



Maryana Prokop<sup>1</sup>

## HYBRID REGIMES – THE DETERMINATION OF IDEAL TYPE

### Abstract

The article presents an attempt to describe the hybrid regimes as a new type of ideal political regime, which is situated on the continuum axis, by considering the phenomenon of antinomy. The author tried to define the significant features of hybrid regimes based on the analysis of notions and main features of the democracy and authoritarianism. The approach made it possible to create a gradual classification, to provide a reference point for the hybrid regimes' perception, as well as to work on a tool for research the hybrid regimes and on the attempts of this phenomenon explanation.

### Keywords

Hybrid regimes, democracy, authoritarianism, ideal types.

### Introduction

Such issues as the process of democracy consolidation and the impossibility of each country, which pass the process of systemic transition, to transform into democracy have been frequently discussed in the works of Polish and foreign researcher. Despite the general interest in this problem, these issues have not still been fully presented. Moreover, it requires further thorough researches at the theoretical, methodological and empirical level by undertaking the so-called case studies. The long-lasting and unfinished process of systemic transition has made impossible to identify clearly the political regimes (democracy or authoritarianism) of all states. Marcel H. Van Herpen, who analysed Russia's political system, emphasized that in some cases it is difficult to define a particular regimes for a concrete state. The use of such terms as "democratic" and "non-democratic" can have different meaning.

Application of the notion "undemocratic regimes": "...it may tell us that the process of democratization has been temporarily stopped, but there is a hope that it will be resumed. It can also happen that the process of democratization has been

---

<sup>1</sup> Maryana Prokop, Ph.D., the Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland.

stopped decisively and a rather rigid autocratic regime has found itself in the grey zone between democracy and repressive dictatorship. The third possibility is that Russia has moved in the opposite direction, that means movement away from the ideals of democracy and the rule of law while strengthening the autocratic tendencies”<sup>2</sup>.

Researchers identify the process of constant balancing between the democratic and nondemocratic regime by the category of hybrid regimes. This has contributed to a specific dualism, because states on the one hand are characterized by democratic features, while on the other hand in political practice they have often applied solutions according to authoritarian regime. The conception of hybrid regimes also can be defined through the perspective of the transitology paradigm<sup>3</sup>, although it can not be excluded that systemic transition can be held for years, thus lead to the consolidation of hybrid regimes feature. The aim of this article is an attempt to determine the hybrid regimes as a new type of ideal political regime, and thus to define its significant features<sup>4</sup>.

According to research purposes, the author focuses on the concept of perfect types according to Max Weber<sup>5</sup>, which in his opinion “In its conceptual purity is not empirically exists in reality, and it is utopia [...], that’s why have emerged the tasks of determining in each particular case how far reality is approaching or deviating from that perfect image”<sup>6</sup>.

The use of the category of ideal types, considered as an abstract model of the significant qualities of a particular phenomenon, which generally not exists in reality, will allow comparison of social phenomena in relation to the abstract model. The ideal types are characterized by antinomy, which is occurred by the opposition of significant qualities. Between the ideal type and its antinomy exists a *continuum* zone, where the specific real cases are placed and, in the same time, have the features of ideal type or antinomy, they should be regarded as cases close to them. If in such case one can not observe the clear features of ideal type or antinomy, they take the character of hybrid regime. Such type of approach makes it possible to create a gradual classification. The study of political regimes will make possible to consider whether the investigated cases should be treated as close to the ideal types or through the prism

---

<sup>2</sup> M. H. van Herpen, *Putinizm. Powolny rozwój radykalnego reżimu prawicowego w Rosji*, J. Okupieniewski, Gdańsk 2014, p. 141-142.

<sup>3</sup> See: D. A. Rustow, *Transition of democracy: Toward a Dynamics Model*, “Comparative politics” 1970, vol. 2, No 3, p. 337–363.

<sup>4</sup> The significant features, constitutive or primordial constitutional principles are the norms of a particular state system contained in the constitutions, which define the characteristics of a particular system and express the basic constitutional value. Among them are the following: the principle of the separation of power and the balance of power, the principle of national sovereignty, political pluralism, the democratic rule of law. See: W. Skrzydło (ed.), *Polskie prawo konstytucyjne*, Lublin 2004, p. 107.

<sup>5</sup> See: M. Weber, *Szkice z socjologii religii*, Warszawa 1995; P. Załęski, *Typy idealne w socjologii religii Maxa Webera. Analiza struktury kategorizującej pole religii*, „Kultura i Społeczeństwo” 2003, No 1, p. 45–51; M. Orzechowski, *Polityka, władza, panowanie w teorii Maxa Webera*, Warszawa 1984; R. Bäcker, *O znaczeniu kategorii typu idealnego*, [in:] Z. Blok (ed.), *Czym jest teoria w politologii*, Warszawa 2011, p. 20–24; P. Ossowski, *Kategoria typu idealnego w konstruowaniu modelu teoretycznego*, [in:] Z. Blok, op. cit., p. 214–224.

<sup>6</sup> See: M. Weber, *Obiektywność poznania w naukach społecznych*, [in:] *Problemy socjologii wiedzy*, A. Chmielecki, S. Czerniak, J. Niżnika, S. Rainka, (eds.), Warszawa 1985, p. 81.

of hybrids of significant features<sup>7</sup>. In other words, the ideal type is a catalogue of features which define it, but in the reality we can not find a creature which reflects it completely, just as we do not find the ideal type of democracy, because the state may be close to the ideal type, but it can not be completely ideal. The determination of hybrid regimes' ideal type will provide a reference point for the hybrid regimes perception, as well as make possible to work on a tool for research the hybrid regimes and on the attempts of this phenomenon explanation. Moreover, it makes possible to identify the significant features which can be used as criteria in defining a particular regime as hybrid.

### The concept of hybrid regimes

The hybrid regimes category most commonly is applied in relation to the evolution of European countries, especially in the former Soviet republics<sup>8</sup>. One of the first who used the "hybrid regimes" term was a Hungarian sociologist, Edward Hankiss, for description the communist regime of Hungary during the rule of János Kadar<sup>9</sup>. Among the researchers who investigate the hybrid regimes, such scientists should be mentioned as Gulermo O'Donnell<sup>10</sup>, Larry Diamond<sup>11</sup>, Philippe C. Schmitter<sup>12</sup> and Terry L. Karl<sup>13</sup>. It is believed that these scientists were the first to make the attempt of interpretation the concept of hybrid regimes and to introduce this term in political science. Polish researchers, Andrzej Antoszewski and Ryszard Herbut<sup>14</sup>, in the consideration of the political systems use the term of a "grey zone" between democracy and authoritarianism and the term of delegative democracy. Among the scientists<sup>15</sup> who investigate this problem we would like to mention Lucana Way,

---

<sup>7</sup> Compare: R. Bäcker, *O znaczeniu kategorii...*, op. cit., p. 20–24.

<sup>8</sup> G. B. Robertson, *The Politics of Protest in Hybrid Regime. Managing Dissent in Post-Communist Russia*, New York 2011, p. 4–6.

<sup>9</sup> See: E. Hankiss, *The «Second Society» is there an alternative Social Model Emerging in Contemporary Hungary?* "Social Research" No 55, (1-2), 1988, p. 26–35.

<sup>10</sup> G. O'Donnell, *Delegative democracy*, "Journal of Democracy" No 5 (1), 1996, p. 55–69.

<sup>11</sup> L. Diamond points out that between liberal democracy and closed authoritarianism on the axis of the *continuum*, it could be placed the antinomian political regimes – electoral democracies, ambiguous regimes, competitive authoritarianism and hegemonic authoritarianism. L. Diamond, *Development Democracy: Toward Consolidation*, Baltimor 1999.

<sup>12</sup> G. O'Donnell G., P. C. Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*, Baltimore Press 1986.

<sup>13</sup> P. C. Schmitter, T. L. Karl, *What Democracy is... and Is Not*, "Journal of Democracy" 1991, vol. 2, No 3, p. 77–88; T. L. Karl, *The Hybrid Regimes of Central America*, "Journal of Democracy" vol. 6, 1995, No 3, p. 72–86.

<sup>14</sup> See: A. Antoszewski, R. Herbut, *Systemy polityczne współczesnej Europy*, Gdańsk 2006.

<sup>15</sup> In the English literature, we can observe, on the one hand, the variety of works considering the hybrid systems, but on the other hand, such works can be characterized by disorder, as the hybridization of state regimes is the subject of great number of researchers, that in turn has led to different concepts' establishment, and the ways of defining the causes of state belonging to the *continuum* between democracy and authoritarianism.

Steven Levitsky<sup>16</sup>, Wolfgang Merkel and Andreas Croissant<sup>17</sup>, Genadiy Shypunov<sup>18</sup>, Mykola Riabchuk<sup>19</sup>, Dmitriy Furman<sup>20</sup>, Jan Holzer, Stanislaw Balik<sup>21</sup>, Thomas Carothers<sup>22</sup>.

The problem of the interpretation ambiguity of the hybrid regimes has led to the emergence of many competing concepts, as well as to attempts of their interpretation through the related concept. Researches who investigate the regimes of states which are placed between democracy and authoritarianism use different notions such as “incomplete democracy”, “directed democracy<sup>23</sup>”, “guided democracy<sup>24</sup>”, “semi-democracy”, “delegative democracy”, “illiberal democracy”, “semi-authoritarian regime”, “competitive authoritarianism”, “grey zone”, “regime of ruled pluralism”, “regime of the power’s dominance”, and “anocracy”<sup>25</sup>.

The analysis of the aforementioned approaches provides the basis for arguing that these concepts, by taking into account the transition processes, may be regarded as related categories that fall within the general concept of hybrid regime. Generally speaking, the theory of hybrid regimes is highly characterized by chaos, because of constant rising of science’s wealth, as well as constructions of new concepts, multiplication of definitions and propositions of new research methods of hybrid regimes study<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> P. Levitsky, L. A. Way, *Competitive authoritarianism, Hybrid regimes after the Cold War*, New York 2010; P. Levitsky, L. A. Way, *The Durability of Revolutionary Regimes*, „Journal of Democracy” 2013, vol. 24, No 3, p. 5–17.

<sup>17</sup> В. Меркель, А. Круассан, *Формальные и неформальные институты в дефектных демократиях* (II), “Полис” 2002, no. 1–2, p. 6–17.

<sup>18</sup> Г. Шипунов, *Теоретико-методологічні засади аналізу гібридних політичних режимів: український контекст*, „Наукові записки [Національного університету “Острозька академія”], Політичні науки” 2008.

<sup>19</sup> M. Riabchuk M, *Agony of a “Blackmail state”: Rise and (Possible) Fall of Post-Soviet Semi-Authoritarian Regimes* [in:] A. N. Lushyckyj, M. Riabchuk (Hrsg.): *Ukraine on its meandering path between East and West*, Frankfurt am Main 2009.

<sup>20</sup> Д. Фурман, *Политическая система современной России и её жезненный цикл*, “Свободная мысль” 2003, No 11, p. 2–10.

<sup>21</sup> J. Holzer, P. Balik, *Postkomunistyczne reżimy niedemokratyczne. Badania nad przemianami teorii politycznej w okresie po transformacji ustrojowej*. Kraków 2009.

<sup>22</sup> Th. Carothers, *The «sequencing» fallacy*, “Journal of Democracy” 2007, vol. 18, No 1, p. 12–27; Th. Carothers, *The end of transition paradigm*, “Journal of Democracy” 2002, vol. 13, No 2, p. 5–19.

<sup>23</sup> “Directed democracy” means a system in which democratic institutions exist (e.g. presidential and parliamentary elections), while the decision-making is the responsibility of the entity or the ruling party. The purpose of the election is not to confront the diverse interests and rationality, but to show the unity of the ruling and the ruled. The aim of regular elections is not a replacement of the ruling elite, but justifying its legitimacy. A. Skrzypek, *Putinada. Rosja – kraj kierowanej demokracji*. Warszawa 2014, p. 14.

<sup>24</sup> See: A. Bryc, *Rosja w XXI wieku: gracz światowy czy koniec gry?*, Warszawa 2009, p. 24-29.

<sup>25</sup> Anocracy – the regime characterized by lack of internal coherence, as well as lack of well-established (institutionalized) and nation-wide features of democracy or autocracy. A. Kondratowicz *Demokracja a jakość rządzenia*, [in:] J. Wilkin (ed.), *Jakość rządzenia w Polsce. Jak ją badać, monitorować i poprawiać?*, Warszawa 2013, p. 74.

<sup>26</sup> See: M. Prokop, *Demokratyczno-autorytarna hybryda: redefinicja kategorii teoretycznej*, „Historia i Polityka” 2015, No 13 (20), M. Прокоп, *Теоретико-методологічні засади аналізу гібридних режимів. Операціоналізація та концептуалізація поняття*, „Вісник Дніпропетровського Університету. Серія: філософія, соціологія, політологія” 2016, No 6.

The hybrid regime is presented as the *Democracy Index* in the classification of Economist Intelligence Unit that is a research unit linked to The Economist weekly, which intends to measure the state of democracy in 167 countries all over the world. The *Democracy Index* is based on sixty indicators grouped in five categories: electoral process and pluralism, civil liberties, functioning of government, political participation and political culture. According to these assumptions, countries are divided into full (liberal) democracies, flawed (electoral) democracies, hybrid regimes and authoritarian regimes (consolidated authoritarianism)<sup>27</sup>. The hybrid regimes' term has also appeared in the reports of the Freedom House, the American Foundation, which systematically monitors the political changes in the post-Soviet space. The research is based on the following criteria: the quality of national democratic governance at central and local level, electoral process, civil society development, independent media, judicial framework and independence and corruption. Each criteria is scored from 1 (maximum democratic level) to 7 (maximum authoritarian level). Based on these variables, Freedom House has identified the next types: Consolidated Democracy (the average of received scores is between 1.00 and 2.99), Semi-Consolidated Democracy (3.00-3.99), Transitional Government or Hybrid Regime (4.00-4.99), Semi-Consolidated Authoritarian Regime (5.00-5.99) and Consolidated Authoritarian Regime (6.00-7.00)<sup>28</sup>.

Samuel Huntington, according to the results of analysing the waves of democratization, distinguished several stages of the democratization process: the end of the authoritarian regime, the establishment of a democratic system and the consolidation of the democratic system<sup>29</sup>.

### **The determination of ideal type**

According to M. Weber, ideal types are situated on the *continuum* axis. Each of these types has its own antinomy, that is to say, creatures which have opposing features to this type or lack of them, so in this case we can apply their disconnection. Considering that the hybrid regime is situated between the ideal types of democracy and authoritarianism, it is justified to assert that the significant qualities of this type would be a balance of democracy and authoritarianism feature.

Thus, in order to determine the ideal type of hybrid regimes, three stages were identified. The first phase included operationalization for the category of democracy and authoritarianism, by defining their qualities. The second phase consisted of an attempt to justify the selection of qualities for democracy and authoritarianism, and an attempt to close the catalogue of the above characteristics (because it can not be an infinite number of properties that in such case would lead to a huge problem in operationalization). In turn, the third phase was introduced by an antinomy set of features for democracy and authoritarianism (obtained at the operationalization stage) with the aim to isolate the significant qualities for the ideal type of hybrid regimes.

---

<sup>27</sup> Democracy index 2011. Democracy under stress. A report from the Economist Intelligence Unit; [online:] [http://pagep.eiu.com/rs/eiu2/images/EIU\\_Democracy\\_Index\\_Dec2011.pdf](http://pagep.eiu.com/rs/eiu2/images/EIU_Democracy_Index_Dec2011.pdf) (12.03.2014).

<sup>28</sup> Methodology Freedom House, [online:] <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit-2012/-methodology#.V SWno.9ysUXN>, (20.03.2014).

<sup>29</sup> See: P. Huntington, *Trzecia fala demokratyzacji*, Warszawa 1995, p. 45, 50–53.

According to the stages above it should be emphasized that in current research are used the assumptions of democracy by David Held. The scientist has studied a democracy model on the basis of an analysis of the institutional and social conditions, and consequently represents the whole range of democracy establishment characteristic. In spite of the impossibility to find directly distinguishable qualities of democracy in the scientist's book, we can analyse the particular models classified into two groups: classical models (classic democracy, republicanism, liberal democracy, Marxism) and contemporary models (competitive elitism, pluralism, legal democracy, participatory democracy, deliberative democracy and modern democracy). These models became a framework for determining the principle of political alternation, the principle of political pluralism, the principle of separation of powers and the functioning of the opposition forces<sup>30</sup>.

The category of authoritarianism is considered due to the approach of the Juan J. Linz, who defines it as following: "political systems characterized by political pluralism that is limited and free of political responsibility to the society; without leading-edge ideology, but with clear mental features; free from extensive and intensive political mobilization (except of certain periods of development); and in which a leader or sometimes a small group of leaders have the power of weakly defined formal boundaries, which in fact are easily predictable"<sup>31</sup>.

The assumptions above made it possible to distinguish the following features of democracy: the principle of power alternation, the principle of separation of power, the principle of political pluralism, the role of political opposition, the political activity of citizen. On the other hand, due to the antinomy, authoritarianism is characterized by the lack of power alternation, imbalance of realization the separation of tripartite power, limitation of political opposition and political pluralism, as well as political apathy.

Therefore, it should be explained and justified the selection of such main features for defining the democracy and authoritarianism. The principle of the power alternation as a constitutive feature of democracy is largely based on the institution of elections as a procedure for the elimination of the ruling elite. In this case, the principle of the nation's sovereignty was not considered, while is commonly appeared in democracy definitions and means that the supreme power in the state should belong to the nation. According to the modern constitutionalism, a nation is understood not as subject who practically ruled the state, but an entity from which this power comes<sup>32</sup>. Here, the principle of the sovereignty of the nation is replaced by the principle of power alternation in the state, which constitutes the exchange of the ruling elite, and thus enables the nation to create a power.

The realization of political pluralism should be treated as a feature of democracy, but with taking into account the definition of authoritarianism of J. Linz<sup>33</sup>. The highly limitation of political pluralism leads to transformation of the state into the undemocratic form of government. In this case the treatment of political pluralism, as

---

<sup>30</sup> D. Held, *Modele demokracji*, Kraków 2010.

<sup>31</sup> J. J. Linz, *Totalitaryzm i autorytaryzm*, [in:] J. Szczupaczyński (ed.), *Władza i społeczeństwo, wybór i opracowanie* Warszawa 1995, t. 1.

<sup>32</sup> B. Banaszak, *Prawo konstytucyjne*, V. 5, Warszawa 2010, p. 261–273.

<sup>33</sup> J. J. Linz, op. cit., p. 210.



a significant feature in the study, highlights its essence for democracy, as well as for authoritarianism on the basis of antinomy. The adopted principle of separation of power, their mutual regulation and obstructing have been used as a constitutive feature of democracy. In turn, the free functioning of the opposition was adopted with the aim to assess the degree of democracy, while the application of restrictions to oppositional activities is a non-democratic mechanism for the functioning of the political system. The last feature, the political apathy, was adopted as a constitutive feature for authoritarianism, while the antinomy of political apathy defined as a political activity (involving all kinds of public participation) determines the democratic nature of the regime.

Moreover, it should be clarified why the catalogue of significant qualities in the research don't include a very important feature derived from the definition of J. J. Linz, who replaced the ideological category by mentality<sup>34</sup>. In the current research this feature can be recognized as a political identity<sup>35</sup> that manifests itself in the existence of some kind of mentality expressed in the "common interest" of the nation and the state, which should be dealt with by all political forces and society. The main function in this case belongs to a head of state, who is defined as the "father of the nation"<sup>36</sup>. For the purpose of the interpretation of this feature exclusion from the research process, attention should be paid to the way in which the research tool is constructed.

In this research the definition of significant qualities is based on the ideal types considered in the field of antinomy, that is to say in case of not ensuring the feature as the essence of democracy, it was identified as a feature of an authoritarian type, and otherwise, the absence of emphasizing this characteristic for authoritarianism is automatically defined for democracy. Consequently, the qualities can be grouped as follows:

- ensuring of the power alternation – lack of power alternation;
- ensuring the separation of power – a monopoly of one authority body;
- guaranteeing of political pluralism – limiting / or lack of the political pluralism;
- the free functioning of the political opposition – limiting the activities of the political opposition;

---

<sup>34</sup> The assumption is based on the reflections of the German sociologist, Theodor Geiger. According to his view, ideologies could be understood as thought systems, intellectually refined, systematized in writing by intellectuals or by so-called pseudointellectual. Mental types are more emotional than rational ways of thinking and feeling, which provide unwritten rules of reaction for different situation. Ibidem, p. 312.

<sup>35</sup> R. Bäcker uses the notion of political consciousness and social awareness. In the first case, the concept is related to apathy emergence and to separation of the private and state sphere. The state sphere is introduced by myths and stereotypes that are spread through the mass media. This sphere is characterized by emotional mentality and expression of hostility towards everything alien. In turn, in the private sphere dominates vegetative thinking, while only a small minority can be classified to a type of thinking of totalitarian political gnosis. R. Bäcker defines the Russians' social consciousness (February, 2014) within the boundaries between a strong mentality characteristic for strong authoritarianism and the immature forms of political gnosis that derive from the forms of great nationalism. See: R. Bäcker, *Świadomość polityczna współczesnych Rosjan*, „Kultura i Edukacja” 2014, No 4 (104), p. 222–224.

<sup>36</sup> Г. Шипунов, *Теоретико-методологічні засади аналізу гібридних...*, op. cit., p. 97.

– political apathy of the society – political activity of the society<sup>37</sup>.

According to the following analogy, the principle for the omitted feature can be presented as: political identity of society – lack of expressed political identity. In this case some doubts have been cast upon the impossibility to say that some societies are devoid of political identity or political consciousness. So, the autonomy can not be applied here. It should also be noted that the term of identity derives from psychological sciences<sup>38</sup>, while it has also been applied in sociology<sup>39</sup>, philosophical<sup>40</sup> and political<sup>41</sup> science. Generally speaking, the category of political identity should be understood by the prism of entity identifying with a certain political group or leader, which is related to the emergence of some kind of connection between them, which is shaped by the acceptance of the views of the group/leader and perception of their views as own<sup>42</sup>. Moreover, the personal political identity is expressed in emergence of a unique emotional relation to a particular leader. Thus, the category of identity is derived from psychological sciences and is defined from sociology by the prism of qualities and values of a particular community, that's why to a great extent raises objections of its usefulness.

Considering the previously analysed catalogue of the five significant features it should be emphasized the dependence between them on the basis of antinomian types, which means that in this case an antinomian feature determines the antinomian type of ideal political regime. For the case of feature implementation possibility, its

---

<sup>37</sup> Such assumptions are also useful in the discussion about hybrid regimes, as they allow tasting the indicator by a prism of variable for democracy and authoritarianism, which in turn gives the opportunity to take into account situations where none of these variables are fully realized. Thus, a feature acquires new properties, that is to say, a specific intermediate state.

<sup>38</sup> And it is treated by the prism of the stacked ability of all identities' integration and as the confidence that the inside identity and continuity acquired in the past reflects the identity and continuity of other. See: E. H. Erikson, *Dzieciństwo i społeczeństwo*, Poznań 2000, p. 272.

<sup>39</sup> In the field of sociology, the concept of identity is interpreted by researchers in a very broad way, with regard to the views and feelings of the entity, and by the prism of self-identification, also expressed in human behaviour and expectations in relation to the individual's social role. B. Szacka, *Wprowadzenie do socjologii*, Warszawa 2003, p. 149–152; G. Marshall (ed.), *Słownik socjologii i nauk społecznych*, Warszawa 2004, p. 402–403.

<sup>40</sup> In the field of philosophical sciences, identity is understood by the prism of the qualities that a particular entity attributes to itself and to others. Thus, it creates a catalogue of characteristics by which it identifies the perception of oneself and the surrounding. G. H. Mead, *Umysł, osobowość i społeczeństwo*, Warszawa 1975, p. 267–270.

<sup>41</sup> Political identity, according to Jerzy Mizgalski, is an aspect of a larger and more complex part of the whole human identity. Identity includes the whole of the individual and community identification through the creation of natural and community links, and at the same time forming the sense of belonging to a particular community. Nevertheless, there is a conscious perception of differences in relation to other members of the community on the basis of: biological-species identity, procreative-genealogical, social and cultural identities. On this basis the following types of human identity can be formed: biological, social, cultural, national and historical, individual, religious, generational, family and political. See: J. Migalski, *Tożsamość polityczna. Studium zjawiska*, Toruń 2008, p. 19–26.

<sup>42</sup> Compare: I. Ю. Иванов *Феномен політичної ідентичності: політологічний аспект*, „Грані: Науково-теоретичний і громадсько-політичний альманах” 2012, No 4, p. 139–142; B. Dalgliesh, *Problematising the Political Theory of Identity Politics: Towards an Agonistic Freedom*, „Kritike” 2013, vol. 7, No 1; K. von Beyme, *Federalism, democracy and the politics identity*, [in:] M–P. Darviche (ed.), *Multinational state building. Considering and continuing the work of Juan Linz*, W. Genieys, Montpellier 2008.



restriction or lack of antinomy existence, it was define a *continuum* for a particular feature, which ensure the possibility of its partial implementation or the use of restrictions in this purpose.

**Table 1. Gradation of the significant features**

<b>Democracy</b>	<b>Hybridity of the significant features</b>	<b>Authoritarianism</b>
Principle of power alternation	Partially guaranteed principle of power alternation	Lack of the power alternation / Undemocratic alternation
Principle of separation of power	Willingness of introduction a monopoly for executive power	Domination of the executive power
Political pluralism	Partially limited political pluralism	Limited pluralism / lack of pluralism
Free functioning of the opposition	Partially restricted functioning of the opposition	Total restricted functioning of the opposition (ban on functioning)
Political activity	Occasional political activity with elements of political apathy	Political apathy

Source: author's own research

The table above presents the following features which can be described as features of the ideal type of hybrid regime: partially guaranteed principle of power alternation (which mainly means the mechanisms preventing the opposition from participating in the elections on an equal basis), actions with purpose of introduction a monopoly for executive power (which cause the systemic changes), partially limited political pluralism and the partially restricted functioning of the opposition (these features are interrelated and are expressed in oppression of opposition groups) and the occasional involvement of the public to the political affairs with elements of political apathy.

## **Conclusions**

The article was intended to describe the hybrid regimes through a catalogue of significant features, which would allow determining the ideal type for a particular category. Undoubtedly, these assumptions require an empirical confirmation based on case study analysis. Furthermore, it was made an attempt of operationalization the category of hybrid regimes. Additionally, the investigation represents a new approach in the interpretation of hybrid regimes not only through the prism of systemic transition (as its stage), but first of all by looking on it through the prism of consolidation of its hybridism, as a new type of political regime. Undoubtedly this perception is somewhat controversial in relation to popular concepts, but in the same time deserves attention at least for the sake of confrontation with other approaches.

## Bibliography

1. Antoszewski A., Herbut R., *Systemy polityczne współczesnej Europy*, Gdańsk 2006.
2. Bäcker R., *O znaczeniu kategorii typu idealnego*, [in:] Z. Blok (ed.), *Czym jest teoria w politologii*, Warszawa 2011.
3. Bäcker R., *Świadomość polityczna współczesnych Rosjan*, „Kultura i Edukacja” 2014, No 4 (104).
4. Banaszak B., *Prawo konstytucyjne*, Warszawa 2010.
5. Bryc A., *Rosja w XXI wieku: gracz światowy czy koniec gry?*, Warszawa 2009.
6. Carothers Th., *The „sequencing” fallacy*, “Journal of Democracy” 2007, vol. 18, No 1.
7. Carothers Th., *The end of transition paradigm*, “Journal of Democracy” 2002, vol. 13, No 2.
8. Dalgliesh B., *Problematising the Political Theory of Identity Politics: Towards an Agonistic Freedom*, „Kritike” 2013, vol. 7, No 1.
9. *Democracy index 2011. Democracy under stress. A report from the Economist Intelligence Unit*; [online:] [http://pagep.eiu.com/rs/eiu2/images/EIU\\_Democracy\\_Index\\_Dec2011.pdf](http://pagep.eiu.com/rs/eiu2/images/EIU_Democracy_Index_Dec2011.pdf) (12.03.2014).
10. Diamond L., *Development Democracy: Toward Consolidation*, Baltimor 1999.
11. Erikson E. H., *Dzieciństwo i społeczeństwo*, Poznań 2000.
12. Hankiss E., *The „Second Society” is there an alternative Social Model Emerging in Contemporary Hungary?* “Social Research” No 55(1-2), 1988.
13. Held D., *Modele demokracji*, Kraków 2010.
14. Holzer J., Balik P., *Postkomunistyczne reżimy niedemokratyczne. Badania nad przemianami teorii politycznej w okresie po transformacji ustrojowej*, Kraków 2009.
15. Huntington P., *Trzecia fala demokratyzacji*, Warszawa 1995.
16. Karl T. L., *The Hybrid Regimes of Central America*, “Journal of Democracy” 1995, vol 6, No 3.
17. Kondratowicz A., *Demokracja a jakość rządzenia*, [in:], J. Wilkin (ed.), *Jakość rządzenia w Polsce. Jak ją badać, monitorować i poprawiać?*, Warszawa 2013.
18. Levitsky P., Way L. A., *Competitive authoritarianism, Hybrid regimes after the Cold War*, New York 2010.
19. Levitsky P., Way L. A., *The Durability of Revolutionary Regimes*, „Journal of Democracy” 2013, vol. 24, No 3.
20. Linz J. J., *Totalitaryzm i autorytaryzm*, [in:] J. Szczupaczyński (ed.) *Władza i społeczeństwo, wybór i opracowanie* Warszawa 1995, t. 1.
21. Marshall G. (ed.), *Słownik socjologii i nauk społecznych*, Warszawa 2004.
22. Mead G. H., *Umysł, osobowość i społeczeństwo*, Warszawa 1975.
23. *Methodology Freedom House*, [online:] <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nations-transit-2012/-methodology#.VSWno.9ysUXN>, (20.03.2014).
24. Migalski J., *Tożsamość polityczna. Studium zjawiska*, Toruń 2008.
25. O’Donnell G., *Delegative democracy*, “Journal of Democracy” No 5 (1), 1996.
26. O’Donnell G., Schmitter P. C., *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Democracies*, Baltimore Press 1986.

27. Orzechowski M., *Polityka, władza, panowanie w teorii Maxa Webera*, Warszawa 1984.
28. Ossowski P., *Kategoria typu idealnego w konstruowaniu modelu teoretycznego*, [in:] *Czym jest teoria w politologii*, Z. Blok (ed.), Warszawa 2011.
29. *Polskie prawo konstytucyjne*, Lublin 2004.
30. Prokop M., *Demokratyczno-autorytarna hybryda: redefinicja kategorii teoretycznej*, „Historia i Polityka” 2015, No 13 (20).
31. Riabchuk M., *Agony of a “Blackmail state”: Rise and (Possible) Fall of Post-Soviet Semi-Authoritarian Regims* [in:] A. N. Lushyckyj, M. Riabchuk (Hrsg.): *Ukraine on its meandering path between East and West*, Frankfurt am Main 2009.
32. Robertson G. B., *The Politics of Protest in Hybrid Regime. Managing Dissent in Post-Communist Russia*, New York 2011.
33. Rustow D. A., *Transition of democracy: Toward a Dynamics Model*, “Comparative politics” 1970, vol. 2, no. 3.
34. Schmitter P. C., Karl T. L., *What Democracy is... and Is Not*, “Journal of Democracy” 1991, vol. 2, No 3,
35. Skrzypek A., *Putinada. Rosja – kraj kierowanej demokracji*. Warszawa 2014.
36. Szacka B., *Wprowadzenie do socjologii*, Warszawa 2003.
37. van Herpen M. H., *Putinizm. Powolny rozwój radykalnego reżimu prawicowego w Rosji*, Gdańsk 2014.
38. von Beyme K., *Federalism, democracy and the politics identity*, [in:] M-P. Darviche, W. Genieys (eds.), *Multinational state building. Considering and continuing the work of Juan Linz*, , Montpellier 2008.
39. Weber M., *Obiektywność poznania w naukach społecznych*, [in:] A. Chmielecki, S. Czerniak, J. Niżnika, S. Rainka,(eds.), *Problemy socjologii wiedzy*, Warszawa 1985.
40. Weber M., *Szkice z socjologii religii*, Warszawa 1995.
41. Załęski P., *Typy idealne w socjologii religii Maxa Webera. Analiza struktury kategoryzującej pole religii*, „Kultura i Społeczeństwo” No 1, 2003.
42. Іванов І. Ю., *Феномен політичної ідентичності: політологічний аспект*, „Грані: Науково-теоретичний і громадсько-політичний альманах” No 4, 2012.
43. Меркель В., Круассан А., *Формальные и неформальные институты в дефектных демократиях (II)*, “Полис” 2002, No 1–2.
44. Прокоп М., *Тереотико-методологічні засади аналізу гібридних режимів. Операціоналізація та концептуалізація поняття*, „Вісник Дніпропетровського Університету. Серія: філософія, соціологія, політологія” 2016, No 6.
45. Фурман Д., *Политическая система современной России и её жезненный цыкл*, “Свободная мысль” 2003, no. 11.
46. Шипунов Г., *Теоретико-методологічні засади аналізу гібридних політичних режимів: український контекст*, Наукові записки [Національного університету "Острозька академія"], Політичні науки 2008.

## Streszczenie

Artykuł przedstawia próbę ujęcia reżimów hybrydalnych jako nowego typu idealnego reżimu politycznego, który znajduje się na osi *continuum*, między demokracją i autorytaryzmem. Autor podjął się zadania określenia cech istotnościowych dla reżimów hybrydalnych poprzez operacjonalizację antynomicznych kategorii demokracji i autorytaryzmu. Podejście to umożliwiło stworzenie stopniowej klasyfikacji, aby zapewnić punkt odniesienia dla postrzegania reżimów hybrydowych, jak również do pracy nad narzędziem do badań reżimów hybrydowych oraz prób wyjaśnienia specyfiki danego zjawiska.

### Reżimy hybrydalne – ujęcie typu idealnego

#### Słowa kluczowe

Reżimy hybrydalne, demokracja, autorytaryzm, typy idealne

**Maryana Prokop** – Ph.D., Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce; a graduate of doctoral studies in political sciences at the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Torun (2015); a graduate of master studies in political science (2009), as well as journalism and social communication (2011) at the University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn. Scientific interests: political systems of Eastern Europe, international relations in post-Soviet space, and theory of hybrid regimes.