller explanation. Don't, in other words, just apply one theory after another without comparing and contrasting. Finally, to "critically apply" means to consider ways in which the case departs from the theory as well as ways in which the case supports the theory.

You are encouraged to submit a plan or proposal for the essay as formative assessment. There is no set format for such a plan or proposal, but a document of at least 500 words is recommended to allow for useful feedback. These proposals should be emailed to the lecturer on the Monday before spring break: 18 March 2019.

Coursework will be marked according to the Politics grading schedule, which is provided below.

Politics Grading Schedule		
Grade	Mark	Description
A1 A2 A3 A4 A5	22 21 20 19 18	Excellent performance, characterised by most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear, comprehensive answer that displays sound critical thinking and insights • Relevant evidence and readings from the course, and perhaps beyond, are cited accurately with very few errors. • All key points are addressed fully • Originality, creativity, and independent judgement are present
B1 B2 B3	17 16 15	Very good performance, characterised by most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear answer that fully addresses the key points • Sound reasoning that displays a good understanding of the subject matter • Relevant evidence and course readings are used with few errors • Less critical thinking, originality, and insight than in an excellent performance
C1 C2 C3	14 13 12	Good performance, characterised by most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answer displays a basic understanding of the subject matter • Evidence of reading from course materials, but some points may not be fully relevant • Little in the way of an argument or critical thinking • Some errors may be present
D1 D2 D3	11 10 9	Satisfactory performance, characterised by most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a modest understanding of the subject matter is displayed • Modest evidence of reading from course materials, with the inclusion of a few relevant points • Many errors may be present
E1 E2 E3	8 7 6	Weak performance, characterised by most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to answer question, though there may be an answer to a similar question • Little evidence of any understanding of the subject matter is displayed • Significant errors may be present
F1 F2 F3	5 4 3	Poor performance, characterised by most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to answer question directly • Very little evidence of any understanding of the subject matter is displayed • Many significant errors are likely to be present
G1 G2	2 1	Very poor performance, characterised by most of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to answer question • No evidence of any understanding of the subject matter is displayed
H	0	Absence of positive qualities

5 Coursework Submission Procedures

When submitting your case summary and essay, one copy should be submitted to Urkund via the link on Moodle and an identical paper version should be placed in the Politics Drop Box together with an appropriate cover sheet (cover sheets can be downloaded from the politics honours common room (<https://moodle.gla.ac.uk/course/view.php?id=1159>)). When submitting your work via Moodle please use your student number as the title.

The case summary should be 1,250 to 1,500 words in length and the essay should be 3,000 to 3,500 words in length. These limits exclude lists of references. Coursework that is over the word limit will be penalised, as follows: 1 point for being 10-15% over the limit; 2 points for being 15-20% over the limit, etc. In other words, an essay that is 3,850 words in length will receive a 10% penalty. There is no specific penalty for being under-length.

Case summaries and essays should be clearly-written, generally free of grammatical and spelling errors, and inclusive of academic references and a linked bibliography. Work that does not meet these standards will be penalised. Case summaries and essays should be typed and

printed on A4 paper with pages numbered consecutively and securely stapled. For ease of reading please use 1.5 spacing, 2.5cm margins, and 12-point Times New Roman font.

6 Extensions and Penalties

The University of Glasgow uses a fairly strict system of penalties for late coursework. Failure to submit coursework on time will result in the loss of two points, on the 22-point scale, per working day. After five working days, failure to submit the coursework will result in the award of an “H” grade (0) for the coursework and may result in the refusal of credit for the course. See here for more information on the university-wide penalty system:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/senateoffice/studentcodes/students/studentconduct/>

Penalties will not be applied to late work if you can demonstrate that a medical condition or a serious personal problem has stood in the way of timely submission, under the University’s Code of Assessment. You will normally be required to submit the work at a later date.

If you anticipate having problems in submitting work on time you should follow these procedures:

- To request a coursework extension for *up to 5 working days*, submit an extension request form via MyCampus. Forms are available on the politics undergraduate common room or here: <https://www.gla.ac.uk/schools/socialpolitical/studentinfo/extensionrequestforms/>
- To request a coursework extension for *longer than 5 working days*, submit a Good Cause Claim on MyCampus: go to your “Student Centre” and select “My Good Cause” from the Academics menu. Guidance for students on reporting good cause is available here: https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_420013_en.pdf. Please include any important or sensitive information: it will be treated sympathetically and confidentially. If you miss an examination due to adverse circumstances you should submit a Good Cause Claim instead of an Absence report.

7 Plagiarism and Urkund

This course applies the university rules on plagiarism. Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else’s ideas or written work (including lecture slides, internet material, books, articles, theses, dissertations, and essays) as one’s own without proper acknowledgement. Even when paraphrasing someone else’s ideas you should give proper credit to the source to avoid plagiarism.

The University Calendar says that plagiarism is “considered as an act of academic fraudulence and is an offence against University discipline”. The presentation of someone else’s essay as your own is obviously fraudulent, but the dividing line between your own work and that of your sources is less clear. The solution is always to acknowledge your sources and to use quotations when repeating exactly what someone else has said. Generally you should avoid excessive paraphrasing of others’ writings, even with acknowledgement because it does not demonstrate that you have understood the material you are reproducing. If in doubt seek guidance from the lecturer. For more information about plagiarism please visit <http://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/leads/students/plagiarism/>.

To help avoid plagiarism, your coursework will be checked by Urkund, plagiarism-detecting software, when you upload it using the links provided on the course moodle page. A “draft” link will be provided for you to submit a draft of your essay to Urkund, which you can then later

revise. You must also submit your final version of the essay to Urkund. See the politics Honours handbook for more information on Urkund.

8 Feedback

There are a number of ways you can receive feedback on your learning throughout the course:

- You will receive feedback in seminars from the lecturer and your peers in response to your participation in small group and plenary discussions.
- You will receive written feedback on formative and summative assessment. Written feedback is returned no later than three weeks (15 working days) in line with University policy. Written feedback on summative assessment will take the form of responses to the following questions:
 - 1) Did the essay answer the question?
 - 2) Did the author demonstrate knowledge of the relevant literature?
 - 3) Is the argument convincing?
 - 4) Suggestions for improvement
- You are also encouraged to make use of the lecturer's weekly hours for consultation and feedback, where you may seek guidance on your essay, discuss course readings, etc. These consultation and feedback times are on Thursdays from 13:00 to 15:00 and please email to set up an appointment outside of these times.
- You can also make use of the range of tailored support for Politics students made available by the College of Social Science's Learning Enhancement & Academic Development Service: <https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/leads/students/>.

9 Course Schedule and Deadlines

Week	Date	Topic	
1	7 January	Introduction, processes and trends	
2	14 January	Conceptualising democracy and autocracy	
3	21 January	Approaches: structure vs agency; elites vs masses	
4	28 January	Economic origins	
5	4 February	The resource curse	
6	11 February	Culture and religion	<i>Case summary due</i>
7	18 February	Public support	
8	25 February	Media	
9	4 March	International forces	
10	11 March	Conclusions from case studies	
11	18 March	Reading week: no class	
	15 April		<i>Essay due</i>

10 Required Readings

There is no core text or textbook for this course. Readings are listed in the following pages and will be accessible through links supplied in the online reading list, which is available here:

<https://glasgow.rl.talis.com/lists/CE940529-D900-BE5D-92F0-361A822E21F2.html>

Week 1: Introduction: processes and trends

Required reading:

- Plattner. 1991. 'The Democratic Moment.' *Journal of Democracy*
- Mechkova, Lührmann, Lindberg. 2017. 'How Much Democratic Backsliding?' *Journal of Democracy*
- Plattner. 2017. 'Liberal Democracy's Fading Allure.' *Journal of Democracy*

Further reading:

- Fukuyama. 1989. 'The End of History?' *The National Interest*
- Huntington. 1991. 'Democracy's Third Wave.' *Journal of Democracy*
- Linz and Stepan. 1996. 'Toward Consolidated Democracies.' *Journal of Democracy*
- Plattner. 2015. 'Is Democracy in Decline?' *Journal of Democracy*
- Fukuyama. 2015. 'Why is Democracy Performing So Poorly?' *Journal of Democracy*
- Lindberg. 2018. 'The Nature of Democratic Backsliding in Europe.' Carnegie Europe, <https://carnegieeurope.eu/2018/07/24/nature-of-democratic-backsliding-in-europe-pub-76868>
- Freedom House. 2016. 'Anxious Dictators, Wavering Democracies: Global Freedom under Pressure'. https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/FH_FITW_Report_2016.pdf
- *The Economist*. 2014. '[What's Gone Wrong With Democracy?](#)'

Week 2: Conceptualising democracy and autocracy

Required reading:

- Schmitter and Karl. 1991. 'What Democracy is ... And is Not.' *Journal of Democracy*
- Levitsky and Way. 2002. 'The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism' *Journal of Democracy*
- Ezrow and Frantz. 2011. *Dictators and Dictatorships: Understanding Authoritarian Regimes and Their Leaders*, ch. 1
- Examine Freedom House democracy index (<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2017>) and methodology (<https://freedomhouse.org/report/methodology-freedom-world-2017>)

Further reading:

- Haerpfer et al. (eds). 2009. *Democratization*, chs. 2, 3 & 10
- Dahl. 2005. 'What Political Institutions Does Large-Scale Democracy Require?' *Political Science Quarterly*
- Brownlee. 2009. 'Portents of Pluralism: How Hybrid Regimes Affect Democratic Transitions.' *American Journal of Political Science*
- Gandhi and Lust-Okar. 2009. 'Elections Under Authoritarianism.' *Annual Review of Political Science*
- Pepinsky. 2014. 'The Institutional Turn in Comparative Authoritarianism.' *British Journal of Political Science*
- Morse. 2012. 'The Era of Electoral Authoritarianism.' *World Politics*
- Magaloni and Kricheli. 2010. 'Political Order and One-Party Rule.' *Annual Review of Political Science*
- Collier and Levitsky. 1997. 'Democracy with Adjectives – Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research.' *World Politics*
- O'Donnell. 1994. 'Delegative Democracy?' *Journal of Democracy*
- Coppedge and Gerring. 2011. 'Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: A New Approach.' *Perspectives on Politics*
- V-Dem Institute. 2018. 'Democracy for All? – The V-Dem Annual Democracy Report 2018,' https://www.v-dem.net/media/filer_public/3f/19/3f19efc9-e25f-4356-b159-b5c0ec894115/v-dem_democracy_report_2018.pdf
- Munck and Verkuilen. 2002. 'Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy: Evaluating Alternative Indices.' *Comparative Political Studies*
- Coppedge. 2002. 'Democracy and Dimensions: Comments on Munck and Verkuilen.' *Comparative Political Studies*
- Elkins. 2000. 'Gradations of Democracy? Empirical Tests of Alternative Conceptualizations.' *American Journal of Political Science*
- Collier and Adcock. 1999. 'Democracy and Dichotomies: A Pragmatic Approach to Choices about Concepts.' *Annual Review of Political Science*
- Clark, Golder and Golder. 2013. *Principles of Comparative Politics*, 2nd ed., ch. 5
- Bogaards. 2012. 'Where to Draw the Line? From Degree to Dichotomy in Measures of Democracy.' *Democratization*
- Coppedge, Alvarez and Maldonado. 2008. 'Two Persistent Dimensions of Democracy: Contestation and Inclusiveness.' *Journal of Politics*
- Alvarez, Cheibub, Limongi and Przeworski. 1996. 'Classifying Political Regimes.' *Studies In Comparative International Development*

Week 3: Approaches: Structure vs Agency; Elites vs Masses

Required reading:

- Przeworski and Limongi. 1997. 'Modernization: Theories and Facts.' *World Politics*
- Huntington. 1991. 'How Countries Democratize.' *Political Science Quarterly*
- Wood. 2001. 'An Insurgent Path to Democracy: Popular Mobilization, Economic Interests, and Regime Transition in South Africa and El Salvador.' *Comparative Political Studies*

Further reading:

- Wucherpfennig and Deutsch. 2009. 'Modernization and Democracy: Theories and Evidence Revisited.' *Living Reviews in Democracy*
- Clark, Golder and Golder. 2013. *Principles of Comparative Politics*, 2nd ed., pp. 171-184
- Przeworski, et al. 2000. *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950-1990*
- Boix and Stokes. 2003. 'Endogenous Democratization.' *World Politics*
- Svobik. 2008. 'Authoritarian Reversals and Democratic Consolidation.' *American Political Science Review*
- Acemoglu, et al. 2008. 'Income and Democracy.' *American Economic Review*
- O'Donnell, Schmitter and Whitehead. 1986. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*
- Huntington. 1991. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*
- Wood. 2000. *Forging Democracy from Below: Insurgent Transitions in South Africa and El Salvador*
- Schock. 2005. *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies*
- Haerpfer et al. (eds). 2009. *Democratization*, ch. 12
- Bermeo. 1997. 'Myths of Moderation: Confrontation and Conflict during Democratic Transitions.' *Comparative Politics*
- Della Porta and Rossi. 2013. "Democratization and Democratic Transition," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*
- Way. 2014. 'Civil Society and Democratization.' *Journal of Democracy*
- Tucker. 2007. 'Enough! Electoral Fraud, Collective Action Problems, and Post-Communist Colored Revolutions.' *Perspectives on Politics*
- Lansky and Suthers. 2013. 'Outlawing the Opposition.' *Journal of Democracy*
- Kalandadze and Orenstein. 2009. 'Electoral Protests and Democratization. Beyond the Color Revolutions.' *Comparative Political Studies*
- Güneş. 2012. 'Democracy Promotion, Authoritarian Resiliency, and Political Unrest in Iran'. *Democratization*
- Brownlee, Masoud and Reynolds. 2013. 'Tracking the 'Arab Spring': Why the Modest Harvest?' *Journal of Democracy*
- Teorell. 2010. *Determinants of Democratization: Explaining Regime Change in the World, 1972-2006*, ch. 5

Week 4: Economic Origins

Required reading:

- Huber, Rueschemeyer and Stephens. 1993. 'The Impact of Economic Development on Democracy.' *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*
- Acemoglu and Robinson. 2006. *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, ch. 2

Further reading:

- Moore. 1966. *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*
- Skocpol. 1973. 'A Critical Review of Barrington Moore's Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy.' *Politics and Society*
- Teorell. 2010. *Determinants of Democratization: Explaining Regime Change in the World, 1972-2006*, ch. 3
- Haggard and Kaufman. 1995. *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions*
- Ziblatt. 2006. 'How Did Europe Democratize?' *World Politics*
- Collier. 1999. *Paths Toward Democracy*
- Luebbert. 1991. *Liberalism, Fascism, or Social Democracy: Social Classes and the Political Origins of Regimes in Interwar Europe*
- Acemoglu and Robinson. 2000. 'Why Did the West Extend the Franchise?' *Quarterly Journal of Economics*
- Houle. 2009. 'Inequality and Democracy: Why Inequality Harms Consolidation but Does Not Affect Democratization'. *World Politics*
- Freeman and Quinn. 2012. 'The Economic Origins of Democracy Reconsidered.' *American Political Science Review*

Week 5: The Resource Curse

Required reading:

- Bates. 1991. 'The Economics of Transitions to Democracy.' *PS: Political Science and Politics*
- Ross. 2013. *The Oil Curse: How Petroleum Wealth Shapes the Development of Nations*, chs. 1 & 3 [ch.1 here: <http://assets.press.princeton.edu/chapters/s9686.pdf>]

Further reading:

- Ross. 2001. 'Does Oil Hinder Democracy?' *World Politics*
- Clark, Golder and Golder. 2013. *Principles of Comparative Politics*, 2nd ed., pp. 185-203
- Jensen and Wantchekon. 2004. 'Resource Wealth and Political Regimes in Africa.' *Comparative Political Studies*
- Ulfelder. 2007. 'Natural Resource Wealth and the Survival of Autocracies.' *Comparative Political Studies*
- Dunning. 2008. *Crude Democracy: Natural Resource Wealth and Political Regimes*
- Diamond. 2010. 'Why Are There No Arab Democracies?' *Journal of Democracy*
- Haber and Menaldo. 2011. 'Do Natural Resources Fuel Authoritarianism? A Reappraisal of the Resource Curse.' *American Political Science Review*
- Ahmadov. 2014. 'Oil, Democracy, and Context: A Meta-Analysis.' *Comparative Political Studies*
- Ross. 2015. 'What Have We Learned about the Resource Curse?' *Annual Review of Political Science*
- Boix. 2003. *Democracy and Redistribution*, ch. 1
- North and Weingast. 1989. 'Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutions Governing Public Choice in Seventeenth-Century England.' *The Journal of Economic History*
- Kiser and Barzel. 1991. 'The Origins of Democracy in England.' *Rationality and Society*
- Tilly. 1992. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990–1992*

Week 6: Culture and Religion

Required reading:

- Lust. 2011. 'Missing the Third Wave: Islam, Institutions, and Democracy in the Middle East.' *Studies in Comparative International Development*
- Inglehart and Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*, pp. 1-5 & 149-172

Further reading:

- Inglehart and Norris. 2003. 'The True Clash of Civilizations?' *Foreign Policy*
- Fish. 2002. 'Islam and Authoritarianism.' *World Politics*
- Donno and Russett. 2004. 'Islam, Authoritarianism, and Female Empowerment: What Are the Linkages?' *World Politics*
- Ross. 2008. 'Oil, Islam, and Women.' *American Political Science Review*
- Hofmann. 2004. 'Islam and Democracy: Micro-Level Indications of Compatibility.' *Comparative Political Studies*
- Tessler. 2002. 'Islam and Democracy in the Middle East: The Impact of Religious Orientations on Attitudes toward Democracy in Four Arab Countries.' *Comparative Politics*
- Rose. 2002. 'How Muslims View Democracy: Evidence from Central Asia.' *Journal of Democracy*
- Clark, Golder and Golder. 2013. *Principles of Comparative Politics, 2nd ed.*, pp. 213-259.
- Inglehart and Welzel. 2005. *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*
- Inglehart and Welzel. 2009. 'How Development Leads to Democracy: What We Know About Modernization.' *Foreign Affairs*
- Muller and Seligson. 1994. 'Civic Culture and Democracy: The Question of Causal Relationships.' *American Political Science Review*
- Hadenius and Teorell. 2005. 'Cultural and Economic Prerequisites of Democracy: Reassessing Recent Evidence.' *Studies in Comparative International Development*
- Welzel. 2013. *Freedom Rising*
- Inglehart and Norris. 2017. 'Trump and the Populist Authoritarian Parties: The Silent Revolution in Reverse.' *Perspectives on Politics*

Week 7: Public Support

Required reading:

- Claassen. 2019. 'Does Public Support Help Democracy Survive?'
- Foa and Mounk. 2016. 'The Danger of Deconsolidation: The Democratic Disconnect.' *Journal of Democracy*

Further reading:

- Foa and Mounk. 2017. 'The Signs of Deconsolidation.' *Journal of Democracy*
- Online Exchange on 'Democratic Deconsolidation' (Foa and Mounk 2016, 2017), *Journal of Democracy*, <https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/online-exchange-%E2%80%9Cdemocratic-deconsolidation%E2%80%9D>
- Mattes. 2018. 'Support for Democracy.' *Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Politics*
- Claassen. 2019. 'In the Mood for Democracy? Democratic Support as Thermostatic Opinion.'
- Rose, Mishler and Haerpfer. 1998. *Democracy and its Alternatives: Understanding Post-Communist Societies*.
- Norris. 2011. *Democratic Deficit: Critical Citizens Revisited*
- Norris (ed.). 1999. *Critical Citizens: Global Support for Democratic Governance*
- Dalton. 2004. *Democratic Challenges, Democratic Choices: The Erosion of Political Support in Advanced Industrial Democracies*
- Booth and Seligson. 2009. *The Legitimacy Puzzle in Latin America: Political Support and Democracy in Eight Nations*
- Mattes and Bratton. 2007. 'Learning about Democracy in Africa: Awareness, Performance, and Experience.' *American Journal of Political Science*
- Inglehart. 2003. 'How Solid is Mass Support for Democracy: And How Can We Measure It?' *PS: Political Science and Politics*

Week 8: Media

Required reading:

- Jebri, Stetka, and Loveless. 2013. 'Media and Democratisation: What is Known about the Role of Mass Media in Transitions to Democracy.' Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, University of Oxford, <https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:5898ac0d-8834-4d99-9939-4454b70828a7>
- Tucker, Theocharis, Roberts, and Barberá. 2017. 'From Liberation to Turmoil: Social Media And Democracy.' *Journal of Democracy*

Further reading:

- Graber. 2003. 'The Media and Democracy: Beyond Myths and Stereotypes.' *Annual Review of Political Science*
- Sunstein. 2017. *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Princeton University Press (ch. 1 here: <http://assets.press.princeton.edu/chapters/s10935.pdf>)
- McConnell and Becker. 2002. 'The Role of the Media in Democratization.' http://www.grady.uga.edu/coxcenter/activities/Act_2001_to_2002/Materials01-02/DemocratizationIAMCRJuly2002.pdf
- Vosoughi, Roy, and Aral. 2018. 'The Spread of True and False News Online.' *Science*
- Lazer, et al. 2018. 'The Science of Fake News.' *Science*

Week 9: International Forces

Required reading:

- Levitsky and Way. 2006. 'Linkage versus Leverage: Rethinking the International Dimension of Regime Change.' *Comparative Politics*
- Pevehouse. 2005. *Democracy from Above: Regional Organizations and Democratization*, ch. 2.

Further reading:

- Haerpfer et al. (eds). 2009. *Democratization*, ch. 7
- Starr. 1991. 'Democratic Dominoes: Diffusion Approaches to the Spread of Democracy in the International System.' *Journal of Conflict Resolution*
- Brinks and Coppedge. 2006. 'Diffusion is No Illusion: Neighbor Emulation in the Third Wave of Democracy.' *Comparative Political Studies*
- Gleditsch and Ward. 2006. 'Diffusion and the International Context of Democratization.' *International Organization*
- Leeson and Dean. 2009. 'The Democratic Domino Theory: An Empirical Investigation.' *American Journal of Political Science*
- Pevehouse. 2002. 'Democracy from the Outside-In? International Organizations and Democratization.' *International Organization*
- Mansfield and Pevehouse. 2006. 'Democratization and International Organizations.' *International Organization*
- Donno. 2010. 'Who Is Punished? Regional Intergovernmental Organizations and the Enforcement of Democratic Norms.' *International Organization*
- Carothers. 1999. *Aiding Democracy Abroad*.
- Carothers. 2004. *Critical Mission: Essays on Democracy Promotion*.
- Knack. 2004. 'Does Foreign Aid Promote Democracy?' *International Studies Quarterly*
- Kopstein. 2006. 'The Transatlantic Divide over Democracy Promotion.' *The Washington Quarterly*
- Finkel, Perez-Linan and Seligson. 2007. 'The Effects of U.S. Foreign Assistance on Democracy Building, 1990-2003.' *World Politics*
- Orenstein and Schmitz. 2007. 'The New Transnationalism and Comparative Politics' *Comparative Politics*
- Wright. 2009. 'How Foreign Aid Can Foster Democratization in Authoritarian Regimes.' *American Journal of Political Science*
- Carnegie and Marinov. 2017. 'Foreign Aid, Human Rights, and Democracy Promotion: Evidence from a Natural Experiment.' *American Journal of Political Science*