Democratic Governance and Institutional Accountability in the 21st Century[*]

Sathaka Tanchai

Roi Et Secondary Educational Service Area Office, Thailand
E-mail: sathaka101@gmail.com

Abstract

This article examines the evolving landscape of democratic governance and institutional accountability in the 21st century, with a focus on the mechanisms, challenges, and innovations that shape the integrity and effectiveness of modern democracies. Drawing on theoretical frameworks such as democratic theory, new institutionalism, and accountability models, the study analyzes global trends using comparative case studies and cross-national governance indices. It explores successful practices in transparency and participation—such as Scandinavian anti-corruption systems and participatory budgeting in Brazil—alongside crises of democratic erosion in countries like Hungary and the United States. The article further investigates the dual impact of digital technologies, highlighting both their potential for enhancing civic oversight and the growing threat of digital authoritarianism. International frameworks such as SDG 16, the Open Government Partnership, and OECD guidelines are evaluated as normative benchmarks for reform. The study concludes that sustaining democratic governance requires legal innovation, strong civil society, public trust-building, and adaptive institutions that are resilient in the face of complex global challenges.

Keywords: Democratic governance, Institutional accountability, Transparency, Digital democracy, Civil society, SDG 16, Democratic backsliding

Introduction

The 21st century has witnessed significant transformations in political systems worldwide, marked by a paradoxical trend: while democratic ideals such as participation, transparency, and accountability have gained global traction, many democracies are simultaneously experiencing erosion in institutional trust and legitimacy. Democratic governance, traditionally defined by the principles of representative decision-making, the rule of law, and responsive institutions (Dahl, 1989; Diamond & Morlino, 2004), is increasingly challenged by rising authoritarian tendencies, digital disinformation, and weakening oversight mechanisms.

Institutional accountability, a cornerstone of democratic systems, refers to the capacity of public institutions to answer to the public and other institutions for their actions and decisions. It involves both vertical mechanisms (e.g., elections, public scrutiny) and horizontal checks (e.g., judicial review, legislative oversight) that ensure the responsible use of public power (Schedler, 1999; Bovens, 2007). However, in many democratic and hybrid regimes, these mechanisms are under strain due to the rise of populism, the centralization of executive power, and the politicization of oversight bodies (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018).

In this context, the need to reassess and strengthen the frameworks of democratic governance and institutional accountability becomes urgent. The digital revolution has introduced both opportunities and threats: while it enables civic engagement through e-governance and open data, it also allows for increased state surveillance and manipulation of public discourse (Fukuyama, 2021). Moreover, global crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic have tested the resilience of democratic institutions, revealing both innovative practices and systemic vulnerabilities.

This article seeks to examine how institutional accountability operates within contemporary democratic governance, identifying both the challenges and pathways for reform in the 21st century. Through a comparative and interdisciplinary lens, it aims to explore the mechanisms that foster institutional integrity, evaluate cases of democratic backsliding, and propose strategies for sustaining democratic norms in an era of uncertainty.

Theoretical Framework
Democratic Governance: Concepts and Principles
Democratic governance is broadly understood as a system of political administration that emphasizes the active participation of citizens, representation through fair electoral processes, adherence to the rule of law, institutional responsiveness, and mechanisms for public accountability. At its core, it relies on constitutional and legal frameworks that guarantee civil liberties, promote pluralism, and institutionalize public participation in decision-making (Diamond & Morlino, 2004; UNDP, 2013).

Participation is a foundational element, referring to the inclusion of citizens in political processes through mechanisms such as voting, civic engagement, and public consultations. **Representation** ensures that diverse societal interests are reflected in legislative and policy-making institutions. The **rule of law** upholds legal equality, constrains arbitrary state power, and guarantees fundamental rights. Lastly, **responsiveness** refers to the ability of institutions to effectively address the needs, concerns, and feedback of the population in a timely manner (Dahl, 1989; Rothstein & Teorell, 2008).

Institutional Accountability

Accountability in democratic governance refers to the obligation of public officials and institutions to justify their actions, accept responsibility, and face consequences for failures or abuses of power. It is generally categorized into two major dimensions: **vertical accountability**, which includes mechanisms like elections, public protests, and civil society oversight; and **horizontal accountability**, which involves inter-institutional checks such as judicial review, legislative scrutiny, and audit commissions (Schedler, 1999).

Vertical accountability enables citizens to sanction or reward political leaders through democratic processes. Horizontal accountability, by contrast, is exercised by state institutions that are legally empowered to monitor, investigate, and sanction the misconduct of other public entities (O'Donnell, 1998). The presence and strength of both forms are critical to maintaining institutional legitimacy and preventing authoritarian drift.

Key Theoretical Approaches

Several theoretical frameworks contribute to our understanding of democratic governance and institutional accountability:

-**Institutionalism**, particularly new institutionalism, emphasizes how formal structures and informal norms shape political behavior. March and Olsen (1984) argue that institutions are not merely arenas of strategic interaction but are embedded with values and routines that influence outcomes over time.

-**Democratic theory**, as articulated by scholars such as Dahl (1989), provides criteria for assessing democratic quality, including effective participation, voting equality, enlightened understanding, control of the agenda, and inclusion of all adults.

-**Accountability frameworks**, such as those proposed by Schedler (1999) and Bovens (2007), conceptualize accountability as a relationship involving three components: information (the duty to inform), explanation (the duty to justify), and consequences (the possibility of sanctions). These frameworks help distinguish between answerability and enforceability in both political and administrative contexts.

Together, these theoretical lenses offer a multidimensional understanding of how democratic governance functions and how institutional accountability can be conceptualized, operationalized, and evaluated.

Literature Review

Trends in Democratic Governance

Over the past two decades, the global trajectory of democracy has experienced notable fluctuation. While the post-Cold War period saw a proliferation of liberal democratic institutions, recent years have witnessed increasing concerns over democratic backsliding and the fragility of democratic norms. According to the *Freedom House* (2024) report, global freedom has declined for the 18th consecutive year, with significant setbacks in electoral integrity, judicial independence, and civil

liberties. Similarly, the *Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem)* project (2023) reports that electoral autocracies now outnumber liberal democracies, with democratic erosion occurring even in long-established democracies.

Yet, the literature also highlights a degree of democratic resilience. Despite global pressures, many states have adapted by reinforcing democratic safeguards, engaging civil society, and adopting participatory reforms (Lührmann & Lindberg, 2019). Scholars argue that resilience is often tied to institutional robustness, political culture, and active civic engagement (Carothers, 2020).

Institutional Mechanisms for Accountability

Institutional accountability remains a core component of democratic governance, with several mechanisms designed to check the abuse of power. Legislative oversight, often through committees and inquiries, plays a critical role in scrutinizing executive actions. Judicial review, as a form of legal accountability, enables courts to uphold constitutional constraints and protect minority rights (Ginsburg, 2003). In addition, independent auditing bodies such as supreme audit institutions serve to assess public sector performance and financial integrity (Schillemans, 2016).

Empirical studies suggest that the strength and independence of these mechanisms directly affect governance outcomes. For instance, O'Donnell (1998) emphasizes the need for "horizontal accountability" between state institutions, while Bovens (2007) underscores the importance of formalized accountability relationships supported by transparency and public reporting.

New Challenges in the 21st Century

Modern democracies face unprecedented challenges rooted in technological, social, and geopolitical transformations. Digital disinformation—often propagated through social media algorithms—undermines informed citizenship and fosters polarization (Wardle & Derakhshan, 2017). The rise of surveillance capitalism further complicates governance by allowing private corporations and governments to collect and manipulate personal data at scale (Zuboff, 2019).

Moreover, populist movements have increasingly targeted democratic institutions, portraying them as elitist and obstructive to "the will of the people" (Mounk, 2018). These populist strategies frequently erode checks and balances, politicize oversight agencies, and weaken judicial independence, creating conditions for democratic decay (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018).

Gaps in the Literature

While the literature on democratic decline and institutional accountability is robust, several gaps persist. Notably, there is a lack of comparative empirical research on institutional innovation—how newer accountability mechanisms (e.g., digital transparency tools, citizen assemblies, e-governance) perform across different political contexts. Moreover, existing studies often focus on either advanced democracies or authoritarian states, with less attention given to hybrid regimes or transitional

democracies. Further research is needed to assess how democratic institutions evolve under pressure and what factors enhance their resilience in the face of emerging threats.

Democratic Governance in Practice: Global Patterns

1. Success Stories

Despite widespread concerns about democratic backsliding, several countries demonstrate how institutional design, political culture, and innovation can reinforce democratic governance. The **Scandinavian countries**, notably Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, have long been recognized for their robust commitment to **transparency, low corruption levels**, and effective bureaucracies. These successes are attributed to a combination of strong legal frameworks, well-functioning ombudsman institutions, and a deeply rooted culture of trust and civic engagement (Rothstein & Teorell, 2008; Bauhr & Grimes, 2014).

Similarly, **participatory budgeting in Brazil**, first implemented in Porto Alegre in 1989, serves as a global model for **citizen engagement and fiscal transparency**. By allowing residents to directly influence budget allocations, the initiative improved service delivery, particularly in poorer neighborhoods, and increased public satisfaction with local government (Wampler, 2007; Goldfrank, 2011). Though the expansion of participatory budgeting across Brazil has faced challenges, its early success illustrates the potential of inclusive governance models in fostering legitimacy and accountability.

2. Crisis and Decline

In contrast, several democracies have experienced significant institutional erosion in the 21st century. **Hungary**, under the leadership of Viktor Orbán, has undergone systematic democratic backsliding. Since 2010, constitutional reforms, media consolidation, and the politicization of the judiciary have weakened the system of checks and balances and concentrated power in the executive (Bánkuti, Halmai, & Scheppele, 2012; Bogaards, 2018). These changes have effectively transformed Hungary into a **competitive authoritarian regime**, where elections exist but are no longer meaningfully free or fair (Freedom House, 2024).

In the **United States**, rising **political polarization** and **institutional distrust** have eroded public confidence in democratic processes. Congressional gridlock, increasing executive overreach, and the politicization of the judiciary have undermined perceptions of impartial governance (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). The events surrounding the 2020 presidential election, including efforts to delegitimize electoral outcomes, underscored the fragility of democratic norms even in long-standing democracies.

3. Digital Democracy and E-Governance

The digital age has introduced new tools to **enhance accountability** while simultaneously generating new risks. In many countries, **e-governance platforms** are improving transparency and service delivery by digitizing public services and allowing real-time citizen feedback. For instance, **Estonia's e-residency and blockchain-**

enabled public record systems are frequently cited as best practices in digital democracy (Margetts & Dunleavy, 2013; OECD, 2020). Civic technologies such as **AI-powered complaint systems, open-data dashboards**, and **blockchain-based procurement monitoring** have the potential to reduce corruption and bureaucratic opacity (Meijer, Curtin, & Hillebrandt, 2012).

However, the same technologies have also facilitated the rise of **digital authoritarianism**. In countries like China and Russia, surveillance technologies, internet censorship, and data manipulation have been deployed to suppress dissent and control public discourse (Feldstein, 2019). The global diffusion of these practices poses serious risks to democratic governance, especially in fragile or hybrid regimes, as governments increasingly adopt **sophisticated digital tools for repression** under the guise of efficiency or national security (Bradshaw & Howard, 2019).

Strengthening Institutional Accountability

1. Legal and Constitutional Innovations

One of the primary mechanisms for enhancing institutional accountability in democracies involves legal and constitutional reforms. In recent decades, numerous countries have enacted anti-corruption laws, strengthened ombudsman institutions, and adopted freedom of information acts (FOIAs) to improve transparency and citizen oversight. For example, the implementation of FOIAs in countries such as India, Mexico, and South Africa has significantly empowered citizens to request information and monitor government activity (Roberts, 2006; Ackerman & Sandoval-Ballesteros, 2006).

Similarly, ombudsman offices, which serve as independent public authorities addressing citizen grievances and administrative abuses, have become increasingly important in enforcing public accountability (Reif, 2004). These innovations, while often symbolic without enforcement powers, can become effective when coupled with judicial independence and political will.

2. Role of Civil Society and Media

A vibrant civil society and an independent media are vital to the accountability ecosystem. Watchdog organizations—both domestic NGOs and international bodies such as Transparency International—monitor public institutions and expose misuse of power. Their efforts are complemented by investigative journalism, which plays a crucial role in uncovering corruption, abuse, and policy failures. High-profile cases like the Panama Papers and Paradise Papers have demonstrated the transnational impact of media-led accountability efforts (Obermayer & Obermaier, 2016).

In environments where formal mechanisms are weak or compromised, civil society actors often serve as de facto accountability agents, mobilizing public opinion and advocating for institutional reform (Grimes, 2013). However, in many authoritarian and hybrid regimes, these actors face increasing restrictions, harassment, and delegitimization.

3. International Frameworks and Norms

Accountability has also been institutionalized at the international level through global norms and initiatives. Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16, for instance, explicitly calls for "peace, justice, and strong institutions," promoting transparent governance, access to justice, and effective, accountable institutions (UN, 2015). Likewise, the Open Government Partnership (OGP) encourages member states to commit to transparency reforms, citizen participation, and the use of technology to foster accountability (OGP, 2023).

Furthermore, organizations such as the OECD have developed comprehensive guidelines for integrity, public procurement, and anti-corruption, offering member and partner countries benchmarks and best practices (OECD, 2017). These international frameworks create normative pressure on governments to maintain democratic standards and offer transnational support for domestic reformers.

4. Future Directions

Looking ahead, strengthening institutional accountability requires a multidimensional approach that combines legal structures, civic engagement, and adaptive governance. Civic education is essential to fostering a culture of accountability by building citizens' awareness of their rights and responsibilities (Galston, 2001). At the same time, efforts to rebuild public trust must prioritize fairness, responsiveness, and institutional performance, particularly in post-crisis environments (Blind, 2007).

As political, technological, and social landscapes evolve, institutional adaptation becomes crucial. Governments must invest in open data infrastructures, develop responsive feedback loops, and support hybrid accountability models that integrate formal institutions with informal community-based mechanisms. Ultimately, sustaining accountability in the 21st century will depend on the synergy between state institutions, civil society, and informed, active citizenries.

Conclusion

The 21st century has presented both formidable challenges and promising opportunities for democratic governance and institutional accountability. While the global trend reflects increasing concern over democratic backsliding, political polarization, and the erosion of checks and balances, there remains significant variation in how different states respond to these pressures. As the literature and case studies in this article demonstrate, the effectiveness of democratic governance hinges not only on institutional design but also on the political will to uphold transparency, the resilience of legal frameworks, and the active engagement of civil society.

Countries such as those in Scandinavia and participatory models like Brazil's budgeting initiatives illustrate that well-structured accountability mechanisms can foster trust and institutional legitimacy. In contrast, the democratic regression observed in Hungary and the increasing polarization in the United States underscore the fragility of democratic norms when institutions are politicized or weakened. The rise of digital technologies has further complicated the accountability landscape, introducing both tools for innovation and risks of surveillance and manipulation.

Strengthening institutional accountability in this context demands a holistic and adaptive approach. Legal innovations, international norms such as SDG 16 and the OGP, and robust civil society participation all contribute to a more accountable and transparent governance ecosystem. However, future strategies must also address emerging threats, such as disinformation, technocratic opacity, and declining civic trust. Investment in civic education, technological literacy, and institutional reform will be crucial for safeguarding democratic values in an era of rapid change.

Ultimately, the vitality of democratic governance depends on the interplay between accountable institutions and engaged citizens. Reinvigorating this relationship—through innovation, vigilance, and normative commitment—offers the most viable path for democracies seeking to navigate the complexities of the 21st century while preserving the core principles of justice, participation, and the rule of law.

References

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4)**,** 447–468.

Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Diamond, L., & Morlino, L. (2004). The Quality of Democracy: An Overview. *Journal of Democracy*, 15(4)**,** 20–31.

Fukuyama, F. (2021). *Liberalism and Its Discontents*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die*. New York: Crown Publishing Group.

Schedler, A. (1999). Conceptualizing Accountability. In A. Schedler, L. Diamond, & M. Plattner (Eds.), The Self-Restraining State: Power and Accountability in New Democracies (pp. 13–28). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Ackerman, J. M., & Sandoval-Ballesteros, I. E. (2006). The Global Explosion of Freedom of Information Laws. *Administrative Law Review*, 58(1), 85–130.

Bánkuti, M., Halmai, G., & Scheppele, K. L. (2012). Disabling the Constitution. *Journal of Democracy*, 23(3), 138–146.

Bauhr, M., & Grimes, M. (2014). Indignation or Resignation: The Implications of Transparency for Societal Accountability. *Governance*, 27(2), 291–320.

Blind, P. K. (2007). Building Trust in Government in the Twenty-First Century. *UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs*.

Bogaards, M. (2018). De-democratization in Hungary: Diffusely Defective Democracy. *Democratization*, 25(8), 1481–1499.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447–468.

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447–468.

Bradshaw, S., & Howard, P. N. (2019). The Global Disinformation Order. *Oxford Internet Institute Working Paper*.

Carothers, T. (2020). Resilient Democracies in a Time of Crisis. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*.

Dahl, R. A. (1989). *Democracy and Its Critics*. Yale University Press.

Diamond, L., & Morlino, L. (2004). The Quality of Democracy: An Overview. *Journal of Democracy*, 15(4), 20–31.

Feldstein, S. (2019). *The Global Expansion of AI Surveillance*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Freedom House. (2024). *Freedom in the World 2024: The Mounting Damage of Disinformation and Polarization*. https://freedomhouse.org

Galston, W. A. (2001). Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 217–234.

Ginsburg, T. (2003). *Judicial Review in New Democracies: Constitutional Courts in Asian Cases*. Cambridge University Press.

Goldfrank, B. (2011). *Deepening Local Democracy in Latin America: Participation, Decentralization, and the Left*. Penn State University Press.

Grimes, M. (2013). The Contingent Effect of Performance Monitoring on Public Officials' Corruption. *Governance*, 26(4), 675–700.

Levitsky, S., & Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die*. New York: Crown Publishing Group.

Lührmann, A., & Lindberg, S. I. (2019). A Third Wave of Autocratization is Here: What is New About It? *Democratization*, 26(7), 1095–1113.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1984). The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life. *American Political Science Review*, 78(3), 734–749.

Margetts, H., & Dunleavy, P. (2013). The Second Wave of Digital-Era Governance. *Government Information Quarterly*, 30(1), 1–17.

Meijer, A., Curtin, D., & Hillebrandt, M. (2012). Open Government: Connecting Vision and Voice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 78(1), 10–29.

Mounk, Y. (2018). *The People vs. Democracy: Why Our Freedom Is in Danger and How to Save It*. Harvard University Press.

O'Donnell, G. (1998). Horizontal Accountability in New Democracies. *Journal of Democracy*, 9(3), 112–126.

Obermayer, B., & Obermaier, F. (2016). *The Panama Papers: Breaking the Story of How the Rich and Powerful Hide Their Money*. Oneworld Publications.

O'Donnell, G. (1998). Horizontal Accountability in New Democracies. *Journal of Democracy*, 9(3), 112–126.

OECD. (2017). *OECD Integrity Review of Mexico: Taking a Stronger Stance Against Corruption*. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2020). *Digital Government in Estonia: Boosting the Digital Transformation of the Public Sector*. OECD Publishing.

OGP. (2023). *Open Government Partnership: 2023 Annual Report*. https://www.opengovpartnership.org

Reif, L. C. (2004). *The Ombudsman, Good Governance, and the International Human Rights System*. Martinus Nijhoff.

Roberts, A. (2006). *Blacked Out: Government Secrecy in the Information Age*. Cambridge University Press.

Rothstein, B., & Teorell, J. (2008). What Is Quality of Government? A Theory of Impartial Government Institutions. *Governance*, 21(2), 165–190.

Schedler, A. (1999). Conceptualizing Accountability. In A. Schedler, L. Diamond, & M. F. Plattner (Eds.), *The Self-Restraining State: Power and Accountability in New Democracies* (pp. 13–28). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Schillemans, T. (2016). Calibrating Public Sector Accountability: Translating Experimental Findings to Public Sector Accountability. *Public Management Review*, 18(9), 1400–1420.

UN. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations. https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal16

UNDP. (2013). *User's Guide on Measuring Democratic Governance*. United Nations Development Programme.

V-Dem Institute. (2023). *Democracy Report 2023: Defiance in the Face of Autocratization*. https://v-dem.net

Wampler, B. (2007). *Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability*. Penn State University Press.

Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information Disorder: Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework for Research and Policymaking*. Council of Europe.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. New York: PublicAffairs.