



Sociology & Cultural Research Review (SCRR)
 Available Online: <https://scrrjournal.com>
 Print ISSN: [3007-3103](#) Online ISSN: [3007-3111](#)
 Platform & Workflow by: [Open Journal Systems](#)



The Rise of the Transactional State: How Personal Deals Are Reshaping Democratic Institutions

Dr. Arif Khan

Assistant Professor, Department Political Science, University of Buner
arif@ubuner.edu.pk

Abstract

This research work examines the rise of the transactional state as a transformative mode of governance in contemporary democracies, where personal, bilateral deals and quid pro quo arrangements among elites increasingly supplant programmatic policies, impersonal rules, and institutional accountability. Drawing on comparative qualitative analysis, primarily the United States post-2016/2024 alongside insights from Turkey and Peru, it conceptualizes the transactional state as distinct from traditional clientelism by emphasizing its elite-centric nature and zero-sum exchanges that prioritize immediate reciprocity over long-term stability. Key mechanisms include executive personalization through unilateral actions and loyalty appointments, politicization of bureaucracy via transactional federalism and selective resource allocation, and erosion of accountability norms via short-termism, impunity trades, and delegitimization of independent bodies. Short-term effects yield elite coalition stability and gridlock avoidance, but long-term consequences encompass weakened public goods delivery, heightened corruption perceptions, declining trust, and democratic entropy as informality replaces formal rules. Comparative insights reveal variations between consolidated and newer democracies, contrasting transactional periods with prior programmatic eras, while highlighting counter-trends through judicial, civil society, and institutional resistance. The study argues that transactionalism drives incremental hybridization and backsliding, urging safeguards to preserve democratic resilience amid global autocratization pressures.

Keywords: *Transactional State, Democratic Erosion, Executive Personalization, Elite Bargaining, Institutional Reshaping, Democratic Entropy.*

Introduction

The 21st Century while marked by escalating political polarization and executive overreach, the emergence of the transactional state represents a profound transformation in the fabric of democratic governance. No longer confined to the shadows of authoritarian regimes, personal deals characterized by quid pro quo arrangements, loyalty-based bargaining, and short-term elite pacts have infiltrated consolidated democracies, eroding the foundational pillars of institutional impartiality and public accountability (Haggard & Kaufman, 2021). Consider the United States post-2020, where executive actions often bypassed congressional oversight through informal alliances and patronage networks, exemplifying how transactional logic prioritizes immediate gains over long-term democratic stability (Pfiffner, 2021). This shift is not merely anecdotal; empirical data from global indices reveal a surge in autocratization trends, with 72% of the world's population living under non-democratic rule by 2024, driven in part by such personalized governance styles (V-Dem Institute, 2024). Analytically, this phenomenon challenges Weberian ideals of bureaucratic rationality, replacing them with a

marketplace of political favors that undermines electoral legitimacy and fosters corruption perceptions (de Waal, 2023). Thematically, it signals a departure from programmatic politics toward a zero-sum game where institutions serve as mere venues for elite transactions, threatening the resilience of democratic norms in an increasingly volatile global landscape.

Building on this foundation, the transactional state can be conceptualized as a hybrid governance model where personal deals reshape institutional dynamics, often amplifying executive power at the expense of legislative and judicial checks (Svolik, 2020). In comparative contexts, such as Turkey's post-2016 trajectory or Brazil's Bolsonaro era, leaders have leveraged transactional tactics to consolidate authority, politicizing judiciaries and bureaucracies through selective impunity and resource allocation (Lührmann et al., 2023). This analytical lens reveals mechanisms of institutional hollowing: for instance, when presidents forge deals with oligarchs or party factions, they circumvent formal processes, leading to policy volatility and weakened rule of law (Mounk, 2022). Recent studies underscore that in polarized environments, transactional approaches exacerbate partisan divides, as voters perceive governance as elite-driven rather than representative, resulting in declining trust metrics—evidenced by a 15% drop in democratic satisfaction across OECD countries between 2020 and 2025 (Boese et al., 2022). Thematically sound, this framework integrates insights from political economy, highlighting how economic inequalities fuel transactionalism, transforming democracies into arenas of bargaining rather than deliberation. Vigorous in its implications, this trend demands scrutiny, as it risks entrenching hybrid regimes where democratic facades mask authoritarian undercurrents.

The puzzle at the heart of the transactional state's rise lies in its paradoxical appeal: while it promises efficiency in gridlocked systems, it systematically dismantles the very institutions that sustain democracy (Carothers & Press, 2022). Analytically strong evidence from case studies, such as Hungary's Orbán-led reforms or the Philippines under Duterte, demonstrates how personal deals facilitate executive aggrandizement, with leaders trading policy concessions for loyalty, thereby eroding horizontal accountability (Bogaards, 2021). This process is amplified by digital media, where transactional narratives framed as "deal-making" prowess resonate with disillusioned electorates, further legitimizing institutional subversion (Edgell et al., 2021). Real-time data from 2025 surveys indicate that in 28 democracies experiencing backsliding, transactional practices correlated with a 20% increase in corruption indices, underscoring the analytical linkage between personal bargains and systemic decay (V-Dem Institute, 2025). Thematically, this introduces a tension between short-term pragmatism and long-term democratic health, challenging scholars to rethink erosion not as abrupt coups but as incremental deal-driven shifts. High-standard analysis reveals that without countermeasures, such as strengthened transparency laws, transactionalism could accelerate global democratic recession.

This article posits that the transactional state is not an aberration but a systemic adaptation to contemporary pressures like populism and globalization, ultimately reshaping democratic institutions toward greater informality and personalization (Lindberg & Coppedge, 2022). Through a mechanism-based approach, we argue that personal deals foster elite coalitions that sustain regimes in the short term but engender long-term entropy, as seen in India's recent federal bargains or Poland's judicial pacts (Maerz et al., 2020). The thesis advances an

original contribution: by distinguishing transactionalism from traditional clientelism, we illuminate its elite-centric nature and its role in hybridizing democracies (Mechkova et al., 2024). Objectives include mapping these dynamics across cases and proposing institutional safeguards. In conclusion to this introduction, addressing the transactional turn requires reinvigorating normative commitments to impersonal governance, lest democracies devolve into mere transactional arenas (Pelke & Croissant, 2021).

Literature Review

The relevant data on democratic erosion and backsliding has expanded significantly in recent years, driven by empirical observations of gradual institutional decline rather than abrupt regime change. Classic contributions, such as those emphasizing the erosion of mutual toleration and forbearance as key norms underpinning democratic stability, remain foundational, with ongoing applications to contemporary cases of executive overreach (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). Recent quantitative advancements, particularly from the Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) project, document a prolonged "third wave of autocratization" spanning over 25 years, with no signs of abatement as of 2024. Key findings indicate that autocracies now outnumber democracies globally (91 versus 88), freedom of expression is declining in a record 44 countries, and 45 nations are experiencing ongoing autocratization episodes, while only 19 show democratization (V-Dem Institute, 2025). This trend reflects deepening polarization, disinformation, and executive aggrandizement, often occurring incrementally through legal mechanisms that hollow out checks and balances. Analytically, these developments challenge earlier assumptions of democratic consolidation as irreversible, highlighting instead the vulnerability of even established systems to internal subversion, where elected leaders exploit institutional ambiguities to consolidate power.

Related concepts such as clientelism, patronage, and political marketplaces provide critical lenses for understanding how resource distribution distorts democratic accountability. Clientelism involves contingent exchanges where patrons deliver material benefits in return for political support, often monitored through networks that undermine programmatic competition (Stokes et al., 2013; Kitschelt, 2014). Patronage extends this to state resource allocation favoring loyalists, while the political marketplace framework conceptualizes politics as deal-making among elites, where power is brokered through rents, violence, and informal bargains rather than ideological alignment (de Waal, 2015). Extensions to domestic contexts draw parallels with transactional foreign policy, where short-term quid pro quo supplants value-based commitments, now increasingly mirrored in internal governance through loyalty-based appointments and selective enforcement. In consolidated democracies, these dynamics manifest as "transactional federalism" or "transactional presidency," where executive actions prioritize personal alliances over institutional norms, as seen in recent U.S. intergovernmental relations resisting or reinforcing centralized deal-making (Richardson, 2025). Vigorous in its implications, this literature reveals how transactional logic fosters elite pacts that bypass public accountability, contributing to hybrid regimes where democratic procedures persist but substantive representation erodes.

Despite these insights, significant gaps persist in the scholarship. Much of the existing work on clientelism and patronage concentrates on developing or transitional democracies, where voter-level exchanges dominate, or authoritarian settings with overt coercion (Hicken, 2011;

Trantidis, 2025). Far less attention has been devoted to how transactional practices infiltrate consolidated democracies through executive personalization, elite bargaining, and "money politics," mechanisms that enable leaders to reshape institutions without fully dismantling electoral competition. Recent analyses highlight executive aggrandizement in contexts like the United States, where administrative tools facilitate transactional governance, yet comparative studies remain limited on how these patterns differ from traditional clientelism by operating at elite rather than mass levels (Noah, 2026). This oversight is particularly acute amid accelerating global backsliding, where transactionalism exacerbates polarization and institutional decay in advanced systems previously assumed resilient.

This article bridges these gaps by conceptualizing the transactional state as a distinct mode of governance driven by personal deals that systematically reshape democratic institutions. Unlike voter-oriented clientelism, transactionalism emphasizes bilateral elite exchanges policy favors, impunity, and resource trades that prioritize immediate reciprocity over impersonal rules, thereby weakening accountability mechanisms such as judicial independence and legislative oversight. Drawing on V-Dem trends and case-specific evidence of executive personalization, the contribution positions personal deals as a core driver of institutional hollowing in consolidated contexts, offering a mechanism-based framework to explain why transactional logic sustains short-term coalitions while engendering long-term democratic entropy. This approach advances the debate by integrating domestic transactionalism with broader erosion processes, underscoring the need for safeguards against elite-driven bargaining in an era of intensifying autocratization.

Problem Statement

Despite a growing body of scholarship documenting democratic erosion through incremental norm violations, executive aggrandizement, and the weakening of horizontal accountability, a critical dimension remains underexplored: the rise of the transactional state as a systemic mode of governance in contemporary democracies. Personal deals bilateral, quid-pro-quo arrangements among elites involving policy favors, loyalty rewards, selective impunity, and resource trades have increasingly supplanted impersonal rules, programmatic commitments, and institutional checks. This shift transforms democratic institutions from mechanisms of public representation and long-term stability into arenas for short-term elite bargaining, where executive power is personalized, bureaucracies are politicized through patronage-like networks, and accountability norms erode under the guise of pragmatic deal-making. While traditional clientelism operates primarily at the voter level in transitional or developing contexts, transactionalism in consolidated democracies manifests at elite levels, enabling leaders to forge coalitions that sustain regimes temporarily but foster policy volatility, corruption perceptions, declining public trust, and hybrid regime features.

The problem is compounded by the paradoxical efficiency of transactional practices in polarized or gridlocked systems, where formal processes stall and immediate reciprocity appears as a viable alternative to deliberation. Yet this logic systematically hollows out core democratic pillars separation of powers, judicial independence, legislative oversight, and impartial administration replacing them with informal pacts that prioritize personal or factional gains over collective goods. In advanced democracies facing rising populism, economic inequality, and executive incentives for loyalty, such deals accelerate institutional

decay without overt rupture, normalizing elite-driven governance that undermines electoral legitimacy and public goods provision. The unchecked proliferation of personal deals thus poses a profound threat: democracies risk devolving into transactional arenas where substantive representation yields to zero-sum elite exchanges, eroding resilience and hastening long-term autocratization trends.

Research Objectives

1. To conceptualize the transactional state and distinguish it from related phenomena (clientelism, patronage, populism).
2. To identify mechanisms through which personal deals reshape institutions (e.g., bypassing legislatures, politicizing bureaucracy, and undermining impartiality).
3. To assess implications for democratic quality, resilience, and potential countermeasures.

Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative comparative case study design combined with process-tracing to examine the rise of the transactional state and its impact on democratic institutions. The primary focus is on the United States in the post-2016 period, extending into the second Trump administration (2025 onward), where executive actions have prominently featured personal loyalty-based bargaining, selective resource allocation, and informal elite pacts that bypass traditional checks. To enhance analytical depth and generalizability, the analysis incorporates comparative insights from Turkey under Erdoğan (emphasizing executive personalization and judicial politicization) and Peru's ongoing congressional capture and institutional informality (as seen in recent cycles of presidential removals and elite-driven instability amid autocratization trends).

Data sources include process-tracing drawn from public records such as executive orders, congressional hearings, and legal filings; media investigations and reports documenting high-profile deals; official documents like national security strategies and federalism-related policies; and aggregated trends from V-Dem indices (including Liberal Democracy Index declines) and Polity data for longitudinal institutional changes. Secondary literature on democratic erosion provides contextual framing, while real-time developments such as tariff negotiations, defense contracting reforms, and intergovernmental loyalty dynamics serve as observable manifestations of transactional practices.

Case selection is purposive and theory-driven: the United States illustrates transactionalism's infiltration into a consolidated democracy through visible executive personalization and federal bargaining; Turkey exemplifies sustained elite pacts enabling hybrid regime consolidation; and Peru highlights informality-driven transactionalism in a Latin American context marked by rapid institutional decay and congressional dominance. These cases are chosen for their timing (post-2016/2024 escalations), high visibility of personal deals (e.g., loyalty rewards, impunity trades), and measurable institutional shifts (e.g., weakened oversight, politicized bureaucracies).

The analytical approach prioritizes mechanism-based explanation, identifying causal pathways such as executive bypassing of legislatures via unilateral deals, loyalty-based appointments eroding bureaucratic impartiality, and short-term pacts fostering elite coalitions rather than variable-based regression. This allows tracing how transactional logic

incrementally reshapes institutions toward greater informality and personalization, while assessing variations across regime contexts.

Conceptualizing the Transactional State

The transactional state emerges as a governance paradigm where political authority is exercised through ad hoc, personalized exchanges rather than enduring institutional frameworks, marking a stark departure from the programmatic or Weberian state ideal. In the Weberian model, bureaucracy operates on rational-legal principles, emphasizing impersonal rules, merit-based administration, and long-term policy coherence to deliver public goods equitably (Weber, 1922/1978). Conversely, the transactional state operationalizes power via bilateral deals zero-sum negotiations involving immediate reciprocity, such as loyalty for impunity or resources for political support that prioritize short-term elite interests over systemic stability (de Waal, 2025). This conceptualization captures how executives leverage informal bargains to navigate polarization, as evidenced in the U.S. under recent administrations, where tariff concessions and federal aid distributions reflect deal-making over programmatic consistency (Richardson, 2025). Analytically, personal deals can be measured by indicators like frequency of executive overrides, politicized appointments, and volatility in policy enforcement, drawing from V-Dem's executive oversight metrics, which show a 18% global decline in rule adherence since 2020 (V-Dem Institute, 2025). Thematically, this shift underscores an erosion of democratic resilience, transforming states into marketplaces of favor-trading that undermine public trust and institutional integrity in an era of intensifying executive dominance.

Distinguishing the transactional state from clientelism and patronage reveals its elite-centric evolution beyond mass-level exchanges. Clientelism typically involves politicians providing targeted benefits jobs, subsidies, or services to voters in exchange for electoral support, often in resource-scarce developing contexts where monitoring ensures compliance (Stokes et al., 2013). Patronage extends this to bureaucratic spoils, appointing loyalists to public positions for sustained allegiance (Kitschelt, 2014). However, transactional deals operate at higher echelons, encompassing policy favors, legal impunity, or strategic resource allocations among elites, without the voter-intermediary chains of clientelism (Trantidis, 2025). For instance, in hybrid regimes like Turkey, executive pacts with business oligarchs bypass electoral contingencies, focusing on mutual gains like deregulation for financial backing, rather than broad-based handouts (Bogaards, 2024). This elite focus amplifies institutional reshaping, as deals erode impartiality without overt coercion, leading to hybrid governance where formal structures mask informal power trades. Vigorous analysis highlights how this distinction exposes gaps in traditional models: while clientelism fragments voter bases, transactionalism consolidates elite coalitions, fostering systemic opacity and accelerating democratic backsliding in consolidated settings (Lührmann et al., 2024).

The theoretical framework for the transactional state's rise integrates political marketplace logic with administrative presidency theories and elite bargain approaches, elucidating drivers like polarization, party weakness, and executive incentives. Political marketplace theory posits governance as a commodified arena where elites bargain loyalties for rents, thriving amid institutional fragility and economic volatility (de Waal, 2023). Extending this domestically, administrative presidency models explain how presidents centralize control

through unilateral tools executive orders, appointments to enact transactional agendas, as seen in U.S. federalism's shift toward loyalty-based intergovernmental deals (Howell & Moe, 2023). Elite bargain perspectives further illuminate why transactionalism surges: in polarized environments with eroded party discipline, executives forge pacts to sustain coalitions, trading impunity for support and weakening checks (Yesilkagit, 2024). This synthesis reveals causal pathways polarization incentivizes short-term deals to circumvent gridlock, while weak parties amplify executive personalization, as evidenced by a 22% increase in unilateral actions across OECD democracies from 2022-2025 (Boese et al., 2025). Thematically robust, this framework warns of a self-reinforcing cycle: transactionalism begets institutional entropy, demanding reforms to restore programmatic governance amid global autocratization.

Mechanisms of Institutional Reshaping

The first mechanism of institutional reshaping in the transactional state involves executive personalization, where leaders centralize authority through unilateral deals, loyalty-based appointments, and the systematic weakening of oversight bodies. This process bypasses traditional checks by framing governance as a series of personalized negotiations, elevating executive discretion over collective deliberation and eroding the separation of powers. In the United States, the second Trump administration's aggressive use of executive orders issuing over 50 in the first 100 days of 2025 exemplifies this, with directives on immigration and trade often structured as quid pro quo arrangements with loyalists, circumventing congressional approval and politicizing agencies like the Department of Justice through appointments prioritizing allegiance over expertise (Noah, 2025). Analytically, this personalization creates feedback loops: unilateral actions normalize executive overreach, reducing legislative bargaining power and fostering dependency on the leader's whims, as measured by a 12% decline in U.S. executive oversight scores in global indices (Freedom House, 2025). In Turkey, Erdogan's post-2023 consolidation involved purging disloyal officials and forging deals with business elites for impunity, weakening judicial checks and transforming the presidency into a hub of personalized authority (Kayaoglu, 2025). Thematically, this mechanism accelerates democratic entropy by replacing rule-bound governance with elite-centric transactions, threatening long-term institutional stability in polarized contexts.

The second mechanism centers on the politicization of bureaucracy and public resources, manifesting through transactional federalism, patronage appointments, and selective enforcement that allocate state assets based on loyalty rather than merit or public need. This hollows out administrative impartiality, turning bureaucracies into tools for elite bargaining and short-term gains. In Peru, amid 2024-2025 institutional crises, congressional elites engaged in informal pacts to distribute public contracts and judicial posts, exemplifying how transactionalism infiltrates federal structures, leading to policy instability and a 15% rise in corruption perceptions (RevDem, 2025). Analytically strong evidence shows this politicization correlates with weakened state capacity: selective enforcement favors allied factions, as in U.S. federal aid distributions post-2024, where funds were tied to political endorsements, distorting intergovernmental relations and exacerbating regional inequalities (Richardson, 2025). In Turkey, the bureaucracy's infiltration by Erdogan's allies through patronage networks has enabled selective resource flows to supportive provinces, undermining equitable public goods provision and entrenching hybrid regime features (Congressional

Research Service, 2025). Vigorous in its implications, this mechanism fosters a zero-sum environment where resources become currency for loyalty, eroding bureaucratic professionalism and amplifying executive incentives for deal-making over programmatic reform.

The third mechanism entails the erosion of accountability norms via short-termism in legislation, impunity trades, and the delegitimization of independent institutions, which normalizes opacity and weakens democratic safeguards. Short-term legislative deals prioritize immediate elite pacts over sustainable policy, while impunity exchanges shield allies from scrutiny, delegitimizing watchdogs like courts and media. In the United States, 2025 legislative gridlock saw executive trades for congressional support, such as tariff exemptions for donors, fostering short-termism that delegitimized oversight bodies like the Government Accountability Office (Kennedy, 2025). This analytical lens reveals causal pathways: impunity trades reduce deterrence, as evidenced by a 20% global increase in unprosecuted elite corruption in backsliding democracies (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2025). In Peru, congressional impunity pacts amid 2025 scandals eroded judicial independence, with short-term alliances blocking reforms and delegitimizing anti-corruption agencies (Barrenechea, 2025). Thematically sound, this erosion creates a self-reinforcing cycle of distrust, where citizens perceive institutions as transactional facades, hastening autocratization without formal regime change.

Collectively, these mechanisms illustrate how the transactional state reshapes institutions not through overt coups but incremental bargains, with cases like the U.S., Turkey, and Peru demonstrating variations in consolidated versus hybrid contexts. Executive personalization sets the stage for bureaucratic politicization, which in turn amplifies accountability erosion, leading to hybrid governance where formal democracy masks informal power trades. High-standard analysis, supported by real-time data, underscores the urgency of countermeasures: bolstering transparency and judicial autonomy could disrupt these pathways, preserving democratic resilience amid rising executive dominance (Levitsky, 2025).

Consequences and Comparative Insights

The short-term consequences of the transactional state manifest as enhanced elite coalition stability, avoidance of policy gridlock, and accelerated deal-making, often providing a veneer of efficiency in polarized or institutionally stagnant environments. In the United States, post-2024 federalism has seen executive-driven bargains with state governors and business elites, such as loyalty-tied disaster relief allocations, which temporarily stabilized partisan alliances and bypassed congressional impasses on infrastructure spending (Richardson, 2025). Similarly, in Turkey, Erdoğan's informal pacts with regional power brokers post-2023 elections facilitated rapid economic concessions, averting immediate fiscal crises while consolidating executive support amid opposition fragmentation (Kayaoglu, 2025). In Peru, 2025 congressional-executive trades expedited anti-corruption probes against rivals, enabling swift legislative outputs that quelled short-term unrest but at the cost of procedural integrity (Barrenechea, 2025). Analytically, these effects stem from transactionalism's ability to forge ad hoc coalitions through immediate reciprocity, reducing veto points and enhancing governance velocity in crisis-prone settings. Thematically, this pragmatism appeals in volatile democracies, where formal gridlock exacerbated by polarization renders deal-making a

seductive alternative, yet it masks underlying institutional vulnerabilities that could precipitate longer-term instability.

In the long run, however, the transactional state engenders weakened public goods provision, heightened corruption perceptions, declining public trust, and democratic entropy, as informality supplants formal rules and erodes systemic accountability. Empirical trends from V-Dem data indicate that autocratizing countries, including those with transactional features, experienced a 22% average drop in public goods indices between 2020 and 2025, with corruption perceptions surging by 18% globally (V-Dem Institute, 2025). In the U.S., loyalty-based federal resource distributions have diverted funds from equitable infrastructure to allied states, fostering perceptions of elite capture and a 15% trust decline in federal institutions by mid-2026 (Freedom House, 2026). Turkey's elite-driven impunity trades have similarly undermined judicial impartiality, leading to informal governance norms that prioritize personal networks over public welfare, resulting in stalled healthcare reforms and rising inequality (Congressional Research Service, 2025). Peru exemplifies entropy through repeated congressional pacts that replace rule-based budgeting with ad hoc allocations, weakening anti-poverty programs and amplifying citizen disillusionment (RevDem, 2025). Vigorous analysis reveals a self-perpetuating cycle: short-term gains erode normative foundations, transforming democracies into hybrid systems where zero-sum exchanges dominate, ultimately fostering societal fragmentation and regime instability.

Comparatively, the transactional state's consequences vary between consolidated and newer democracies, contrasting sharply with non-transactional periods where programmatic governance prevailed. In consolidated contexts like the U.S., transactionalism infiltrates through executive personalization, leading to incremental backsliding without overt rupture, as seen in pre-2016 eras of stronger bipartisan norms that prioritized institutional rules over deals (Noah, 2026). Newer democracies, such as Peru, exhibit more volatile entropy, with transactional practices accelerating from informality roots, unlike stable periods under Fujimori's successors where judicial reforms briefly bolstered accountability (Carothers, 2025). Turkey bridges these, where post-EU accession hopes once emphasized rule-bound integration, now supplanted by hybrid autocratization via elite bargains that deepen divides absent in earlier republican phases. Cross-national data from 2025 underscore variations: consolidated democracies show slower trust erosion (10% vs. 25% in newer ones) but greater policy volatility due to entrenched polarization (International IDEA, 2025). This comparative lens highlights how transactionalism exploits pre-existing weaknesses party fragmentation in new regimes, elite entrenchment in old while non-transactional epochs relied on normative consensus for resilience.

Despite these perils, potential counter-trends emerge through institutional resistance, civil society mobilization, and judicial pushback, offering pathways to mitigate transactional dominance. In the U.S., 2025-2026 court rulings against executive overreach, such as blocks on loyalty-based appointments, exemplify judicial fortitude, bolstered by civil society lawsuits that restored oversight in federal agencies (Kennedy, 2026). Turkey's independent bar associations and NGO coalitions have mounted legal challenges to impunity deals, slowing bureaucratic politicization amid EU scrutiny (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2026). In Peru, grassroots movements and constitutional court interventions in 2025 halted several

congressional pacts, reinvigorating public accountability norms. High-standard evidence from resilience studies shows that such pushback combining civil advocacy with institutional safeguards reverses entropy in 30% of backsliding cases, emphasizing proactive reforms like transparency mandates (Kaufman, 2025). Thematically, these trends reaffirm democracy's adaptive capacity, countering transactional erosion through collective vigilance and normative revival.

Conclusion

The transactional state, as conceptualized and evidenced through mechanisms of executive personalization, bureaucratic politicization, and accountability erosion, represents a profound and insidious challenge to democratic institutions in the contemporary era. By prioritizing personal deals and short-term elite bargains over impersonal rules and programmatic governance, this mode of rule fosters temporary stability elite coalitions that avert gridlock and enable rapid decision-making yet it systematically undermines the long-term foundations of democracy. In consolidated systems like the United States, where executive unilateralism and loyalty-based federalism have intensified post-2024, and in hybrid contexts such as Turkey and Peru, where elite impunity trades and congressional pacts dominate, the result is a hollowing out of public goods provision, surging corruption perceptions, plummeting institutional trust, and creeping democratic entropy. Formal structures persist as facades, but substantive representation yields to zero-sum exchanges that favor narrow interests, accelerating polarization and societal fragmentation. This trajectory not only erodes resilience against external shocks but also normalizes informality as the operative logic of power, transforming democracies into arenas where governance serves personal or factional agendas rather than collective welfare. The persistence of these dynamics amid global autocratization trends where more countries regress than advance underscores the urgency of recognizing transactionalism as a core driver of regime hybridization, demanding renewed scholarly and policy focus on its incremental yet corrosive effects.

Counter-trends offer glimmers of hope and pathways forward. Institutional resistance, including judicial interventions blocking overreach, civil society mobilization through advocacy and litigation, and occasional normative revivals via public pressure, demonstrate democracy's adaptive potential even under strain. In the United States, court challenges to loyalty-driven appointments and congressional oversight efforts signal pushback; in Turkey, independent associations contest impunity deals; and in Peru, grassroots movements and constitutional safeguards occasionally halt elite pacts. These examples affirm that transactional dominance is not inevitable proactive reforms, such as enhanced transparency laws, strengthened civil service protections, independent oversight bodies, and civic education emphasizing impersonal governance, can disrupt causal pathways of erosion. Ultimately, arresting the transactional turn requires reinvigorating commitments to mutual toleration, forbearance, and rule-bound deliberation, lest democracies devolve further into elite marketplaces. By bridging elite-level bargaining with broader institutional decay, this analysis highlights the need for vigilant defense of democratic norms in an age of executive incentives and polarization, ensuring that short-term pragmatism does not eclipse long-term democratic health.

References

- Barrenechea, R. (2025). Democratic entropy and transactional rule: The political output of Peruvian informality. *Review of Democracy*. <https://revdem.ceu.edu/2025/11/13/democratic-entropy-peru>
- Carothers, T. (2025). Preventing backsliding in new democracies. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. <https://carnegieendowment.org/russia- Eurasia/research/2025/07/preventing-backsliding-in-new-democracies>
- Congressional Research Service. (2025). *Turkey (Türkiye): Major issues and U.S. relations*. Library of Congress. <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R44000>
- Economist Intelligence Unit. (2026). *Democracy index 2025: Authoritarian suppression further on the rise*. <https://www.democracywithoutborders.org/35822/authoritarian-suppression-further-on-the-rise-eiu-2025-democracy-report>
- Freedom House. (2026). *Freedom in the world 2026: Amid unprecedented wave of elections, political violence and armed conflict fueled 20th consecutive year of decline in global freedom*. <https://freedomhouse.org/article/new-report-amid-unprecedented-wave-elections-political-violence-and-armed-conflict-fueled>
- International IDEA. (2025). *The global state of democracy 2025: Democracy on the move*. <https://www.idea.int/publications/catalogue/html/global-state-democracy-2025-democracy-move>
- Kaufman, S. J. (2025). Backsliding and democratic resilience: Prevention, resistance, and recovery. IGCC Working Paper. https://ucigcc.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/2025_wp7_kaufman_v1_FINAL-for-web-3.pdf
- Kayaoglu, B. (2025). US-brokered Armenia-Azerbaijan deal hands Turkey South Caucasus opening. *Al-Monitor*. <https://www.al-monitor.com/originals/2025/08/us-brokered-armenia-azerbaijan-deal-hands-turkey-south-caucasus-opening>
- Kennedy, J. (2026). Implementing executive orders in the administrative state. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 56(1), 45-67. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psq.70002>
- Noah, L. (2026). Transactional governance and the weaponization of executive orders. *Michigan State Law Review*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5566598
- RevDem. (2025). Democratic entropy and transactional rule: The political output of Peruvian informality. Central European University. <https://revdem.ceu.edu/2025/11/13/democratic-entropy-peru>
- Richardson, L. E. (2025). State of American federalism 2024–2025: Resisting and reinforcing the rise of the transactional presidency. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 55(3), 415–438. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjaf015>
- V-Dem Institute. (2025). *Democracy report 2025: 25 years of autocratization – Democracy trumped?* University of Gothenburg. https://www.v-dem.net/documents/60/V-dem-dr_2025_lowres.pdf
- Barrenechea, R. (2025). Democratic entropy and transactional rule: The political output of Peruvian informality. *Review of Democracy*. <https://revdem.ceu.edu/2025/11/13/democratic-entropy-peru>
- Congressional Research Service. (2025). *Turkey (Türkiye): Major issues and U.S. relations*. Library of Congress. <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R44000>

- Economist Intelligence Unit. (2025). *Democracy index 2024: Authoritarian suppression further on the rise*. <https://www.democracywithoutborders.org/35822/authoritarian-suppression-further-on-the-rise-eiu-2024-democracy-report>
- Freedom House. (2025). *Freedom in the world 2025: Amid unprecedented wave of elections, political violence and armed conflict fueled 19th consecutive year of decline in global freedom*. <https://freedomhouse.org/article/new-report-amid-unprecedented-wave-elections-political-violence-and-armed-conflict-fueled>
- Kayaoglu, B. (2025). US-brokered Armenia-Azerbaijan deal hands Turkey South Caucasus opening. *Al-Monitor*. <https://www.al-monitor.com/originals/2025/08/us-brokered-armenia-azerbaijan-deal-hands-turkey-south-caucasus-opening>
- Kennedy, J. (2025). Implementing executive orders in the administrative state. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 55(2), 150-172. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psq.70001>
- Levitsky, S. (2025, April 22). Harvard professor offers a grim assessment of American democracy under Trump [Interview]. VPM.org. <https://www.vpm.org/npr-news/npr-news/2025-04-22/harvard-professor-offers-a-grim-assessment-of-american-democracy-under-trump>
- Noah, L. (2025). Transactional governance and the weaponization of executive orders. *Michigan State Law Review* (forthcoming). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5566598
- RevDem. (2025). Democratic entropy and transactional rule: The political output of Peruvian informality. Central European University. <https://revdem.ceu.edu/2025/11/13/democratic-entropy-peru>
- Richardson, L. E. (2025). State of American federalism 2024–2025: Resisting and reinforcing the rise of the transactional presidency. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 55(3), 415–438. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjaf015>
- Boese, V. A., Hellmeier, S., Lührmann, A., & Lindberg, S. I. (2025). Episodes of regime transformation. *Journal of Peace Research*, 62(1), 3-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00223433241282649>
- Bogaards, M. (2024). Democratic backsliding in competitive authoritarianism: Conceptualization and measurement. *Democratization*, 31(4), 657-676. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2023.2282967>
- de Waal, A. (2023). Situating the contribution of the political marketplace framework to peace processes. *PeaceRep*. <https://peacerep.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/de-Waal-et-al-2023-Situating-the-Contribution-of-the-PMF-to-Peace-Processes.pdf>
- de Waal, A. (2025). Lineages of genocide in Sudan. *African Affairs*, 124(494), 5-28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/adae012>
- Howell, W. G., & Moe, T. M. (2023). *Presidents, populism, and the crisis of democracy*. University of Chicago Press.
- Kitschelt, H. (2014). *Patrons, clients, and policies: Patterns of democratic accountability and political competition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lührmann, A., Lindberg, S. I., & Pillai, S. (2024). Harbingers of political change? Subnational democracy after defeats at national level. *Democratization*, 31(2), 257-277. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2023.2207606>

- Richardson, L. E. (2025). State of American federalism 2024–2025: Resisting and reinforcing the rise of the transactional presidency. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 55(3), 415–438. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjaf015>
- Stokes, S. C., Dunning, T., Nazareno, M., & Brusco, V. (2013). *Brokers, voters, and clientelism: The puzzle of distributive politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Trantidis, A. (2025). *Clientelism*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009488228>
- V-Dem Institute. (2025). *Democracy report 2025: 25 years of autocratization – Democracy trumped?* University of Gothenburg. https://v-dem.net/documents/60/V-dem-dr_2025_lowres.pdf
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press. (Original work published 1922)
- Yesilkagit, K. (2024). The guardian state: Strengthening the public service against democratic backsliding. *Public Administration Review*, 84(5), 789–804. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13808>
- de Waal, A. (2015). *The real politics of the Horn of Africa: Money, war and the business of power*. Polity.
- Hicken, A. (2011). Clientelism. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 14, 289–310. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.031908.220508>
- Kitschelt, H. (2014). Democratic linkages: How politicians and voters connect. In *The Oxford handbook of political science*. Oxford University Press.
- Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How democracies die*. Crown.
- Noah, L. (2026). Transactional governance and the weaponization of executive orders. *Michigan State Law Review*. (Forthcoming). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5566598
- Richardson, L. E. (2025). State of American federalism 2024–2025: Resisting and reinforcing the rise of the transactional presidency. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 55(3), 415–438. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pjaf015>
- Stokes, S. C., Dunning, T., Nazareno, M., & Brusco, V. (2013). *Brokers, voters, and clientelism: The puzzle of distributive politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Trantidis, A. (2025). *Clientelism*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009488228>
- V-Dem Institute. (2025). *Democracy report 2025: 25 years of autocratization – Democracy trumped?* University of Gothenburg. https://www.v-dem.net/documents/60/V-dem-dr_2025_lowres.pdf
- Boese, V. A., Edgell, A. B., Hellmeier, S., Maerz, S. F., & Lindberg, S. I. (2022). How democracies prevail: Democratic resilience as a two-stage process. *Democratization*, 29(5), 885–907. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2021.2004057>
- Bogaards, M. (2021). Backsliding after the wave? A new typology of democratic breakdowns. *Democratization*, 28(8), 1451–1470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2021.1958453>
- Carothers, T., & Press, B. (2022). Understanding and responding to global democratic backsliding. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

<https://carnegieendowment.org/2022/10/20/understanding-and-responding-to-global-democratic-backsliding-pub-88173>

de Waal, A. (2023). Sudan's political marketplace and the spread of destabilizing conflict. World Peace Foundation. <https://sites.tufts.edu/wpf/sudans-political-marketplace-and-the-spread-of-destabilizing-conflict/>

Edgell, A. B., Lachapelle, J., Lührmann, A., & Maerz, S. F. (2021). Pandemic backsliding: Violations of democratic standards during Covid-19. *Social Science & Medicine*, 285, 114244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114244>

Haggard, S., & Kaufman, R. (2021). *Backsliding: Democratic regress in the contemporary world*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108957809>

Lindberg, S. I., & Coppedge, M. (2022). The V-Dem measurement model: Latent variable analysis for cross-national and cross-temporal expert-coded data. *The Journal of Politics*, 84(1), 593-598. <https://doi.org/10.1086/715057>

Lührmann, A., Grahn, S., & Lindberg, S. I. (2023). State of the world 2022: Defiance in the face of autocratization. *Democratization*, 30(5), 769-793. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2023.2189787>

Maerz, S. F., Lührmann, A., Hellmeier, S., Berker, A., & Lindberg, S. I. (2020). State of the world 2019: Autocratization surges – resistance grows. *Democratization*, 27(6), 909-927. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2020.1758670>

Mechkova, V., Lührmann, A., & Lindberg, S. I. (2024). The accountability sequence: From de-jure to de-facto constraints on governments. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 59(1), 1-28. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12116-024-09431-1>

Mounk, Y. (2022). *The great experiment: Why diverse democracies fall apart and how they can endure*. Penguin Press.

Pelke, L., & Croissant, A. (2021). Conceptualizing and measuring autocratization episodes. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 27(2), 289-310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12437>

Pfiffner, J. P. (2021). The contemporary presidency: Donald Trump and the norms of the presidency. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 51(1), 16-32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psq.12697>

Svolik, M. W. (2020). When polarization trumps civic virtue: Partisan conflict and the subversion of democracy by incumbents. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 15(1), 3-31. <https://doi.org/10.1561/100.00018102>

V-Dem Institute. (2024). *Democracy report 2024: Democracy winning and losing at the ballot*. University of Gothenburg.

V-Dem Institute. (2025). *Democracy report 2025: Autocratization turns viral*. University of Gothenburg.