

## Electoral Populism and Democratic Governance in Indian States: Boon or Bane?

**Subham Tripathy**

UGC Senior Research Fellow (SRF), School of Political Science, Gangadhar Meher  
University, Sambalpur, Odisha

### **Abstract:**

Electoral populism has emerged as a defining feature of democratic politics in several Indian states, with political parties increasingly relying on welfare schemes and freebie policies to attract and retain voter support. This paper examines the impact of such populist practices on democratic governance, exploring whether they serve as a boon that enhances social welfare and political inclusion or a bane that undermines fiscal responsibility and long-term policy planning. The study adopts a qualitative approach, drawing on secondary sources including government reports, policy documents, scholarly articles, and media analyses. A comparative case study method is used to analyze specific examples from Tamil Nadu, Telangana, and Delhi—states that have witnessed the widespread use of populist welfare measures such as subsidized electricity, direct cash transfers, and social welfare programs. The findings suggest that while electoral populism can promote immediate socio-economic benefits, alleviate poverty, and foster political participation among marginalized communities, it also poses significant challenges to democratic governance. These challenges include fiscal stress on state economies, the entrenchment of vote-bank politics, and the erosion of policy-based decision-making processes. The paper highlights the fine balance required between delivering welfare and maintaining democratic accountability, offering policy recommendations to ensure that populist initiatives contribute to sustainable and inclusive development without compromising the integrity of democratic institutions.

**Keywords:** Electoral Populism, Democratic Governance, Welfare Politics, Indian States, Vote-Bank Politics

### **Introduction:**

The rise of populism has become a prominent global phenomenon, reshaping political landscapes across diverse regions (Guriev & Papaioannou, 2022). The recent electoral successes of populist movements suggest that a re-evaluation of our understanding of global and domestic institutions is required (Devinney & Hartwell, 2020). Populism is often conceptualized as a discourse emerging in response to transformations in state-society relations and the norms of statehood. It frequently arises from a perceived disconnect between internationalized elites and the general populace, capitalizing on material and cultural anxieties (Chryssogelos, 2018).

Populism is often described as a thin ideology (Ivaldi et al., 2017), characterized by an "us versus them" mentality, where "the people" are pitted against a corrupt elite and dangerous "others" (Wojczewski, 2019). This framework allows populist leaders to claim they represent the true interests of the sovereign people, often emphasizing national sovereignty and a

rejection of globalization. However, the specific manifestations of populism vary significantly, shaped by the thicker ideological traditions with which it interacts (Ivaldi et al., 2017). These variations can be observed across the left-right spectrum, with different populist parties emphasizing different aspects of society and employing distinct strategies (Devinney & Hartwell, 2020).

Comparative studies of populism have become increasingly common, moving beyond the traditional focus on Latin America. This comparative approach has led to the development of ideational conceptualizations of populism, drawing on discursive theories. These conceptualizations emphasize the importance of understanding populism as a specific type of political discourse, rather than solely as a structural, economic, or political-strategic phenomenon (Hawkins & Kaltwasser, 2017).

The study of populism in international relations (IR) is a growing area of research, seeking to understand the international dimensions of this phenomenon (Wojczewski, 2019). While much of the existing literature focuses on Europe, it is crucial to examine populism in the Global South to gain a more comprehensive understanding of its global implications. Factors such as a country's status-seeking behaviour and its embeddedness in international institutions can mitigate the effects of populism (Destradi & Plagemann, 2019).

In the Indian context, populism is often intertwined with Hindu nationalism, with leaders like Narendra Modi employing discursive strategies to construct a "people versus elite" antagonism (Wojczewski, 2019). This involves the use of cultural symbols and historical narratives to create a sense of national identity and to differentiate "the people" from "others" (Saleem et al., 2022). Populist leaders in India often leverage ethno-religious tensions and attempt to delegitimize independent news media, portraying them as enemies of the people (Rogenhofer & Panievsky, 2020).

The rise of populism in India can also be understood in relation to broader processes of state transformation and internationalization. As elites become increasingly insulated from popular scrutiny, populist movements can emerge to challenge the status quo and claim to represent the "real people". This is achieved by articulating social demands in a way that challenges the perceived universality of internationalization (Chryssogelos, 2018).

However, the concept of populism remains contested, and its application to specific cases requires careful consideration. It is important to avoid conflating populism with other political ideologies, such as nationalism or authoritarianism, although these can often overlap (Chryssogelos, 2017). Populist leaders may also adopt seemingly contradictory positions, such as protectionism in trade while simultaneously pursuing trade deals that favour their interests.

The relationship between populism and neoliberalism is also complex and multifaceted. Some scholars argue that populism can be seen as a reaction against the negative consequences of neoliberal policies, such as increased inequality and economic insecurity (Flew & Iosifidis, 2019). Others suggest that populist leaders may, in fact, continue to implement neoliberal policies while couching their rhetoric in nationalist terms (Arsel et al., 2021). It is also observed that the current infatuation of civil society is accompanied by alarming increases in civic strife,

escalation in war, and reports of dramatic growth in countries of domestic violence, rape, child abuse, and prison populations (Comaroff et al., 2001).

The study of local governance and participation provides insights into the dynamics of populism at the subnational level. Decentralization initiatives, often associated with neoliberal reforms, can create opportunities for both democratic engagement and elite capture. The interplay between participation, partnership, and political leadership is crucial in shaping the outcomes of these initiatives (Guarneros-Meza & Geddes, 2010).

The impact of populism on democratic governance is a central concern for scholars and policymakers (Lee, 2019). While populism can potentially enhance political inclusion and challenge established power structures, it also carries risks of eroding democratic norms and institutions (Lee, 2019a). Populist leaders may undermine independent judiciaries, curtail civil liberties, and engage in practices that undermine the fairness of elections (Voeten, 2019).

The role of social media in the rise of populism is another important area of inquiry. Social media platforms can provide populist leaders with direct access to their supporters, bypassing traditional media outlets. However, this can also contribute to the spread of misinformation and the polarization of public discourse (Flew & Iosifidis, 2019).

#### **Research Gap:**

- Limited research on how populism affects democratic governance in specific Indian states.
- Existing studies focus mostly on national-level populism in India.
- Economic impacts of populist policies are underexplored, especially on fiscal sustainability and development.
- Need for comparative research across global regions to understand diverse forms of populism.
- Civil society's role in resisting or supporting populism is not well understood.

#### **Research Questions:**

- How has electoral populism evolved in Indian states over time?
- What types of populist schemes are implemented by state governments, and what are their goals?
- What are the positive and negative impacts of these schemes on welfare, inclusion, fiscal health, and accountability?
- Is state-level populism a boon or bane for democracy, and what policy solutions can address its drawbacks?

#### **Research Objectives:**

- Review literature on populism and democratic governance, with focus on India.
- Identify trends and patterns of populist politics in Indian states.
- Examine how state governments promote welfare populism, using case studies.
- Assess how populist schemes affect governance outcomes—positively and negatively.
- Offer policy recommendations for sustainable, accountable governance.

**Methodology:**

- Qualitative Analysis
- Data used from literature, policies, and media sources.
- Case studies of selected Indian states for in-depth insights.
- Analysis based on comparative political economy and institutional theory.

**Conceptual Understanding of Populism and Democratic Governance:**

Populism has become a prominent feature of contemporary politics, demanding a clear conceptual understanding, especially within the context of electoral democracies and its distinction from welfare policies. This section aims to define populism, explore its manifestations within the Indian context, and differentiate it from welfare to provide a robust framework for analysing its impact on democratic governance.

**Defining Populism in Electoral Democracies:**

Defining populism is a complex task due to its varied interpretations and manifestations. Scholars often describe it as a "thin ideology" (Ivaldi et al., 2017), characterized by a few core tenets. At its heart, populism posits a dichotomy between "the people" and "the elite" (Kübler & Kriesi, 2017; De Cleen et al., 2018; Havlík & Voda, 2018), where "the people" are portrayed as virtuous and homogeneous, and "the elite" are seen as corrupt and self-serving. This division is central to the populist narrative. Populism asserts that the will of the people should be the primary basis of political legitimacy (Kübler & Kriesi, 2017b; Havlík & Voda, 2018)).

Populist leaders often claim to represent the "true" interests of the sovereign people, setting themselves apart from traditional political actors. This claim often involves a rejection of pluralism and a belief that there is a single, unified "popular will" (Destradi & Plagemann, 2019). Populism can be understood as a political logic that can be invoked for different goals across the political spectrum (Cleen et al., 2018), from the radical left to the right. This makes it a versatile tool. The rise of populism can be seen as a response to the perceived failures of established political systems to address the needs and grievances of ordinary citizens (Kübler & Kriesi, 2017).

Populist movements often arise during times of crisis or rapid social and economic change (Chacko & Jayasuriya, 2018; Moffitt, 2014), when people feel that their concerns are not being adequately represented by mainstream parties. These movements can take various forms, ranging from charismatic leaders mobilizing mass constituencies to the development of organized parties that seek to capture state power (Rakhmani & Saraswati, 2021). The success of populist parties in electoral democracies has raised concerns about their impact on democratic norms and institutions (Rensmann et al., 2017; Albertazzi & Mueller, 2013).

**Populism in the Indian Context:**

In India, populism has deep historical roots and contemporary relevance. The rise of populist politics in India is shaped by its unique socio-political context, characterized by deep social divisions, economic inequality, and a complex interplay of identity politics (Rogenhofer & Panievsky, 2020; Margiansyah, 2019). Populist leaders in India often employ rhetoric of nationalism and social justice (Margiansyah, 2019), appealing to the sentiments of the masses

while contrasting themselves with conventional politicians. The success of Narendra Modi exemplifies this trend, with his emphasis on anti-elitism and direct communication with the public (Plagemann & Destradi, 2018)

However, populism in India is not a monolithic phenomenon. Different populist leaders and parties may draw upon different ideological traditions and appeal to different segments of the population. For example, some populist movements may focus on religious or ethnic identity (Rogenhofer & Panievsky, 2020b; Rakhmani & Saraswati, 2021), while others may prioritize economic issues and social welfare (Havlik & Voda, 2018). The role of the political campaign industry in mobilizing narratives and electoral discourses is also significant in the Indian context. These campaigns often rely on mass media and cyber armies to shape public opinion and manufacture allegiance (Rakhmani & Saraswati, 2021).

The intersection of populism with authoritarian tendencies is a growing concern in India (Rakhmani & Saraswati, 2021d; Khaitan, 2020). Some scholars argue that populist leaders may undermine democratic institutions and civil rights in their pursuit of power (Bugaric, 2019). This can manifest in the form of executive aggrandizement, erosion of democratic accountability, and the suppression of dissent (Guasti, 2020; Khaitan, 2020). The use of divisive hyper-nationalism to brand opponents as traitors is also a characteristic of authoritarian populism in India (Khaitan, 2020).

### **Populism vs. Welfare: Drawing the Line:**

While populism often involves promises of enhanced welfare and social justice, it is crucial to distinguish it from genuine welfare policies. Welfare policies are typically based on universal rights and aim to provide a safety net for all citizens (Haque, 2000; (Demirguc-Kunt & Klapper, 2012). In contrast, populist schemes are often targeted at specific groups and are designed to cultivate political support rather than address fundamental social needs. The focus on short-term gains and electoral benefits can undermine the long-term sustainability and effectiveness of these schemes (Guasti, 2020).

Populist welfare measures can also lead to fiscal stress and economic instability (Guasti, 2020), as they may not be based on sound economic principles or sustainable financing mechanisms. Furthermore, the emphasis on direct distribution of benefits can erode democratic accountability and promote clientelism (Ádám, 2019), where citizens become dependent on the state for their well-being and are less likely to hold their leaders accountable. Distinguishing populism from welfare requires careful analysis of the motivations behind policy decisions, the targeting of benefits, and the long-term consequences for democratic governance and economic sustainability.

In conclusion, understanding populism in electoral democracies, particularly within the Indian context, requires a nuanced approach. By defining its core characteristics, recognizing its diverse manifestations, and differentiating it from genuine welfare policies, it becomes possible to assess its impact on democratic governance and identify potential risks and opportunities.

### **Electoral Populism in Indian States- Trends and Patterns:**

The rise of populism in Indian states represents a significant shift in the political landscape, characterized by policies and schemes designed to appeal directly to the masses (Guriev & Papaioannou, 2022). This trend is not unique to India; populism has seen a global resurgence, challenging established political norms and institutions (Devinney & Hartwell, 2020). In the Indian context, this has manifested in various forms, often intertwined with welfare policies and electoral strategies. Understanding the trends and patterns of electoral populism in Indian states requires examining the factors driving its emergence, the role of state governments, and specific examples of populist schemes.

Several factors have contributed to the rise of populist politics in Indian states. Persistent poverty and economic disparities in many regions create fertile ground for populist leaders who promise quick solutions and direct benefits to the marginalized (Rodríguez-Pose, 2017). The promise of addressing these inequalities resonates with voters who feel left behind by mainstream economic development. Moreover, a perceived disconnect between the ruling elite and the common people fuels anti-establishment sentiments, which populist leaders effectively exploit (Ivaldi et al., 2017). This anti-elitism is a core component of populism, where leaders claim to represent the "true" interests of the sovereign people against a corrupt or indifferent elite. The rise of Hindu nationalism has also contributed to the increase in populism (Basu, 2018).

State governments in India play a crucial role in promoting what can be termed "welfare populism." This involves implementing schemes that provide direct benefits to voters, such as subsidized food, free electricity, or cash transfers (Mooij, 1998). While these schemes are often framed as measures to alleviate poverty and promote social welfare, they also serve as effective tools for gaining electoral support. The political economy of the Public Distribution System (PDS) in India exemplifies this dynamic, with state governments using food subsidies to enhance their popularity. However, there are contradictory tendencies, with economic rationalization pushing in different directions. The latter tendency is so strong that drastic curtailment of the program is unlikely (Mooij, 1998).

Several Indian states offer notable examples of populist schemes. Tamil Nadu has long been known for its extensive welfare programs, including subsidized food, free laptops for students, and marriage assistance schemes (Joshi, 2012). These initiatives have contributed to the state's relatively high human development indicators, but also raised concerns about fiscal sustainability. Telangana has implemented schemes such as the "Rythu Bandhu" program, which provides direct cash transfers to farmers, and the "Aasara" pension scheme for elderly and disabled individuals. These schemes have proven popular among voters, but have also increased the state's debt burden. Delhi's Aam Aadmi Party (AAP) has gained prominence through its focus on providing subsidized water, electricity, and free healthcare services. While these measures have improved access to essential services for many residents, they have also sparked debates about the long-term financial implications and the potential for creating a culture of dependency.

These examples highlight the complex interplay between electoral populism and democratic governance in Indian states. While populist schemes can deliver tangible benefits to citizens and enhance political inclusion, they also pose risks to fiscal stability, democratic

accountability, and long-term policy planning. Understanding these trends and patterns is crucial for assessing the overall impact of populism on the quality of governance and the well-being of Indian states. The rise of right-wing leaders combining nationalist rhetoric and challenging the effects of neoliberalism is a global phenomenon (Kaul, 2017).

The increasing support for populists has been noted. Secular economic factors are related to cross-border trade automation. Studies connect the 2008-09 global financial crisis and subsequent austerity to the Great Depression. Identity politics, trust, and cultural backlash also play a role. Consequences include growth, immigration, and refugee crises, with a gap between perceptions and reality regarding immigration. The impact of the internet and social media is also a factor (Guriev & Papaioannou, 2022).

### **Impact of Populist Schemes on Democratic Governance:**

Populist schemes in Indian states present a complex duality, yielding both positive outcomes that bolster democratic governance and negative consequences that undermine its foundations. Assessing whether these schemes are ultimately a boon or a bane requires a nuanced understanding of their multifaceted impacts.

#### **Positive Outcomes (Boon):**

- **Welfare Delivery and Poverty Alleviation:**

One of the most significant positive impacts of populist schemes is their potential to enhance welfare delivery and alleviate poverty. By directly targeting marginalized populations with specific benefits, these schemes can address immediate needs and improve living standards. For instance, the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) in Andhra Pradesh demonstrated the capacity of the Indian state to deliver economic rights to the rural poor (Mukherji et al., 2018). This scheme provided employment and income, contributing to poverty reduction and improved livelihoods in the region. Direct welfare measures can increase security at both the national and household level (Mooij, 1998).

Moreover, targeted programs can be more effective in reaching vulnerable groups compared to broader, universal approaches. When designed and implemented effectively, populist schemes can act as a safety net, providing essential support to those who need it most.

- **Political Inclusion and Electoral Participation:**

Populist schemes can also foster political inclusion and increase electoral participation among previously marginalized groups. By directly addressing the needs and concerns of these populations, such schemes can empower them and encourage their engagement in the democratic process. When citizens perceive that the government is responsive to their needs, they are more likely to participate in elections and other forms of political activity.

However, it's important to note that the link between welfare and political participation is not always straightforward. While some studies suggest that targeted programs can increase political engagement, others have found that clientelistic practices can undermine genuine participation. The key lies in ensuring that populist schemes are implemented in a transparent

and accountable manner, empowering citizens rather than simply making them dependent on the state.

### **Negative Consequences (Bane):**

- **Fiscal Stress and Economic Sustainability:**

Despite their potential benefits, populist schemes can also have negative consequences for democratic governance, particularly in terms of fiscal stress and economic sustainability. The implementation of such schemes often requires significant financial resources, which can strain state budgets and lead to increased debt. If not managed carefully, this can result in a reduction in public investment in other essential sectors, such as education, healthcare, and infrastructure.

Moreover, the long-term economic sustainability of populist schemes is often questionable. Many of these schemes rely on subsidies and other forms of financial assistance, which may not be sustainable in the long run. This can create a situation where states become dependent on populist measures to maintain political support, leading to a cycle of unsustainable spending and economic instability.

The contradictory tendencies between economic rationalization and populist politics can create challenges for policy implementation (Mooij, 1998). While economic rationalization might favor cutting down subsidies and reducing the state's responsibility, populist politics often pushes in the opposite direction, making drastic curtailment of programs unlikely.

- **Erosion of Democratic Accountability and Clientelism:**

Another significant concern is the potential for populist schemes to erode democratic accountability and promote clientelism. When these schemes are implemented in a non-transparent manner, they can become tools for political patronage, benefiting specific groups or individuals in exchange for political support. This can undermine the principles of fairness and equality, leading to a situation where access to public services is determined by political affiliation rather than need.

Clientelism reveals why the state often fails to deliver basic rights such as the right to work, health, and education (Mukherji et al., 2018). Patronage politics can distort the allocation of resources, diverting them away from essential services and towards politically connected individuals or groups. This can further exacerbate inequalities and undermine public trust in government.

The rise of populism can also lead to attempts to denigrate independent news media, portraying it as an "enemy of the people" ((Rogenhofer & Panievsky, 2020). Such actions undermine the media's ability to hold those in power accountable, further eroding democratic accountability.

- **Short-Termism in Governance and Policy Making:**

Populist politics often prioritize short-term gains over long-term planning, leading to short-termism in governance and policy making. In order to maintain political support, populist leaders may focus on implementing policies that provide immediate benefits to voters, even if these policies are not sustainable or beneficial in the long run. This can result in a neglect of

long-term challenges, such as climate change, infrastructure development, and economic diversification.

Furthermore, the focus on short-term gains can undermine the stability and predictability of the policy environment, making it difficult for businesses to invest and create jobs. This can have a negative impact on economic growth and development, ultimately harming the very people that populist schemes are intended to benefit.

The emphasis on quick results can also lead to a neglect of evidence-based policy making. Populist leaders may be more inclined to rely on intuition and anecdotal evidence rather than rigorous analysis, resulting in policies that are ineffective or even counterproductive.

### **Conclusion and Policy Recommendations:**

This article has explored the multifaceted relationship between electoral populism and democratic governance in Indian states. It has examined the rise of populist politics, the role of state governments in promoting welfare populism, and the impact of populist schemes, using case studies to illustrate key points. The analysis has considered both the positive outcomes, such as welfare delivery and political inclusion, and the negative consequences, including fiscal stress and erosion of democratic accountability.

Ultimately, whether electoral populism is a boon or bane for democratic governance in Indian states is a complex question with no simple answer. While populist schemes can provide immediate relief and enhance political participation, they also pose risks to long-term economic stability and democratic norms. The key lies in striking a balance between addressing the needs of the people and ensuring sustainable and accountable governance. Policy recommendations must focus on mitigating the negative consequences while harnessing the potential benefits of populist measures. States need to be aware of the potential for populism to lead to fiscal stress, and design policies that promote long-term economic sustainability. Furthermore, mechanisms for ensuring democratic accountability must be strengthened to prevent the erosion of governance standards. It's crucial to note that the impact of populism can vary significantly depending on the specific context and implementation.

### **References:**

1. Ádám, Z. (2019). Re-feudalizing democracy: an approach to authoritarian populism taken from institutional economics. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 16(1), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1744137419000304>
2. Albertazzi, D., & Mueller, S. (2013). Populism and liberal democracy: Populists in government in Austria, Italy, Poland and Switzerland. *Government and Opposition*, 48(3), 343–371. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2013.12>
3. Arsel, M., Adaman, F., & Saad-Filho, A. (2021). Authoritarian developmentalism: The latest stage of neoliberalism? *Geoforum*, 124, 261–266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.05.003>
4. Basu, A. (2018). Whither democracy, secularism, and minority rights in India? *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*, 16(4), 34–46. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15570274.2018.1535035>

5. Bugarič, B. (2019). Central Europe's descent into autocracy: A constitutional analysis of authoritarian populism. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 17(2), 597–616. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moz032>
6. Chacko, P., & Jayasuriya, K. (2018). Asia's conservative moment: understanding the rise of the right. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 48(4), 529–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2018.1448108>
7. Chrystosogelos, A. (2017). Populism in foreign policy. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.467>
8. Chrystosogelos, A. (2018). State transformation and populism: From the internationalized to the neo-sovereign state? *Politics*, 40(1), 22–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263395718803830>
9. Comaroff, J., Comaroff, J. L., & Weller, R. P. (2001). Millennial capitalism and the culture of neoliberalism. In *Duke University Press eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822380184>
10. De Cleen, B., Glynos, J., & Mondon, A. (2018). Critical research on populism: Nine rules of engagement. *Organization*, 25(5), 649–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508418768053>
11. Demirguc-Kunt, A., & Klapper, L. (2012). Measuring Financial Inclusion: The Global Findex database. In *World Bank policy research working paper*. <https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-6025>
12. Destradi, S., & Plagemann, J. (2019). Populism and International Relations: (Un)predictability, personalisation, and the reinforcement of existing trends in world politics. *Review of International Studies*, 45(5), 711–730. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210519000184>
13. Devinney, T. M., & Hartwell, C. A. (2020). Varieties of populism. *Global Strategy Journal*, 10(1), 32–66. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1373>
14. Flew, T., & Iosifidis, P. (2019). Populism, globalisation and social media. *International Communication Gazette*, 82(1), 7–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048519880721>
15. Guarneros-Meza, V., & Geddes, M. (2010). Local Governance and Participation under Neoliberalism: Comparative Perspectives. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 34(1), 115–129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2427.2010.00952.x>
16. Guasti, P. (2020). Populism in Power and democracy: Democratic Decay and Resilience in the Czech Republic (2013–2020). *Politics and Governance*, 8(4), 473–484. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v8i4.3420>
17. Guriev, S., & Papaioannou, E. (2022). The political economy of populism. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 60(3), 753–832. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20201595>
18. Haque, M. S. (2000). Significance of Accountability under the New Approach to Public Governance. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 66(4), 599–617. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852300664004>
19. Havlík, V., & Voda, P. (2018). Cleavages, protest or voting for hope? The rise of centrist populist parties in the Czech Republic. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 24(2), 161–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12299>

20. Hawkins, K. A., & Kaltwasser, C. R. (2017). The ideational approach to populism. *Latin American Research Review*, 52(4), 513–528. <https://doi.org/10.25222/larr.85>
21. Ivaldi, G., Lanzone, M. E., & Woods, D. (2017). Varieties of Populism across a Left-Right Spectrum: The Case of the Front National, the Northern League, Podemos and Five Star Movement. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 23(4), 354–376. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12278>
22. Joshi, D. K. (2012). The impact of India's regional parties on voter turnout and human development. *Journal of South Asian Development*, 7(2), 139–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0973174112466362>
23. Kaul, N. (2017). Rise of the political right in India: Hindutva-Development mix, Modi myth, and dualities. *Journal of Labor and Society*, 20(4), 523–548. <https://doi.org/10.1111/wusa.12318>
24. Khaitan, T. (2020). Killing a Constitution with a Thousand Cuts: Executive Aggrandizement and Party-state Fusion in India. *Law & Ethics of Human Rights*, 14(1), 49–95. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lehr-2020-2009>
25. Kübler, D., & Kriesi, H. (2017). How Globalisation and Mediatisation Challenge our Democracies. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 23(3), 231–245. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12265>
26. Lee, F. E. (2019). Populism and the American Party System: opportunities and constraints. *Perspectives on Politics*, 18(2), 370–388. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1537592719002664>
27. Margiansyah, D. (2019). Populisme di Indonesia Kontemporer: Transformasi Persaingan Populisme dan Konsekuensinya dalam Dinamika Kontestasi Politik Menjelang Pemilu 2019. *Deleted Journal*, 16(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.14203/jpp.v16i1.783>
28. Moffitt, B. (2014). How to Perform Crisis: A model for understanding the Key role of crisis in contemporary populism. *Government and Opposition*, 50(2), 189–217. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2014.13>
29. Mooij, J. (1998). Food policy and politics: The political economy of the public distribution system in India. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 25(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066159808438667>
30. Mukherji, R., Zarhani, S. H., & Raju, K. (2018). State capacity and welfare Politics in India: Implementing the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in undivided Andhra Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Human Development*, 12(2), 282–297. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0973703018794337>
31. Plagemann, J., & Destradi, S. (2018). Populism and foreign policy: The case of India. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 15(2), 283–301. <https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/ory010>
32. Rakhmani, I., & Saraswati, M. S. (2021). Authoritarian populism in Indonesia: The role of the political campaign industry in engineering consent and coercion. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 40(3), 436–460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034211027885>
33. Rensmann, L., De Lange, S. L., & Couperus, S. (2017). Editorial to the issue on populism and the remaking of (II)Liberal democracy in Europe. *Politics and Governance*, 5(4), 106–111. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v5i4.1328>

34. Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2017). The revenge of the places that don't matter (and what to do about it). *Cambridge Journal of Regions Economy and Society*, 11(1), 189–209. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjres/rsx024>
35. Rogenhofer, J. M., & Panievsky, A. (2020). Antidemocratic populism in power: comparing Erdoğan's Turkey with Modi's India and Netanyahu's Israel. *Democratization*, 27(8), 1394–1412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2020.1795135>
36. Saleem, R. M. A., Yilmaz, I., & Chacko, P. (2022). *Civilizationist populism in South Asia: Turning India saffron*. <https://doi.org/10.55271/pp0009>
37. Voeten, E. (2019). Populism and Backlashes against International Courts. *Perspectives on Politics*, 18(2), 407–422. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1537592719000975>
38. Wojczewski, T. (2019). Populism, Hindu Nationalism, and Foreign Policy in India: The Politics of Representing “the People.” *International Studies Review*, 22(3), 396–422. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viz007>