



E-ISSN: 2664-603X  
P-ISSN: 2664-6021  
Impact Factor (RJIF): 5.92  
IJPSG 2025; 7(9): 82-89  
[www.journalofpoliticalscience.com](http://www.journalofpoliticalscience.com)  
Received: 02-08-2025  
Accepted: 29-08-2025

**Dr. Rama Rao Bonagani**  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Public  
Administration and Policy  
Studies, Kauveri Block, School  
of Social Sciences, Central  
University of Kerala,  
Tejaswini Hills campus,  
Periyar, Kasaragod, Kerala,  
India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Rama Rao Bonagani**  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Public  
Administration and Policy  
Studies, Kauveri Block, School  
of Social Sciences, Central  
University of Kerala,  
Tejaswini Hills campus,  
Periyar, Kasaragod, Kerala,  
India

## Assessment of public administration under the authoritarian regimes: An analysis

**Rama Rao Bonagani**

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.33545/26646021.2025.v7.i9b.667>

### Abstract

Authoritarianism is a form of government characterized by the rejection of political plurality, the use of a strong central power to preserve the political status quo and reductions in the rule of law, separation of powers, and democratic voting. Political scientists have created many typologies describing variations of authoritarian forms of government. Authoritarian regimes may be either autocratic or oligarchic in nature and may be based upon the rule of a party or the military. Whereas, Public administration is the implementation of its government policy and also an academic discipline that studies this implementation. Public administrators of both political and administrative executives are the public employees working in public departments and agencies at all levels of the government in a state. This article has investigated the status of practical public administration in the selected 10 cross sectional authoritarian regimes countries.

**Keywords:** Authoritarian, regime, administration, governance, democratic, assessment

### 1. Introduction

The democratization is the process where by a country adopts a democratic regime. The democratization is a relatively recent phenomenon. A wave of democratization is defined as a group of transitions from non democratic to democratic regimes that occurs within a specified period and that significantly out numbers transitions in the opposite direction. If we see the trends of democratization in the world, it revealed that during the so called first wave of democratization happened between 1893 and 1924, countries such as New Zealand, Australia, United States of America (USA) and many countries in western Europe made a transition to democracy. The regime changes to authoritarianism during the 2<sup>nd</sup> reverse wave after 1924 reflected the rise of ideologies of communism and fascism (Renske Doorenspleet 2008, p.289) <sup>[1]</sup>.

A second short wave began after the world war II (01 September 1939 to 02 September 1945) and continued until approximately 1960. The won allied occupation promoted an installation of democratic institutions in west Germany, Japan and Finland. The countries such as Costa Rica, Chile and Uruguay were the Latin American states that were also adopted a democratic system during this period. There was no clear second reverse wave, but the 1960s and 1970s can better be described as an intermezzo in which transitions to both non democratic and democratic regimes have occurred. In this period for an example, Colombia and Venezuela became democratic countries. By contrast, the polarized Chilean democracy was over thrown by a military coup led in 1973 by General Augusto Pinochet (1915-2006). The military coups in Uruguay and Argentina ended democracy in these two countries as well (Renske Doorenspleet 2008, p.289) <sup>[1]</sup>.

The third wave began at Southern Europe in the 1970s in the countries of Portugal, Greece and Spain. Then it spread to Latin America countries such as Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, El Salvador, Uruguay, Honduras and Brazil. This wave of democratization also affected some Asian countries in the late 1980s such as the Philippines and South Korea. The so called 4<sup>th</sup> wave since 1989 was overwhelming and global. At an end of the 1980s, the wave swept through Eastern Europe. But the 1990s saw a widespread rapid collapse of non-democratic regimes in Africa and more than a dozen democracies emerged. The decade after the cold war was a fruitful period for democratization around the world.

Nevertheless, many countries remained authoritarian (Renske Doorenspleet 2008, p.289) <sup>[1]</sup>.

The present so called fifth wave has started in the year 2021 in a different way. When the G7 countries such as USA, United Kingdom(UK), Germany, France, Canada, Italy as well as Japan issued a statement in their G7 summit and in that statement it was mentioned that “We are at a critical juncture, facing threats to freedom and democracy from rising authoritarianism, electoral interference, corruption, economic coercion, manipulation of information, including disinformation, online harms and cyber attacks, politically motivated Internet shutdowns, human rights violations and abuses, terrorism and violent extremism,” declared the statement, which was referring to the problems facing the democratic world(The Hindu e-paper, 15<sup>th</sup> June 2021).

However, India is one of guest countries of the G7. The rest of guest countries include Australia, South Korea and South Africa. India is a largest democratic country and its Prime Minister Mr. Narendra Modi at G7 through the virtual meet said that “Fight against authoritarianism, extremism”. Moreover, Mr. Modi said that India is a “natural ally” to work with the world’s richest G7 countries to fight against threats of authoritarianism. Mr. Modi was speaking this at a special outreach session for guest countries on “Open Societies and Open Economies” at the G7 summit that has ended in Corbis Bay, UK country on 13-06-2021, Sunday (The Hindu e-paper, 14<sup>th</sup> June 2021). In fact, there are some significant number of countries are authoritarian in the world. So, the democratic backsliding is a major problem in the world.

The public administration is a practice of government. It implements its government policies as well as programs and studies as well as seeks to improve this implementation in a country. The administration of king Frederick William I of Prussia (1688-1740) in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and a Journal article by Woodrow Wilson (1887) have emphasized the need to create and use a non political, career civil service in order to implement policies more honestly and efficiently (Sean J. Savage 2008,p.603). An importance of public administration both political and administrative executives derives from its crucial role in the governing of a society. So, the governance is best illuminated by examining politico-administrative systems (Lawrence F. Keller 2007, p.4).

However, but in practically what happened is that in every region of the world, democracy is under attack by populist leaders and groups that reject pluralism and demand unchecked power to advance the particular interests of their supporters, usually at an expense of minorities and other perceived foes. The novel coronavirus outbreak in 2019 presents a range of new challenges to democracy and human rights as well. The repressive regimes have responded to the pandemic in ways that serve their political interests, often at an expense of public health and basic freedoms. Even open societies face pressure to accept restrictions that may outlive the crisis and have a lasting effect on liberty. The rapidly advancing information and communication technologies have had a profound impact on democracy around the world. They have provided new platforms for civic mobilization and the dissemination of news and commentary, but they are also subject to censorship, surveillance, and exploitation by anti democratic forces (<https://freedomhouse.org/issues>). So, these should not take place.

A well-functioning democracy requires a strong safeguards

against official corruption, which erodes public services as well as public faith in the democratic system. The corruption can also give unfair advantages to incumbent politicians and create pathways for malign interference by foreign powers to other countries. When governments fail to act in the public interest and opposition parties are unwilling or unable to offer a credible alternative, it is up to the civil society organizations to identify abuses and advocate for reforms. But around the world, not only civil society activists, journalists, human rights defenders and organizations come under threat because they stand up for their fellow citizens. The free speech and expression is the lifeblood of democracy, which facilitating open debate, the proper consideration of diverse interests as well as perspectives, the negotiation and compromise necessary for consensual policy decisions. The efforts to suppress nonviolent expression, far from ensuring peace and stability can allow unseen problems to fester and erupt in far more dangerous forms (<https://freedomhouse.org/issues>).

If we look at authoritarianism, it was found that authoritarianism is one of the 3 main types of political systems (or regimes) that exists in the world. The democracy and totalitarianism being the rest of other two. The defining features of authoritarianism include an existence of a single leader or small group of leaders with an ultimate political authority. Believing in the supremacy of an authority of the state over all organizations in society, authoritarian leaders make all important government policy decisions. The states needs are para mount, individualism is encouraged only to an extent that it benefits the state (Lowell W. Barrington & Anne Mozena 2008, p.213) <sup>[7]</sup>.

The scholars have highlighted the 3 types of authoritarianism. These are 1) A military authoritarian system is one in which the military is not only privileged as it typically is in all authoritarian systems but actually in control of all major aspects of government decision making, 2) In party authoritarian systems is a single political party that dominates the system and 3)Bureaucratic authoritarian systems are run by the military but rely heavily on experts in the field of economics and other policy areas often allowing them significant autonomy to set and over see government policy. The social scientists have often label these officials as technocrats (Lowell W. Barrington & Anne Mozena 2008, p.214) <sup>[7]</sup>. So, any form of authoritarianism existence is not good for humanity. In this background, this article has analyzed the status of public administration through democratic governance under authoritarian regimes rule and how democracy had been backsliding in these authoritarian regimes mentioned below.

## 2. Assessment of Public administration in Authoritarian Regimes

The Freedom House at Washington DC in an United States of America had been measured the level of public administration by democratic governance in 29 countries (starting from Albania to Uzbekistan countries) through its annual ‘Nations in Transit 2020’ report (<https://freedomhouse.org/countries/nations-transit/scores>).

The democracy score incorporates separate ratings on national democratic governance(Considers the democratic character of the governmental system; and the independence, effectiveness, and accountability of the legislative and executive branches), electoral process (Examines national executive and legislative elections, the

electoral framework, the functioning of multiparty systems, and popular participation in the political process), civil society (Assesses the organizational capacity and financial sustainability of the civic sector; the legal and political environment in which it operates; the functioning of trade unions; interest group participation in the policy process; and the threat posed by antidemocratic extremist groups), independent media (Examines the current state of press freedom, including libel laws, harassment of journalists, and editorial independence; the operation of a financially viable and independent private press; and the functioning of the public media), local democratic governance (Considers the decentralization of power; the responsibilities, election, and capacity of local governmental bodies; and the transparency and accountability of local authorities), judicial framework and independence (Assesses constitutional and human rights protections, judicial independence, the status of ethnic minority rights, guarantees of equality before the law, treatment of suspects and prisoners, and compliance with judicial decisions) and corruption (Looks at public perceptions of corruption, the business interests of top policymakers, laws on financial disclosure and conflict of interest, and the efficacy of anticorruption initiatives) (Gjergji Vurmo 2020) <sup>[9]</sup>.

Out of the 29 countries, 19 countries were found out to be possessing the below 50, out of 100 as the total score and status. So, these countries are democratically deteriorated countries and became the various forms of authoritarian regimes. I have selected the last 10 countries alphabetically wise among these 19 countries in order to assessment of public administration by practical democratic governance as it exists in their respective countries. The ratings are based on a scale of 1 to 7 points (pts), with 7 representing the highest level of democratic progress and 1 relates to the lowest. The democracy score is an average of ratings for the categories tracked in a given year. The democracy percentage, which was introduced in 2020 is a translation of the democracy score to the 0-100 scale, where 0 equals least democratic and 100 equals to most democratic (Gjergji Vurmo 2020) <sup>[9]</sup>. The selected total of 10 cross-sectional countries data analysis as follows:

### 1) Kyrgyzstan

It is a mountainous landlocked country in Central Asia (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kyrgyzstan>). After two revolutions that ousted authoritarian presidents in 2005 and 2010, Kyrgyzstan has adopted a parliamentary form of government. Governing coalitions have proven unstable and corruption remains pervasive. In recent years, the ruling Social Democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan (SDPK) has sought to consolidate power, using the justice system to suppress political opponents and civil society critics. In this country, court decisions limit the press freedom was there. As per the Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, Kyrgyzstan was rated Not Free in *Freedom in the World 2021*. While, Freedom House's comprehensive study of internet freedom around the globe, Kyrgyzstan was rated Partly Free in Freedom on the Net (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/kyrgyzstan>).

The democracy percentage of Kyrgyzstan country was 16.07/100. The democracy score was 1.96/7. This country's total score was 16/100 and its status was Consolidated Authoritarian Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 17/100 and it was a Consolidated

Authoritarian Regime. Despite early encouraging signs from the new government, the quality of democracy in Kyrgyzstan did not improve in 2019. The cautious optimism of 2018, ushered in by newly elected President Sooronbay Jeenbekov and his reversal of the heavy-handed treatment of the opposition and independent media under his predecessor, largely subsided in 2019. The new leadership's pledges to strengthen parliamentary democracy and reform the justice system produced little impact on the ground, while recent political developments exposed the continuing dependence of the legislature and judiciary on the ruling regime of the day. Meanwhile, investigative reporting on a years-long money-laundering and smuggling scheme laid bare the extent to which corruption had spread within the government and customs service (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/kyrgyzstan/nations-transit/2020>).

This country's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (1.50/7.00), Electoral Process (2.25/7.00), Civil Society (3.25/7.00), Independent Media (2.00/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (1.75/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (1.50/7.00) and Corruption was 1.50/7.00. However, the democracy score slightly declined changes happened in 2020. For example, corruption rating declined from 1.75 to 1.50 to reflect the scale of corruption within the country, made more evident by the investigation into the money laundering scandal involving the former deputy head of the customs service Raimbek Matraimov. As a result, Kyrgyzstan's Democracy Score had declined slightly from 2.00 to 1.96 (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/kyrgyzstan/nations-transit/2020>).

### 2) Moldova

It is a landlocked country in Eastern Europe (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moldova>). Moldova has a competitive electoral environment and the freedoms of assembly, speech and religion are largely protected. Nonetheless, pervasive corruption in the government sector, links between major political parties and powerful economic interests and deficiencies in the rule of law continue to hamper democratic governance (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/moldova>). The democracy percentage of Moldova country was 35.12/100. The democracy score was 3.11/7. This country's total score was 35/100 and its status was Transitional or Hybrid Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 34/100 and it was a Transitional or Hybrid Regime (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/moldova/nations-transit/2020>).

The electoral process was under considerable strain in 2019. Moldova organized two electoral campaigns, parliamentary elections in February and local elections in October, both of which suffered in terms of fairness and equal access to the right to vote for the general population. In the parliamentary elections, observers monitoring the vote were intimidated, which has not occurred in the country since 2009. The quality of democratic governance at the local level remains low. The year saw massive political migration of local public authorities (LPAs) away from the PDM spurred by intimidation, this movement highlights the ongoing political dependence of LPAs on the central administration. Planned administrative-territorial reforms dating back to 2016 did not advance at all during the year (Victor Gotisan 2020) <sup>[16]</sup>.



This county's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (2.50/7.00), Electoral Process (4.00/7.00), Civil Society (4.75/7.00), Independent Media (3.00/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (2.50/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (2.75/7.00), Corruption (2.25/7.00) (Victor Gotisan 2020) <sup>[16]</sup>.

However, the democracy score some slightly improved changes happened in 2020. For examples, 1) National Democratic Governance rating improved from 2.25 to 2.50 due to the ouster of political figures, including PDM leader and oligarch Vladimir Plahotniuc and Orhei mayor Ilan Shor, who exerted informal control over the country's government and 2) Corruption rating improved from 2.00 to 2.25 due to new government-led efforts to combat corruption implemented after the 2019 post-election political crisis, which have led to an increased number of criminal charges against high- and medium-level officials (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/moldova/nations-transit/2020>).

### 3) Montenegro

It is a country in Southeastern Europe (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Montenegro>). While numerous political parties compete for power in Montenegro, the opposition is fragmented, and the governing Democratic Party of Socialists (DPS) has been in power since 1991. The corruption is a serious issue. Investigative journalists and journalists critical of the government face pressure. As per the Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, Montenegro was rated Partly Free in Freedom in the World (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/montenegro>). The democracy percentage of Montenegro country was 47.62/100. The democracy score was 3.86/7. This country's total score was 48/100 and its status was Transitional or Hybrid Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 49/100 and it was a Transitional or Hybrid Regime (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/montenegro/nations-transit/2020>).

In 2019, Montenegro faced a reversal of its overall democratization due to a number of ongoing political crises and scandals in all spheres of the society. The year started with several local environmental protests followed by larger civic protests against the government (prompted by explosive corruption revelations) and ended with massive demonstrations by the Serbian Orthodox Church and its followers against the new Law on Religious Freedoms. Montenegro has been struggling with deep political and societal divisions for many years, which were aggravated in 2019 despite several unsuccessful attempts at dialogue between key political actors. Furthermore, the traditional separation of powers between the state's legislative, executive, and judicial branches continued to break down as a result of the evident concentration of power in the executive branch and limited checks and balances elsewhere in government (Ana Nenezic & Vuk Maras 2020) <sup>[20]</sup>.

This county's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (3.25/7.00), Electoral Process (4.25/7.00), Civil Society (5.25/7.00), Independent Media (3.25/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (4.50/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (3.50/7.00) and Corruption (3.00/7.00) (Ana Nenezic & Vuk Maras 2020) <sup>[20]</sup>. However, the democracy Score some declined changes happened in 2020. For examples, 1) Judicial Framework and

Independence rating declined from 3.75 to 3.50 after several scandals involving the prosecution and judiciary came to light in 2019, while the mandates of the Judicial Council and supreme state prosecutor expired, preventing the justice system from operating in an effective manner and eroding public trust and 2) Corruption rating declined from 3.25 to 3.00 after high-profile corruption revelations were not followed by effective action from the authorities (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/montenegro/nations-transit/2020>).

### 4) North Macedonia

It is a country in Southeast Europe ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North\\_Macedonia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_Macedonia)). North Macedonia is a parliamentary republic. A left-leaning government took power in 2017 after credible allegations of a massive government-sponsored wiretapping and surveillance program emerged in 2015, which prompting a crisis that paralyzed normal political activity. The North Macedonia continues to struggle with corruption and while the media and civil society are active, journalists and activists face pressure and intimidation. As per the Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, North Macedonia was rated Partly Free in Freedom in the World (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/north-macedonia>).

The democracy percentage of North Macedonia country was 45.83/100. The democracy score was 3.75/7. This country's total score was 46/100 and its status was Transitional or Hybrid Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 45/100 and it was a Transitional or Hybrid Regime (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/north-macedonia/nations-transit/2020>). The North Macedonia registered a degree of democratic progress over the course of 2019 despite growing public dissatisfaction with the governing coalition, which had pledged to restore rule of law following revelations from the 2015 "Wiretapping Affair" and subsequent political crisis. The country has charted a positive course since 2017, when the right-wing populist Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organization-Democratic Party for Macedonian National Unity (VMRO-DPMNE) was ousted from power and the new government led by the Social Democratic Union of Macedonia (SDSM) and the Democratic Union for Integration (DUI) initiated several promising legislative and policy moves. However, developments in 2018 and 2019 have shown that the government and new ruling parties are not yet up to the task of reforming the system (Jovan Bliznakovski 2020) <sup>[25]</sup>.

This county's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (3.25/7.00), Electoral Process (4.25/7.00), Civil Society (4.75/7.00), Independent Media (3.50/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (4.00/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (3.25/7.00) and Corruption (3.25/7.00) (Jovan Bliznakovski 2020) <sup>[25]</sup>. However, in the democracy score some improvement changes happened in 2020. For examples, 1) Electoral Process rating slightly improved from 4.00 to 4.25 to reflect the well-organized presidential election, which featured fewer irregularities than previous elections and 2) Independent Media rating has slightly improved from 3.25 to 3.50 to reflect the gradual growth of objective and credible reporting. As a result, North Macedonia's democracy score had improved slightly from 3.68 to 3.75 (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/north-macedonia>).

macedonia/nations-transit/2020).

### 5) Russia

It is a transcontinental country spanning Eastern Europe and Northern Asia (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russia>). Power in Russia's authoritarian political system is concentrated in the hands of President Vladimir Putin. With loyalist security forces, a subservient judiciary, a controlled media environment and a legislature consisting of a ruling party and pliable opposition factions, the Kremlin is able to manipulate elections and suppress genuine dissent. The rampant corruption facilitates shifting links among bureaucrats and organized crime groups. As per the Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, Russia was rated Not Free in Freedom in the World 2021. Moreover, the same Freedom House's comprehensive study of internet freedom around the globe, Russia was rated Not Free in Freedom on the Net (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/Russia>).

Russia under President Vladimir Putin has played an outsized role in the development of modern authoritarian systems. This is particularly true in areas of media control, propaganda, the smothering of civil society and the weakening of political pluralism. Russia has also moved aggressively against neighboring states where democratic institutions have emerged or where democratic movements have succeeded in ousting corrupt authoritarian leaders (Arch Puddington 2017, p.2) <sup>[29]</sup>. The democracy percentage of Russia country was 6.55/100. The democracy score was 1.39/7. This country's total score was 7/100 and its status was Consolidated Authoritarian Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 7/100 and it was a Consolidated Authoritarian Regime (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/russia/nations-transit/2020>).

In 2019, Russia continued to crack down on the political opposition and growing protest movements as the country's political system sank deeper into stagnation and disorder. The regime's "legitimation machine", the combined system of formal and informal political institutions that create and implement policy and manage elections has entered a transition period laden with uncertainties and political challenges for the long term. Driven by the ongoing stagnation of real wages and living standards, the year saw continued protest activity across the country, escalating attempts by Moscow to exert greater control over dissent and political speech, and adaptation to the looming challenge of President Vladimir Putin's fourth term in 2024. Moscow took advantage of the creeping criminalization of protest activity, using violent force on an unprecedented scale to undermine political opposition (Nicholas Trickett 2020).

This country's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (1.25/7.00), Electoral Process (1.25/7.00), Civil Society (1.75/7.00), Independent Media (1.50/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (1.50/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (1.25/7.00) and Corruption (1.25/7.00) (Nicholas Trickett 2020). However, in the democracy score some declined changes had happened in 2020. For example, Civil Society rating declined from 2.00 to 1.75 due to the extraordinary level of violence exercised by the state against protestors, use of the foreign agent law against online activists, and increasing state regulation of the internet and control of the public

sphere as the regime has prevented the opposition from coalescing nationally (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/russia/nations-transit/2020>).

### 6) Serbia

It is a country in Central and Southeast Europe (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serbia>). The Republic of Serbia is a parliamentary democracy with competitive multiparty elections, but in recent years the ruling Serbian Progressive Party (SNS) has steadily eroded political rights and civil liberties, putting pressure on independent media, the political opposition, and civil society organizations. Despite these trends, the country has continued to move toward membership in the European Union (EU). As per Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, Serbia was rated as Partly Free in Freedom in the World (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/Serbia>). The democracy percentage of Serbia country was 49.40/100. The democracy score was 3.96/7. This country's total score was 49/100 and its status was Transitional or Hybrid Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 50/100 and it was a Transitional or Hybrid Regime (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/serbia/nations-transit/2020>).

The state of Serbia's democratic institutions and freedoms continued to deteriorated in 2019, which resulting in the country's lowest democracy score in Nations in Transit since 2001. Although the ruling Serbian Progressive Party (SNS) came to power in 2012 in large part on the wings of its promise to energetically fight widespread corruption, it has failed to do so over the years. By 2019, high-level corruption had become more entrenched, with the country's already fragile anticorruption institutions and policies further undermined. Weak rule of law and widespread corruption remain among the biggest obstacles to good governance in Serbia and, increasingly, these conditions are holding back economic growth in the country (Milos Damnjanovic, 2020) <sup>[35]</sup>. However, this country's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (3.50/7.00), Electoral Process (4.50/7.00), Civil Society (5.50/7.00), Independent Media (3.25/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (4.00/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (3.50/7.00) and Corruption (3.50/7.00) (Milos Damnjanovic 2020) <sup>[35]</sup>.

### 7) Tajikistan

It is a landlocked country in Central Asia (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tajikistan>). The authoritarian regime of President Emomali Rahmon, who has ruled since 1992, severely restricts political rights and civil liberties. The political opposition has been devastated by a sustained campaign of repression in recent years and the government exerts tight control over religious expression and activity. Wealth and authority are increasingly concentrated in the hands of the president and his family. As per Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, Tajikistan was rated Not Free in Freedom in the World. The democracy percentage of Tajikistan country was 2.98/100. The democracy score was 1.18/7. This country's total score was 3/100 and its status was Consolidated Authoritarian Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 4/100 and it was a Consolidated

**Authoritarian Regime**  
(<https://freedomhouse.org/country/tajikistan/nations-transit/2020>).

Tajikistan's authoritarian system became more entrenched in 2019. The Tajikistan functions like a one-party state with few opportunities to express dissatisfaction with the regime. The President Emomali Rahmon, who has been known as "Leader of the Nation" since a law to that effect was introduced in 2015, dominates Tajikistan's political system. His new title renders him legally immune and allows him to rule indefinitely. The former collective farm boss has proven remarkably resilient since coming to power at the height of the country's civil war in November 1992 and is now the longest serving head of state in the former Soviet Union. He has outmaneuvered his rivals and built an authoritarian state centered on his powerful extended family who dominate politics and the country's economy (Edward Lemon 2020)<sup>[38]</sup>.

This country's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (1.00/7.00), Electoral Process (1.25/7.00), Civil Society (1.25/7.00), Independent Media (1.25/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (1.50/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (1.00/7.00) and Corruption (1.00/7.00) (Edward Lemon 2020)<sup>[38]</sup>. However, the democracy score some slightly declined changes happened in 2020. For example, Local Democratic Governance rating declined from 1.75 to 1.50 to reflect the long-term erosion in the autonomy of local leaders, bringing regional governments almost fully under the control of central authorities. As a result, Tajikistan's Democracy Score declined from 1.21 to 1.18 (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/tajikistan/nations-transit/2020>).

## 8) Turkmenistan

It is a landlocked country in Central Asia (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turkmenistan>). Turkmenistan is a repressive authoritarian state where political rights and civil liberties are almost completely denied in practice. Elections are tightly controlled, ensuring nearly unanimous victories for the president and his supporters. The economy is dominated by the state, corruption is systemic, religious groups are persecuted and political dissent is not tolerated. As per the Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, Turkmenistan was rated Not Free in Freedom in the World (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/Turkmenistan>).

Turkmenistan's authoritarianism became further entrenched in 2019. Known for his surreal public stunts, President Gurbanguly Berdimuhamedov (in office since 2006) showcased his skills as an athlete, horse connoisseur, writer, singer, and so forth. However, he failed to accept responsibility for the country's plummeting economy and instead identified convenient scapegoats among the country's public officials. Utilizing a tightly controlled media space, the president regularly broadcast stacy performances of government officials confessing guilt, acknowledging their corrupt personalities, and asking for forgiveness, while shifting focus away from his own shortcomings and his family's unlimited power. Although Turkmenistan has institutions that could in theory provide checks and balances to presidential power, but in reality they merely pay lip service to such duties. The legislative powers of the Mejlis (parliamentary assembly) have

effectively been dismantled, while the president controls the judicial system to advance his personal interests. Given the regime's secrecy and the lack of independent media, freedom of speech, or access to information, the Turkmen people are left largely in the dark and forced to speculate on important issues affecting their lives (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/Turkmenistan>).

The democracy percentage of Turkmenistan country was 0.00/100. The democracy score was 1.00/7. This country's total score was 0/100 and its status was Consolidated Authoritarian Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 1/100 and it was a Consolidated Authoritarian Regime. This country's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (1.00/7.00), Electoral Process (1.00/7.00), Civil Society (1.00/7.00), Independent Media (1.00/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (1.00/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (1.00/7.00) and Corruption (1.00/7.00). However, the democracy Score some declined changes happened in 2020. For example, local Democratic Governance rating declined from 1.25 to 1.00 to reflect the complete lack of independent decision-making at the local level, and the deepening economic crisis further evidenced by slashed subsidies outside the central Ahal region. As a result, Turkmenistan's Democracy Score declined from 1.04 to 1.00 (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/Turkmenistan>).

## 9) Ukraine

It is a country in Eastern Europe (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ukraine>). Ukraine country has enacted a number of positive reforms since the protest-driven ouster of President Viktor Yanukovich in 2014. However, corruption remains endemic and initiatives to combat it are only partially implemented. Attacks against journalists, civil society activists, and members of minority groups are frequent, and police responses are often inadequate. Russia occupies the autonomous Ukrainian region of Crimea, which it invaded in the aftermath of Yanukovich's ouster, and its military supports armed separatists in the eastern Donbas area. As per Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, Ukraine was rated as Partly Free in Freedom in the World 2021. Moreover, in the Freedom House's comprehensive study of internet freedom around the globe, Ukraine was rated Partly Free in Freedom on the Net (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/Ukraine>).

The democracy percentage of Ukraine country was 39.88/100. The democracy score was 3.39/7. This country's total score was 40/100 and its status was Transitional or Hybrid Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 39/100 and it was a Transitional or Hybrid Regime (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/ukraine/nations-transit/2020>). In 2019, Ukraine went through its first peaceful transition of power since the events of Euromaidan, holding open and democratic presidential and parliamentary elections. Continuing the course of the previous administration, Ukraine's new government adopted a pro-European and pro reform orientation with a renewed focus on anticorruption, economic development, and peace building in the occupied and separatist-controlled eastern Donbas region (Yulia Yesmukhanova 2020)<sup>[44]</sup>.

This country's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (2.50/7.00), Electoral Process (4.50/7.00), Civil Society (5.00/7.00), Independent Media



(3.75/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (3.25/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (2.50/7.00) and Corruption (2.25/7.00) (Yulia Yesmukhanova 2020) <sup>[44]</sup>. However, the democracy score some improved changes happened in 2020. For example, National Democratic Governance rating was improved from 2.25 to 2.50 due to the country's first peaceful rotation of power in the post-Euromaidan era with the election of Volodymyr Zelenskiy (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/ukraine/nations-transit/2020>).

### 10) Uzbekistan

It is a doubly landlocked country in Central Asia (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uzbekistan>). While ongoing reforms under a new president Shavkat Mirziyoyev have led to improvements on some issues, Uzbekistan country remains a consolidated authoritarian regime. No genuine opposition parties operate legally. The legislature and judiciary effectively serve as instruments of the executive branch, which initiates reforms by decree, and the media remains tightly controlled by the state. Reports of torture and other ill-treatment remain common, although highly publicized cases of abuse have led to dismissals and prosecutions for some officials. Despite some high-profile releases, the government still holds numerous prisoners on political or religious grounds. As per the Freedom House's annual study of political rights and civil liberties worldwide, Uzbekistan was rated as Not Free in *Freedom in the World*. Moreover, in the Freedom House's comprehensive study of internet freedom around the globe, Uzbekistan was rated as Not Free in Freedom on the Net (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/Uzbekistan>).

The democracy percentage of Uzbekistan country was 2.38/100. The democracy score was 1.14/7. This country's total score was 2/100 and its status was Consolidated Authoritarian Regime. The last year's democracy percentage and status was 2/100 and it was a Consolidated Authoritarian

Regime (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/uzbekistan/nations-transit/2020>). The year 2019 saw great changes in Uzbekistan, which the Economist named as the country that had "improved the most" during the year. The Uzbek government completely eliminated the longstanding practice of using child labor in the country's cotton fields, according to Human Rights Watch. The parliament passed two important laws on women's rights and is adopting a strong stance on the issue of gender equality. These are some of the dramatic social, economic, and political changes that society witnessed over the last three years, since the death of the dictator Islam Karimov in 2016. His successor, President Shavkat Mirziyoyev is still positioning himself as a reformer, promising liberalization of the economy and openness to the world. General reforms are indeed evident, but deeper structural changes that would enshrine a democratic system rather than a personalized power vertical are still a long way off (Anonymous 2020).

This country's scored democracy scores were National Democratic Governance (1.00/7.00), Electoral Process (1.00/7.00), Civil Society (1.25/7.00), Independent Media (1.25/7.00), Local Democratic Governance (1.25/7.00), Judicial framework and Independence (1.00/7.00) and Corruption (1.25/7.00) (Anonymous 2020). However, in the democracy score some improvement changes happened in 2020. For example, Corruption rating improved from 1.00 to

1.25 due to the government's efforts to reduce the incidence of petty corruption, especially among civil servants (<https://freedomhouse.org/country/uzbekistan/nations-transit/2020>).

However, in the Freedom House's 2021 edition of *Nations in Transit*, which was covering the events of 2020, a total of 18 countries suffered declines in their democracy scores; only 6 countries scores improved, while 5 countries experienced no net change (Freedom House 2021, p.1). Moreover, as per this 2021 report, the Democracy Score and Democracy Percentage of above mentioned 10 countries as follows: 1) Kyrgyzstan (1.86 & 14%), 2) Moldova (3.11 & 35%), 3) Montenegro (3.82 & 47%), 4) North Macedonia (3.82 & 47%), 5) Russia (1.39 & 7%), 6) Serbia (3.89 & 48%), 7) Tajikistan (1.11 & 2%), 8) Turkmenistan (1.00 & 0%), 9) Ukraine (3.36 & 39%) and 10) Uzbekistan (1.25 & 4%) (Freedom House 2021, p.26). This data revealed that no country's democracy percentage has crossed at least above 50 percent. This clearly shows that democracy continuously deteriorating in these 10 countries. However, not only freedom house research study, the global human development report 2020 also mentioned generally that ominous signs of democratic backsliding and rising authoritarianism are worrying (UNDP 2020, p.4) <sup>[50]</sup>.

### 3. Conclusion

The research findings have revealed that among the selected 10 cross sectional countries study, the democracy percentage of Turkmenistan country was only 0.00/100. The democracy score was for the same country was 1.00/7. Moreover, this country's total score was 0 out of 100 and its status was Consolidated Authoritarian Regime. So, this country has scored totally only 0, which equals to least democratic country. This is regarded as anti democratic and anti human. In fact, this country's the same figures data as well as status had repeated again in Nations in Transit 2021 report.

### References

1. Doorenspleet, Renske. Democratization, in William A. Darity Jr(ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Volume-2, Detroit: Gale Cengage Learning publication; c2008.
2. The Hindu e-paper, Thiruvananthapuram, 15<sup>th</sup> June; c2021.
3. The Hindu e-paper, Thiruvananthapuram, 14<sup>th</sup> June; c2021.
4. Savage, Sean J. Public Administration, in William A. Darity Jr(ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Volume-6, Detroit: Gale Cengage Learning publication; c2008.
5. Keller, Lawrence F. Public Administration and the American Republic: The Continuing Saga of Management and Administration in Politics, in Jack Rabin, W. Bartley Hildreth & Gerald J. Miller (eds.), *Hand Book of Public Administration*, Third Edition, Boca Raton: CRC: Taylor & Francis Group publication; 2007. at <https://www.pdfdrive.com/handbook-of-public-administration-third-edition-public-administration-and-public-policy-d156651433.html>, accessed on 19-04-2021
6. <https://freedomhouse.org/issues>, accessed on 03<sup>rd</sup> April, 2021
7. Barrington, Lowell W, Mozena, Anne.

- Authoritarianism, in William A. Darity Jr(ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Volume-1, Detroit: Gale Cengage Learning publication; c2008.
8. <https://freedomhouse.org/countries/nations-transit/scores>, accessed on 03<sup>rd</sup> April, 2021
  9. Vurmo, Gjergji. Executive Summary; c2020, at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/albania/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 03<sup>rd</sup> April, 2021.
  10. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kyrgyzstan>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2021
  11. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/kyrgyzstan>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  12. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/kyrgyzstan/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  13. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moldova>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2021.
  14. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/moldova>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  15. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/moldova/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  16. Gotisan, Victor. Executive Summary; c2020. at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/moldova/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  17. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Montenegro>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2021.
  18. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/montenegro>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  19. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/montenegro/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  20. Nenezic, Ana, Maras, Vuk. Executive Summary; c2020. at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/montenegro/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  21. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/montenegro/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  22. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North\\_Macedonia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_Macedonia), accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2021
  23. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/north-macedonia>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  24. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/north-macedonia/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  25. Bliznakovski, Jovan. Executive Summary; c2020. at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/north-macedonia/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  26. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/north-macedonia/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  27. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russia>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2021
  28. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/russia>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  29. Puddington, Arch. Breaking Down Democracy: Goals, Strategies, and Methods of Modern Authoritarians, Special Report, June, New York: Freedom House; c2017. at [https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/June2017\\_FH\\_Report\\_Breaking\\_Down\\_Democracy.pdf](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/June2017_FH_Report_Breaking_Down_Democracy.pdf), accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  30. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/russia/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  31. Trickett, Nicholas. Executive Summary; 2020. at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/russia/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  32. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serbia>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2021
  33. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/Serbia>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  34. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/serbia/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  35. Damnjanovic, Milos. Executive Summary; c2020. at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/serbia/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  36. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tajikistan>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2021
  37. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/tajikistan/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  38. Lemon, Edward. Executive Summary; c2020. at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/tajikistan/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  39. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turkmenistan>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2021
  40. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/turkmenistan>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2021
  41. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ukraine>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2021
  42. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/ukraine>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  43. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/ukraine/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2021
  44. Yesmukhanova, Yulia. Executive Summary; c2020. at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/ukraine/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021.
  45. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uzbekistan>, accessed on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2021
  46. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/uzbekistan>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  47. <https://freedomhouse.org/country/uzbekistan/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2021
  48. Anonymous.(2020): Executive Summary, at <https://freedomhouse.org/country/uzbekistan/nations-transit/2020>, accessed on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2021.
  49. Freedom House. Nations In Transit 2021: The Antidemocratic Turn', at [https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/NIT\\_2021\\_final\\_042321.pdf](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/NIT_2021_final_042321.pdf), accessed on 29<sup>th</sup> April 2021.
  50. UNDP. Human Development Report, The Next Frontier: Human Development and the Anthropocene, New York, 2020. at <http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2020.pdf>