

FEATURES, ATTRIBUTES AND CRITERIA OF DEMOCRATIC POLITICAL REGIMES (COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS)

^aOLEKSANDR SKRYPNIUK, ^bOLEKSII BURIACHENKO,
^cVALENTINA ZGURSKA, ^dNADIYA STOVOLOS,
^eMYROSLAV BURYK

^a*V.M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine.*

^b*National Aviation University, Kyiv, Ukraine.*

^c*Kyiv National University of Construction and Architecture, Kyiv, Ukraine.*

^d*Sumy National Agrarian University, Sumy, Ukraine.*

^e*Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.*

email: ^aalexander.skrypniuk@gmail.com, ^bvoua@ukr.net,

^cvalentinazgurskaya@gmail.com, ^dstovolos-nb@ukr.net,

^emir23.lviv@gmail.com

Abstract. In the context of the continual and sustainable development of social order and civil society, the comprehension of the features, signs, and criteria of a democratic political regime is transforming and necessitates reconsideration, rendering this work pertinent. The objective of this article is to delineate the substance of the array of features and characteristics inherent to a democratic political regime, contrasting them with those of an authoritarian and totalitarian political regime. Additionally, it aims to elucidate the criterion by which distinctions between various types of political regimes can be made. The present publication employs analytical, synthetic, scientific generalization, theoretical comparison, and formal logical methods. The article explicates the contentious nature of the concept of "political regime" and presents diverse scientific approaches to its comprehension. It posits that the criterion for categorizing political regimes into democratic, authoritarian, and totalitarian forms hinges on "the peculiarities of interaction between civil society and the State, the degree of permeation of private life of citizens, and various spheres of the social reality of State power." The author provides a comparative analysis not only of democratic political regimes but also of authoritarian and totalitarian ones. The author conducts a detailed examination of the content associated with political science categories such as "features," "signs," and "criteria" of a political regime. Furthermore, the author introduces a personalized understanding of these concepts and offers insights into the interrelations among the terms under consideration. The article delineates an approach wherein the fundamental classification of political regimes is proposed to be nuanced. According to the author, political regimes ought to be categorized into democratic and non-democratic, with the latter further subcategorized into authoritarian and totalitarian. The author delineates the conventional features of a democratic political regime from the perspective of political science and expounds upon additional features which, in the author's estimation, might signify the presence of a democratic political regime in a given state. The assertion is made that a direct correlation between the form of government and the political regime in the state does not exist, and illustrative examples supporting this perspective are provided.

Keywords: Political regime, Democratic values, Signs of a political regime, Features of a political regime, Criteria of a political regime.

1 Introduction

Nearly every contemporary state possesses a constitution that delineates a spectrum of human and civil rights and freedoms, representing fundamental democratic values that ought to constitute the primary objective and purpose of the country. In addition to the codification of human and civil rights and freedoms, democratic values are commonly regarded as the embodiment of principles such as the separation of powers division of powers into legislative, executive, and judicial branches, the implementation of checks and balances election of governing state institutions, citizen equality in elections, the presence of political opposition, the unrestricted activity of opposition and political figures, and equitable judicial protection, among various others. These democratic values are intrinsically linked to the establishment of a democratic political regime. Simultaneously, it is crucial to recognize the necessity of assessing the actual state of affairs in each specific state, as the proclamation of all the aforementioned democratic values may be merely formal and not upheld in practice.

In the broader context, a democratic political regime is conventionally juxtaposed with totalitarian and authoritarian political regimes. Simultaneously, terminological ambiguity exists within categories such as the "signs" of a political regime, its "features," and "criteria." Furthermore, the political science nature of the concept of a "political regime" is subject to debate. This publication seeks to address these ambiguities and elucidate

the problematic aspects inherent in the features, attributes, and criteria of a democratic political regime.

2 Literature Review

Bjørnskov C. and Rode M. (2020) focused on regime types and regime change utilizing a novel dataset encompassing democracy, coups, and political institutions. Frey C. B., Chen C., and Presidente G. (2020) examined the response of political regimes to COVID-19, emphasizing the role of democratic institutions. Annaka S. (2021) also investigated the correlation between a country's political regime and the mortality rate from COVID-19. Chen C., Frey C. B., and Presidente G. (2023) pursued a similar theme in their publication. Welzel C. (2021) investigates the prospects of a democratic future. Siaroff A.'s (2022) work on the comparative analysis of political regime characteristics holds foundational significance. Mukand S. W. and Rodrik D. (2020) contribute to the discourse on the political economy of liberal democracy. Bickerton C. J. and Accetti C. I.'s (2021) book discusses the novel logical content of democratic politics. Ștefanachi B., Grecu S. P., and Chiriac H. C. (2022) focus on the characteristics, challenges, and opportunities for democratic countries. Mauk M. (2020) authored an article exploring democratic value orientations and their impact on political trust across different regimes. In another publication, Mauk M. (2020) addressed issues related to citizens' support for democratic and autocratic regimes. Croissant A. and Haynes J. (2021) provided an introduction to democratic regression in Asia. Stokke K. and Aung S. M. (2020) focused on the democratization process in Myanmar. Edgell A. B., Wilson M. C., Boese V. A., Grahm S. (2020) examined the democratic legacy. An article by Umpierrez de Reguero S. A., Yener-Roderburg I. Ö., and Cartagena V. (2021) presents a cross-national comparison of political regimes and external electoral rights.

Broadly, extant doctrinal political science research on the democratic political regime manifests considerable diversity and dissimilarity in content. Scholars have scrutinized not only the democratic political regime itself but also related phenomena, encompassing democracy as a broader concept, the political economy of liberal democracy, democratic value orientations, and democratic regression. Nevertheless, a notable absence is observed regarding comprehensive and systematic works that address the features, attributes, and criteria of a democratic political regime.

3 Research Objectives

The article aims to delineate the content of the array of features and characteristics of a democratic political regime in contrast to authoritarian and totalitarian political regimes. Additionally, the article seeks to characterize the criterion that facilitates the differentiation of various types of political regimes. To achieve these objectives, the following goals were established:

1. Describe the factors contributing to the contentious and substantive content of the concept of "political regime" and explore its contemporary interpretation in political science.
2. Define the criterion for categorizing political regimes into democratic, authoritarian, and totalitarian.
3. Provide characterization not only of democratic but also authoritarian and totalitarian political regimes to enhance understanding of the former.
4. Systematically present, from the author's perspective, a clear understanding of the concepts of "features," "signs," and "criteria" of a political regime.
5. Identify a set of traditional features of a democratic political regime and augment them with the author's viewpoint.
6. Highlight the contentious aspects associated with the features of a democratic political regime.

4 Methods

The publication employs various scientific methods, including the method of analysis, the method of synthesis, the method of scientific generalization, the method of theoretical comparison, and the formal logical method. Specifically, the method of analysis is utilized to scrutinize the contentious interpretation of the content of the political regime concept and to present scientific and theoretical approaches to its understanding within the political science doctrine. The synthesis method facilitated the systematic presentation and summarization of the primary, including classical, features of a democratic political regime. Utilizing the method of scientific generalization, we described existing scientific studies not only on democratic political regimes but also on political regimes in general, delineating their content and comparing them with the findings of this publication. The method of theoretical comparison was employed to scrutinize the features of a democratic political regime in contrast to totalitarian and authoritarian political regimes. Additionally, the formal logical method was applied by the author to discern such political science concepts as "features," "signs," and "criteria" of a political regime, elucidating their content and interrelations.

5 Results

Examination of doctrinal approaches to comprehending the political regime as a distinct state and political phenomenon enables the formulation of several perspectives in this context. The contentious interpretation of the political regime concept is fundamentally associated with its multidisciplinary nature. It serves as a subject of study in both jurisprudence and political science, reflecting the intricate character of the political regime as a phenomenon comprising numerous socio-political institutions. Furthermore, the lack of precise criteria for delineating the political regime from other political and legal phenomena related to the process of political governance, such as state-legal or political and legal regimes, further contributes to the controversial nature of its interpretation. Kolesnyk Yu.M. (2014) references the viewpoint of M. Duverger, who conceptualized the political regime as a specific amalgamation of voting methods, party systems, and diverse forms of decision-making by one or more pressure structures. An alternative perspective, posited by the French political scientist J.-L. Kermonne, defines a political regime as a collection of elements encompassing sociological, institutional, and ideological content. These elements are designed to facilitate the establishment of political power during a specific period within a particular country (Kolesnyk, 2014).

A democratic political regime is categorized as one of the types of political regimes, alongside authoritarian and totalitarian, based on the criterion of division, namely, the "peculiarities of interaction between civil society and the state, the degree of penetration into the private life of citizens, and various spheres of the social reality of state power." Recognizing that a comprehensive examination requires an understanding of authoritarian and totalitarian political regimes, the subsequent sections will provide definitions for these categories.

A totalitarian political regime is distinguished by the exertion of comprehensive and all-encompassing control over society, wherein the social system is subjected to the authority of the state, collective objectives, and an overarching ideology. The characteristics of an authoritarian political regime encompass the subordination of political actors, the presence of a robust central authority concentrating power, and the potential for widespread utilization of coercion or violence. In contrast, a democratic political regime is defined more broadly and conceptualized through the lens of the generalization of socio-political life founded on the egalitarian principle among its members. This entails processes such as the periodic election of state bodies and decision-making that reflects the majority's will (Democracy, totalitarianism, and authoritarianism...).

From a theoretical standpoint, comprehending the meanings of the concepts "features," "signs," and "criteria" of a political regime is pivotal in this study. It is essential to ascertain whether these terms are interchangeable and, if not, to delineate their distinctions. According to the author, the concepts of "features," "signs," and "criteria" of a political regime are not synonymous and should be treated as distinct entities. The author's position on this matter is as follows: the concept of a "feature" of a political regime holds primacy. Notably, the academic explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language defines the term "sign" as a feature, property, or peculiarity of someone or something (Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language..., 1970-1980). In essence, according to the lexicographer's definition, a sign can be interpreted as a feature. While it is not definitively asserted that this perspective is incorrect, within the context of a political regime, these concepts are better understood in correlation as general and specific (feature and peculiarity, respectively). We contend that it is more appropriate to discuss the features of a political regime, which, contingent upon its type (democratic, authoritarian, or totalitarian), assume distinct content at the specificity level. Allow us to illustrate with an example: a general feature of a political regime may be articulated as "the presence or absence of political pluralism." The specific feature of a democratic political regime is a multiparty system, whereas that of an authoritarian or totalitarian political regime is a one-party system. Our standpoint asserts that a feature is a characteristic or property that delineates a political regime in a general sense, and a specific feature represents the unique content of a feature specific to a particular political regime. In essence, it is accurate to discuss the characteristics of a political regime and the peculiarities of its types - totalitarian, authoritarian, or democratic.

Concerning the comprehension of the concept "criterion" of a political regime, we suggest considering it as a generalized condition that characterizes a specific method of governance within a particular political regime (democratic, authoritarian, and totalitarian). A "criterion" represents a system of features of a political regime that enables a concise description and contrast of numerous types of political regimes. Accordingly, the traditional classification of political regimes into democratic, authoritarian, and totalitarian regimes necessitates refinement, considering the criteria for their understanding. We assert that the adherence to democratic rights and liberties of individuals is a pivotal criterion for identifying a democratic political regime. Conversely, the transgression or non-compliance with these democratic rights and liberties can be regarded as criteria indicative of authoritarian and totalitarian political regimes. However, this proposition raises a significant question: how to differentiate between authoritarian and totalitarian political regimes? It prompts the consideration of whether the idea of the criterion should be modified. In addressing this issue, a meaningful comprehension of the political regimes under discussion becomes imperative. Frequently in politics-related science, democratic and totalitarian political regimes are perceived as two extremes, with authoritarian political regimes regarded as transitional from totalitarian to democratic. We believe that the criterion for differentiating between political regimes, as formulated by us, is accurate. Nevertheless, there exists a need to refine the typology of political regimes by introducing a slight complication, such as categorizing them into democratic and non-democratic, wherein the latter is further subdivided into authoritarian and totalitarian.

Concerning the focus of the study, specifically the features and characteristics of a democratic political regime, it is pertinent to consult political science literature. The features of a democratic political regime encompass:

- The constitution, serving as the foundational law of the country, delineates the powers (competence) of state authorities in charge of wielding state power and describing their formation process.
- The legal status of individuals is codified at the regulatory level, with consideration given to the standard of equality under the law.

- The division of powers into the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, where the functions of each branch are delineated to implement a system of "checks and balances."
- Political and public organizations enjoy the freedom to conduct their activities.
- Government bodies are established through an elected process.
- The spheres of state power and public society action are distinct and varied.
- Economic pluralism, besides political and ideological pluralism (with the caveat that only anti-human ideologies are prohibited), coexist (Democracy, totalitarianism, and authoritarianism...).

In a comprehensive analysis, these features can be elaborated and complemented by additional characteristics, including:

- Not only the codification of human and public rights and liberties at the regulatory level but also ensuring that the mechanism of public authorities' operation effectively upholds and enables the fulfilment of these rights and liberties.
- A low incidence of corruption within governmental structures.
- The presence and active engagement of political opposition, coupled with the absence of politically motivated criminal prosecution against opposition figures.
- In the European context, a minimal proportion of citizens' applications to the European Court of Human Rights and a low point percentage of judgments by the European Court of Human Rights in favor of citizens against their states.

The author poses a crucial question: what is the correlation between the government form in a state and the political regime? Does the existence of a particular government form indicate the functioning of a particular political regime in the country? It is widely acknowledged that there are classically two government forms: monarchy and republic. In a simplified manner, the main distinguishing factors between these governmental forms hinge on the election of the head of state (republic) or the hereditary nature of the head of state's office (monarchy). In our perspective, the concepts of political governance and form of government in the modern world do not inherently correlate and should be individually characterized in each state. This is evident since it is entirely conceivable for a republic to have an authoritarian political regime, and conversely, a monarchy may harbor a democratic one. A classic example is the United Kingdom, as a monarchy, which unequivocally embodies a democratic political regime (Buryachenko, 2023).

In the examination of the features, signs, and criteria of a democratic political regime, it is essential to acknowledge that some of these components may be declarative at the state level and do not invariably signify the presence of a democratic political system in the country. A noteworthy illustration is the situation in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus. These states adopt a republican form of government, with the constitution enshrining the division of powers into judicial, executive, and legislative branches. Nevertheless, the presence of a democratic political regime cannot be asserted in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus. These nations exhibit an authoritarian political regime, evidenced by the violation of democratic rights and freedoms, restrictions on the right to peaceful assembly, protests, and rallies, along with the legal prosecution of political figures opposing the incumbent government. Additionally, the prevalence of unfair criminal verdicts and the presence of imperfect legislation concerning European values further contribute to this characterization. Hence, the determination of defining characteristics for a democratic political regime is a nuanced matter that consistently necessitates comprehensive political science research.

6 Discussion

Bjørnskov C. and Rode M. (2020) observe that social scientists have generated various datasets in recent years to quantify

political regimes but often offer limited data on the phases of regime change. The objective of their study is to address this gap. The authors approach the matter of their paper in three distinct ways. Firstly, they broadened the scope to encompass 192 sovereign countries and 16 currently self-governing territories spanning from 1950 to 2018, which also includes periods of colonial rule for over ninety entities. The authors additionally furnish more institutional details, a significant aspect in the relevant literature. Moreover, they introduce a novel, self-constructed indicator differentiating successful and unsuccessful coups d'état. The authors further demonstrate the utility of the new dataset by elucidating the significance of political establishments during colonial rule for post-independence democratic development, employing more comprehensive data on colonial institutions. The findings of the study indicate that colonial institutions with heightened activity exert a positive and enduring impact on democratic development following the transition to independence.

Frey C. B., Chen C., and Presidente G. (2020) assert that there exists a prevailing belief suggesting that autocratic governments have proven more effective in restricting the movement of people to mitigate the spread of COVID-19. The authors discovered that autocratic regimes implemented more stringent quarantine measures and closely monitored contacts. However, their findings did not support the notion that autocratic governments were more successful in curtailing travel. Conversely, countries with democratically accountable governments introduced less stringent quarantine measures but demonstrated approximately 20% greater effectiveness in reducing geographic mobility at an equivalent level of policy stringency. Moreover, leveraging an extensive body of research in cross-cultural psychology, the scholars illustrated that nations exhibiting more docile and collectivist cultural traits experienced a significant decline in geographic mobility compared to their more individualistic counterparts at the same level of policy severity. This methodology led the researchers to the conclusion that, in the context of reducing mobility, collectivist and democratic nations have implemented comparatively effective measures against COVID-19.

Similarly, the study conducted by Cepaluni G., Dorsch M. T., and Branyiczki R. (2022) explores the role and significance of political regimes during the COVID-19 pandemic. Interestingly, the authors reach conclusions that differ from those of Frey C. B., Chen C., and Presidente G. (2020).

Cepaluni, G., Dorsch, M. T., and Branyiczki, R. (2022) quantified the association between political institutes and deaths within the initial 100 days of the COVID-19 pandemic. They illustrated that nations having more democratic political institutions encountered a higher per capita death rate compared to less democratic nations. This outcome remains robust when accounting for numerous pertinent controls, employing various estimation methods, and evaluating instrumental variables for institutional measures. The authors delineated the influence of diverse types of political institutes on the mortality rate from COVID-19. As per their analysis, the response of political regimes in democratic countries proved to be less effective in mitigating mortality during the initial phases of the crisis. The findings posit that democratic political institutions might face a disadvantage in mounting swift responses to pandemics.

Welzel, C. (2021) scrutinizes the recent State of Democracy reports and identifies a neglect of the cultural foundations distinguishing autocracy from democracy. This paper explores the explanatory capacity of cultural zones in delineating the contrast between autocracy and democracy, anchored in the categorization of cultures into "authoritarian values versus emancipation." Consequently, both the trajectory and extent of regime change are intertwined with the widening disparities between regime and culture, stemming from shifts in generational values predominantly toward emancipatory ideals. The author concludes that the trajectory of democracy development tends toward authoritarianism and is circumscribed

by the societal state wherein emancipatory values remain underdeveloped.

Mukand S. W. and Rodrik D. (2020) formulated a taxonomy of political regimes, differentiating among three categories of rights: property rights, political rights, and civil rights. The authors posit that the essence of liberal democracy lies in safeguarding civil rights, besides the other two sets of rights. Their article delineates how democratic transitions, arising from a settlement between the elite (primarily concerned with property rights) and the public majority (prioritizing political rights), generally face challenges in establishing a liberal democracy. Overall, as per Mukand S. W. and Rodrik D. (2020), the evolution of liberal democracy may be contingent upon substantial inequality levels and a weak identity divide.

Helms L. (2023) has compiled an overview of the status of political opposition in both democratic and authoritarian regimes. The author asserts that political opposition has historically been among least-explored facets of real-world politics in contemporary democratic and authoritarian systems. Nevertheless, the past decade has witnessed a surge in new studies on opposition, prompting a thorough examination. Notably, contemporary scholarly endeavors have placed a greater emphasis on studying opposition within authoritarian and hybrid systems than within democratic ones. This trend suggests a subtle reconceptualization of political opposition, setting aside the conventional distinction between regime-loyal opposition and various forms of resistance and dissent that confront the regime. Concentrating on party-based manifestations of opposition, widely acknowledged as the most potent, the review article succinctly encapsulates and underscores pivotal issues for future studies. It also considers some of the inherent challenges that impede the progress towards a more integrated field of inter-regime opposition studies.

The article by Kwakwa P. A., Adzawla W., Alhassan H., and Achaamah A. (2022) examines the influence of the political system on the state of natural resources and economic growth in Tunisia. Accordingly, the political regime engages with oil, mineral, and forestry rents to promote growth in the agricultural sector. The researchers posit that a democratic system plays a pivotal role in the effective utilization of resources for sustained economic growth in a country.

Asutay M. and Mohd Sidek N. Z. (2021) explored political economy issues within the framework of political regimes and institutions. In this context, the authors delved into the effectiveness of Islamic bank loan growth from three distinct perspectives: political regime and institutions, governance, and political risks under both regimes. The study's findings indicated that loan growth is positively influenced and has a significant impact in democratic regimes where political and public rights are upheld.

Ghardallou W. and Sridi D. (2020) conducted a literature review on the correlation between democracy and economic growth. Acknowledging the significance of simultaneously examining the economic and political processes, the authors highlight that some researchers have investigated the influence of the political regime on economic growth and development. The mass of these scholars have concentrated on assessing the economic implications of a democratic political system in comparison to an autocratic political regime. The authors' review aims to scrutinize the existing theoretical literature emphasizing the influence of a democratic political system on economic growth, accompanied by a concise overview of pertinent models. Specifically, the paper explores the mechanisms by which democracy can shape economic growth and development.

Kalaycıoğlu E. (2020) considered the reposition in the political regime in Turkey. According to the author, the relationship between Turkey and the European Union has been pertinent starting from 1959. However, it was solely in the post-Cold War era that the international relations between these two entities gained momentum, significantly impacting Turkey's socio-

political development. One of these influential spheres was Turkey's political regime. To bring Turkish democracy in line with the Copenhagen criteria, several Turkish administrations have proposed constitutional amendments. The article examines the context and characteristics of constitutional modifications introduced over the past three decades and explores the role played by the European Union-Turkey relationship in the transformation of the political regime in Turkey.

Saha S. and Sen K. (2021) investigated the correlation between corruption and political regimes. While there exists a widespread belief that corruption detrimentally impacts a country's economic performance, the phenomenon of impressive economic growth coexisting with prevalent corruption within many East and Southeast Asian countries, known as the East Asian paradox, challenges this notion. Notably, these countries share the common feature of having an autocratic political regime. The authors reassess the relationship between corruption and economic growth in the context of the East Asian paradox. The authors investigate the mediating role of political regimes in the interrelation between corruption and economic growth using panel data spanning 100 countries from 1984 to 2016. Their results provide convincing evidence that the correlation between corruption and economic prosperity fluctuates based on the type of political regime. They note that the influence of corruption on economic growth is more noticeable in autocratic systems compared to democracies. The researchers assert that democracy may not foster economic growth in the presence of high corruption levels. Moreover, they provide persuasive confirmation that the mechanism through which corruption facilitates growth in autocratic systems is linked to the perceived trust in the dedication of governing political elect to economic liberty.

Zagrebin A. (2020) authored a scientific article exploring the conceptualization of democracy within both democratic and non-democratic political regimes. The democratic experience significantly shapes individuals' worldviews and influences their comprehension of democracy. The author posits that this assertion finds support in data from the World Values Survey, indicating distinctions in the apprehension of democracy among citizens in democratic and non-democratic societies. In democratic societies, citizens primarily associate democracy with gender equality, whereas individuals in non-democratic countries tend to associate it more with economic prosperity and social control. Furthermore, citizens in democratic countries are less likely to link democracy with military rule and religious authority in political life compared to their counterparts in non-democratic countries.

The thesis of democracy and citizenship is the focus of Zilla C.'s (2022) scientific work. The author contends that in political science, a set of ideas primarily constitutes political ideals. Comparative politics necessitates concepts capable of transcending national and regional boundaries and being quantifiable. Inclusion, as perceived by the author, is a vague concept where normative expectations for aspects such as participation, equality, social impartiality, and recognition converge. Concurrently, it functions as an analytical instrument to assess the status of political regimes. The author poses the question: How can inclusion be defined to maintain its value orientation while also using it as an empirical concept for systemic and qualitative comparative research? By integrating perspectives from democracy and citizenship theory—two fields that have historically run parallel with minimal interaction—the author establishes and operationalizes inclusion as an attribute of democratic political systems. Beginning with a normative conception of democracy and citizenship that results in a procedural definition, the researcher interprets democratic inclusion as encompassing civic and political inclusion. The study then outlines dimensions for the comparative evaluation of political regimes based on inclusive exclusion.

Wegscheider C. and Stark T. (2020) investigate citizens' evaluations of democratic activities and the interplay between citizens' democratic knowledge and the institutional level of

democracy. Highlighting the crucial role of public support for the survival of democratic political systems, in conjunction with citizens' belief in the legitimacy of democracy, the authors underscore the limited availability of information on the correlation between citizens' democracy-related knowledge and their assessment of democratic outcomes on a global relative scale. This research suggests that the cognitive capacity of citizens to distinguish between features of democratic and authoritarian systems functions as an individual criterion for evaluating the practical aspects of democracy. The authors predict that the influence of citizens' democracy-related knowledge on their assessment of democratic performance is tempered by the institutional democracy level.

The significance of the study by Croissant A. and Haynes J. (2021) is linked to the heterogeneity of the Asia-Pacific region and the extensive range of potentially influential causal factors. Sociologists consider this region a natural laboratory for assessing competing theories related to democratic erosion, decline, and resurgence, as well as for discovering new patterns and relationships.

The investigation undertaken by the author of this article diverges notably in content and structure from the aforementioned scientific and theoretical works. This study encapsulates the author's perspectives on the interpretation of the term "political regime," the conceptual underpinnings of the categories "features," "signs," and "criteria" of a political regime, methodologies for classifying political regimes, indicators and attributes of a democratic regime, and contentious aspects linked to the subject matter of the publication. This facet of the democratic political regime remains unexplored in existing scientific literature.

7 Conclusions

The article delineates the constituents of the intricate set of features and characteristics inherent in a democratic political regime as compared to an authoritarian and totalitarian political regime. Additionally, it delineates the criterion that facilitates the differentiation among various types of political regimes. The comprehensive nature of the political regime category, examined within the realms of both legal and political science, underscores its interdisciplinary and contentious theoretical essence. The overarching categorization of political regimes into democratic, authoritarian, and totalitarian is predicated on the criterion of the "peculiarities of interaction between civil society and the State, the degree of penetration into the private life of citizens, and various spheres of the social reality of the State power."

In the context of this study, a precise comprehension of the concepts of "features," "signs," and "criteria" of a political regime holds paramount significance. The author's standpoint posits that a sign is a feature, a characteristic that delineates a particular political regime in general, while a feature encapsulates the specific content of a sign pertinent to a specific political regime. In essence, it is appropriate to consider the attributes of a political regime and the idiosyncrasies associated with its various types—totalitarian, authoritarian, or democratic. A criterion constitutes a system of features of a political regime, enabling a concise depiction and differentiation of political regime types. The author's perspective necessitates a reevaluation of the conventional, classical classification of political regimes. The author contends that a more accurate classification would involve a division into democratic and non-democratic regimes. The latter, in turn, should be further categorized into authoritarian and totalitarian.

The manuscript introduces both the conventional set of features and attributes associated with a democratic political regime, alongside the author's unique perspective on this matter. The publication raises pertinent inquiries concerning the correlation between the political regime and the form of government. This methodology has enabled the author to argue that a specific form of government (monarchy or republic) does not inherently denote the existence of a specific political regime (democratic,

authoritarian, or totalitarian) in a given state. It is imperative to consider the actual state of affairs concerning the adherence and implementation of democratic values, steering clear of merely declarative normative provisions evident in both constitutions and legislative acts. This perspective is substantiated by instances from nations such as the UK, the Russian Federation, and the Republic of Belarus.

The author contends that future scientific investigations necessitate a precise substantive delineation of the definition of the system (complex) of features and characteristics inherent to a political regime, considering the interpretations elucidated in this paper.

Literature:

1. Annaka, S.: Political regime, data transparency, and COVID-19 death cases. *SSM-population health*, 2021, 15, 100832.
2. Asutay, M., & Mohd Sidek, N. Z.: Political economy of Islamic banking growth: Does political regime and institutions, governance and political risks matter? *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, 2021, 3, 26, 4226-4261.
3. Bickerton, C. J., & Accetti, C. I.: *Technopopulism: The new logic of democratic politics*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2021.
4. Bjørnskov, C., & Rode, M. Regime types and regime change: A new dataset on democracy, coups, and political institutions. *The Review of International Organizations*, 2020, 15, 531-551.
5. Buryachenko, O. V.: Democracy vs autocracy against the Russian-Ukrainian war. *Bulletin of NTUU "KPI" Political Science. Sociology. Law*, 2023, 2(58), [https://doi.org/10.20535/2308-5053.2023.2\(58\).285599](https://doi.org/10.20535/2308-5053.2023.2(58).285599)
6. Cepaluni, G., Dorsch, M. T., & Branyiczki, R.: Political regimes and deaths in the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of public finance and public choice*, 2022, 37(1), 27-53.
7. Chen, C., Frey, C. B., & Presidente, G.: Disease and democracy: Political regimes and countries responsiveness to COVID-19. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 2023, 212, 290-299.
8. Croissant, A., & Haynes, J.: Democratic regression in Asia: introduction. *Democratization*, 2021, 28(1), 1-21.
9. Democracy, totalitarianism and authoritarianism as the main types of political regimes. https://studies.in.ua/polit-sistem_ekzamen/2686-demokratya-totalitarizm-ta-avtoritarizm-yak-osnovn-rznovidi-poltichnih-rezhimv.html.
10. Dictionary of the Ukrainian language. Academic explanatory dictionary (1970-1980). <https://sum.in.ua/s/oznaka>.
11. Edgell, A. B., Wilson, M. C., Boese, V. A., & Grahn, S.: Democratic legacies: using democratic stock to assess norms, growth, and regime trajectories. *V-Dem Working Paper*, 2020, 100.
12. Frey, C. B., Chen, C., & Presidente, G.: Democracy, culture, and contagion: Political regimes and countries responsiveness to Covid-19. *Covid Economics*, 2020, 18.
13. Ghardallou, W., & Sridi, D.: Democracy and economic growth: A literature review. *Journal of the knowledge economy*, 2020, 11, 982-1002.
14. Helms, L.: Political oppositions in democratic and authoritarian regimes: a state-of-the-field (s) review. *Government and Opposition*, 2023, 58(2), 391-414.
15. Kalaycioğlu, E.: The Turkish – EU Odyssey and Political Regime Change in Turkey. In *Turkey and the EU: Accession and Reform*. Routledge, 2020, 57-70.
16. Kolesnyk Yu.M.: Theoretical grounds for studying political regimes. *Scientific Bulletin of The International Humanitarian University*, 2014, 7, 177-180.
17. Kwakwa, P. A., Adzawla, W., Alhassan, H., & Achaamah, A.: Natural resources and economic growth: does political regime matter for Tunisia? *Journal of Public Affairs*, 2022, 22, e2707.
18. Mauk, M.: *Citizen support for democratic and autocratic regimes*, 2020. Oxford University Press, USA.

-
19. Mauk, M.: Disentangling an elusive relationship: How democratic value orientations affect political trust in different regimes. *Political Research Quarterly*, 2020, 73(2), 366-380.
20. Mukand, S. W., & Rodrik, D.: The political economy of liberal democracy. *The Economic Journal*, 2020, 130(627), 765-792.
21. Saha, S., & Sen, K.: The corruption-growth relationship: does the political regime matter? *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 2021, 17(2), 243-266.
22. Siaroff, A.: Comparing political regimes: A thematic introduction to comparative politics. *University of Toronto Press*, 2022.
23. Ștefanachi, B., Grecu, S. P., & Chiriac, H. C.: Mapping Sustainability across the World: Signs, Challenges and Opportunities for Democratic Countries. *Sustainability*, 2022, 14(9), 5659.
24. Stokke, K., & Aung, S. M.: Transition to democracy or hybrid regime? The dynamics and outcomes of democratization in Myanmar. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 2020, 32(2), 274-293.
25. Umpierrez de Reguero, S. A., Yener-Roderburg, I. Ö., & Cartagena, V.: Political regimes and external voting rights: A cross-national comparison. *Frontiers in political science*, 2021, 3, 636734.
26. Wegscheider, C., & Stark, T.: What drives citizens' evaluation of democratic performance? The interaction of citizens' democratic knowledge and institutional level of democracy. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft: Comparative Governance and Politics*, 2020, 14(4), 345-374.
27. Welzel, C.: Why the future is democratic. *Journal of Democracy*, 2021, 32(2), 132-144.
28. Zagrebina, A.: Concepts of democracy in democratic and nondemocratic countries. *International Political Science Review*, 2020, 41(2), 174-191.
29. Zilla, C.: Defining democratic inclusion from the perspective of democracy and citizenship theory. *Democratization*, 2022, 29(8), 1518-1538.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AD