T.K. Simonyan

ON SEVERAL KEY METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES OF PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNANCE

This article provides a comprehensive analysis of parliamentary governance and its various complexities. It explores different theoretical frameworks in political science, such as institutionalism, rational choice theory, pluralism, elite theory, democratic theory, and social choice theory, which help scholars to understand how parliamentary systems operate. The paper discusses how these theories apply to understanding the legislative process, the behavior of political actors, and the impact of parliamentary decisions. Furthermore, the article addresses challenges in conceptualizing and measuring parliamentary effectiveness, considering factors such as political context, party systems, and external influences. It also examines the role of party systems and party discipline in shaping parliamentary dynamics, highlighting the differences between multi-party, two-party, and dominant-party systems. Simultaneously the article looks to the qualitative and quantitative approaches used in the political science to examine and study how the effectiveness of the parliamentary system can be measured. In the end, the article touches upon the role of media in shape of public discourse.

Keywords: *Parliamentary Governance, Political Science Theories, Institutionalism, Rational Choice Theory, Pluralism, Elite Theory, Democratic Theory, Social Choice Theory, Parliamentary Effectiveness, Party Systems.*

Introduction

This article explores the complexities of parliamentary governance by focusing on theoretical frameworks of political science, which helps help scholars to understand the functioning and impact of parliamentary systems. Application of concepts like institutionalism, rational choice theory, pluralism, elite theory, and democratic theory, allows this article to examine the behavior of political actors, the structure of parliamentary decision-making and the distribution of power within legislative bodies. In addition, it addresses vital challenges like measurement of parliamentary effectiveness, role of party system and discipline and offers a detailed analysis of how these factors shape the legislative process. Through these lenses, the article aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics at play in parliamentary democracies and their implications for the governance and policymaking.

Theoretical Framework

As a cornerstone of a democratic system parliamentary administration requires thorough and deep analysis for understanding the entire scope of its complexities, institutional dynamics and larger impact on the governance and policy. As a scientific discipline, political science offers various theoretical frameworks which will help scholars to examine, study and investigate the behavior, functioning and outcomes of the parliamentary system. Those theories may provide an insightful perspective on the operation of the legislative branch, how political actors behave in the parliament and how the distribution of power is implemented. This part delves into how several theories of political science like the study of parliamentary governance, including institutionalism, rational

choice theory, pluralism, elite theory and democratic theory may be applied to the study of parliamentary governance.

The first theory which could be used in the examination of parliamentarianism is the concept of institutionalism introduced by T. Veblen [1]. This theory focuses on the importance of formal institutions in the stat that shape the political outcomes. In the framework of parliamentary governance, institutionalism is particularly useful to understand how the rules, design and the structure of the legislator impact the legislative behavior and policy decisions. In general, parliamentary systems varies from state to state and this theory aims to explain how different institutional frameworks impact the governance. Meanwhile, institutionalism also focuses on the historical impact and the systems in general evolved. Historical institutionalism observes the past decisions and institutional structures affect contemporary processes. As a theoretical framework, institutionalism delves into enduring impact of historical legacies like colonial influence on the political systems in countries like Canada, or India. Meanwhile, in contrast to historical institutionalism, rational choice institutionalism perceives parliamentary actors as strategic individuals, who are vested with an authority to make decisions based on the incentives provided by institutional rules. This theory is necessary in order to understand how MPs make decisions about voting, collation-building and party alignment.

Rational choice theory in its turn assume that actors make their dictions based on a cost-benefit analysis as they seek to maximize their utility [3]. In the context of examination of parliamentary governance rational choice theory can be helpful to analyze how MPs, political parties or coalitions act and behave within the system. For instance, MPs may strategically align with certain policies and vote accordingly in order to fulfill their desires which in this context could be re-election or passage of a certain bill or law which potentially could benefit them. RCT is particularly useful in the framework of studying the decision-making process in parliaments. MPs and parties often form coalitions to pass legislations or form a government and this theory helps to explain how these alliances are forged, what interest combines sometimes parties with different ideologies together. At the same time, RCT also helps to explain why parties enforce strict party discipline, as it allows them to maintain control over the legislative outcomes and ensure that MPs vote in favor of party interests.

Pluralism, introduced by Truman focuses on the distribution of power among different interest groups who compete with each other in the policy-making process [4]. By their design, parliamentary systems allow multiple parties and interest groups to function and operate in the legislative process, which allows pluralism as a framework to understand how the diverse forces shape parliamentary behavior. Interest groups such as trade unions, business associations or advocacy organizations sometimes are active in parliamentary debates and by their resources and influence that may impact the legislation. For example, the steering committees could receive impute from lobby groups before formulating a policy recommendation. In addition, pluralism may be used to analyze the functioning of party systems, as in multi-party systems the competition is a usual process, which requires coalition-building in order to achieve legislative goals.

While talking about parliamentarian governance the elite theory is one of the frameworks that could not be bypassed. According to this theory political power is concentrated in the hands of a privileged groups of people who dominate over the decision-making process and shape policy outcomes [5]. Elite theory helps to examine how political elites like party leaders, influential parliament members and senior governmental officials' impact and even dominate legislative process. More particularly, this theory helps to shed a light in situations where a small group of people exercise disproportionate control over the proceedings, decide which policies should be prioritized and how the decisions ought to be made. For example, party leader often has visible control over legislative agendas and sometimes they direct the attention of MPs toward certain issues while sideling others. Concentration of such amount of power may impact the responsiveness of the parliament, as well as may limit the effectiveness of the system in representing different interests.

Democratic theory introduced by J. Lock is one of the fundamental theories in political science and could be very useful as it provides framework for evaluating the well-functioning of parliamentary systems and whether they democratic principles or no [6]. In its essence democratic theory prescribes accountability, transparency and responsiveness of the political system to the needs of citizens. In parliamentary systems, executive branch is drawn from the legislature and this theory may help to assess whether the parliament is effective in holding the government accountable and the key democratic values like representation, participation and accountability are critical, especially during the evolution of the parliamentary system. At the same time, this theory may be used to examine whether the MPs make their decisions that align with public preferences, as well as it may help to analyze whether parliamentary systems allow for effective checks and balances, which means whether the executive is being held accountable for its actions.

Social choice theory introduced by Kenneth Arrow deals with the aggregation of individual preferences to make collective decisions [7]. In the context of parliamentary governance, this theory is helpful for analyzing the voting systems and how MPs' preferences aggregated into collective decisions and the mechanisms through which policy decisions are reached. Social choice theory could help to explain the intricacies of majoritarian rule and how different electoral systems like first-past-the-post versus proportional representation affect legislative outcomes. This theory is also relevant in understanding the dynamics of coalition governments (they are common in parliamentary systems with proportional representation.) Finally, the theory may provide insight how different parties negotiate and form coalitions, as well as balance their members' preferences with the need to achieve a majority in the legislature.

In the end, systems theory introduced by D. Easton looks at parliamentarian governance as a part of broader, interconnected political system. In order to understand the relationships between legislative, executive and judicial branches of the government and how they interact with each other in the context of parliamentarian democracy, this approach may be particularly useful [8]. This theory also highlights the importance of external factors (media or public opinion) impact the decisions of the parliament. By looking at the system as a whole this theory helps scholars to analyze how the MPs' decisions impact other political actors and societal outcomes. For instance, changes in

the legislation passed by the parliament can impact the policies of the executive branch, which in its turn may affect public opinion and media coverage.

Conceptual Ambiguities in Parliamentary Governance

Taking into consideration that the all complexity of examination of parliamentarian governance we should acknowledge that probably the most fundamental challenge in this topic is the conceptualization of "parliamentary governance". The term itself covers wide range of activities and even structures, starting from the relationship between three branches of the government and finishing by party dynamics, electoral system and the role of parliamentary procedures. Almost in all countries, including those with parliamentary system the governance does not occur in vacuum, the interaction between national, regional and local governments, as well as the judiciary have a slight impact on the legislative processes. One of the methodological issues that may arise is connected with the definition of what constitutes effective parliamentary governance. Some scholars put attention on the procedural aspects of the parliamentary system such as role of the committees, voting procedures and the relationship between government and the opposition; while others emphasize broader outcomes of the governance like policymaking, accountability, and responsiveness. This lack of consensus regarding definitions may lead to various interpretations of parliamentary effectiveness complicating efforts to develop a universal framework for analysis.

The Difficulty of Measuring Parliamentary Effectiveness

Measuring parliamentary effectiveness makes it hard to define by its nature by a fact that defining "effectiveness" is almost impossible due to lack of singular and universally accepted definition. The main reason behind the problem is that term can refer to a variety of aspects of parliamentary functioning each of which may be interpreted in different manner, depending on the criteria used. For example, some scholars may prioritize on legislative productivity, which could be referred to the number of laws passed, while others may prioritize representation by measuring how well MPs reflect on the interests and preferences of their constituents. Another perspective emphasizes accountability by focusing on how effectively the legislator securitizes the executive branch and holds the government accountable for its actions [9]. Such varying interpretations may lead to diverse methods of evaluation, and subsequently make the process of understanding parliamentary effectiveness a complex task.

Needless to say, that context in which the system operates should be taken into account as well, and in this case, researchers are dealing with political context. The system of the state, party dynamics and for countries like India and Canada historical context have slight influence on how the effectiveness of parliamentarian system is judged. For instance, in state with coalitional governments like Germany and Netherlands decision-making may be slower but more inclusive; however, in countries with strong majority governments like India, legislations may pass more quickly, but may fail to reflect the diversity of political views. In states where political instability is not rarity like Israel, polarization or gridlock can lead to the perception that legislator do not function effectively, even if its operations are consistent with its institutional framework. In such cases, what may seem as a failure of legislator to preserve the consistency of the function of the state in reality can be a deep political division among different social and political groups (even political parties in the parliament),

rather than dysfunction of the institution itself. Thus, the assessment process of effectiveness becomes challenging when political circumstances shape perceptions of what is and is not working well.

Moreover, worthy to mention that legislative process is inherently complex and time-consuming process, which makes its evolution difficult. The process of passing a law has numerous stages, which is drafting, debating, amending and finally voting, and this process sometimes take considerable time. However, it should be noted that prolonged legislative process does not necessary reflect inefficiency, rather than it may indicate a thorough democratic examination of the issue at hand (Network Enforcement Act presented in Bundestag in 2017 is one of the examples) [10]. Involvement of parliamentary committees in this action who are vested with an authority to securitize bills in depth before they are brought to the floor for debate is another issue which adds more complexity to the process.

The other factor that may complicate the measurement of the effectiveness of parliamentary system is the wide range of non-legislative functions that are performed by the legislator. Apart lawmaking, parliaments are assigned with the task of ensuring the accountability, representing the interests of the public and overseeing the budget and public spending. Those functions are essential for ensuring the responsiveness of the government; however, it is difficult to assess and quantify these non-legislative roles. For example, it is critical for the functioning of democracy the scrutinization of the executive, though its statistics and voting records man not be immediately apparent. Similarly, representation of diverse interests of constituents and maintaining of public trust are also important aspects of parliamentary work that are challenging to measure through traditional metrics. These functions are more qualitative, and requires subjective analysis and public opinion surveys, which in its turn adds another layer of difficulty in the "effectiveness" formation process.

Moving a little bit away from general measurement factors of effectiveness, the tools and indicators used to measure parliamentary effectiveness should be critically evaluated as well. Some studies put focus on quantitative aspect such as the amount of bills passes, number of sessions held or the frequency of the debates; however, looking only to numeric aspect cannot lead researchers to precise conclusion regarding the produced legislation. The fact that parliament passed many laws and bills may not and, in some cases, does not indicate that legislator performed effectively if the passed laws were poorly designed or failed to address the pressing needs of the population. Similarly, other camp of scholars thoroughly examines the party cohesion and voting behavior in order to assess parliament productivity, but usually such general indicators do not take into account complexities such as reaching compromises over disputed question, coalition-building which is again a significant part of a legislative process. This all leads to the fact that lack of standardized indicators further complicates the task, as the criteria to assess the effectiveness may vary across different systems and political contexts.

In the end, a reference has to be made to external factors such as economic conditions, social movements and international events that may significantly impact both the functionality and subsequently its perceived effectiveness. For instance, during the times of economic crisis or

national security threats, the priorities and agenda of the legislator may dramatically shift. In such scenarios, public perception regarding parliament's effectiveness may also be influenced by such factors and even lead to misjudgments regarding the performance of the institution. In case of national security threats, parliament may be viewed as inefficient due to inability to address urgent issues, though it operates within the bounds of its institutional capacities. In such cases, evaluation of parliamentary effectiveness should consider the broader social, political and economic environment in which the institution operates.

The Role of Party Systems and Party Discipline

Party system and the degree of party discipline are crucial for understanding the dynamics of parliamentary governance. In their essence, parties are the backbone of parliamentary systems as the facilitate the political representation, may influence legislative agendas and enable formation of the government. The party system – whether being characterized by many competing parties or a few dominant ones – have profound impact on the how the legislator operates. Similarly, party discipline and adherence of their members to party line have a key role in shaping the efficiency and effectiveness of parliamentary decision-making [11]. In its essence, system of political parties refers to their organization, relative power, ideological positions and the methods which they use to achieve power. In contemporary political reality, party systems are generally classified into three types; multiparty system, two-party systems and dominant-party systems.

In multiparty systems several political parties compete with each other for power and no single party usually holds an absolute majority. This system is very common in states with proportional representation electoral system, where he seats in parliament are allocated to parties based on the percentage of votes they received [12]. In such systems, coalition governments are very common to be formed and they usually are formed from parties, who make an alliance in order to receive a consent to govern. Probably the most prominent advantage of this system is the inclusivity, as smaller parties, who in other scenario would be just left out of political arena receive a chance to have a seat in the parliament and be engaged in the decision-making process. Though this inclusivity has its coast; the need for coalition-building sometimes result in a fragmented parliament which slows down the decision-making process. Formation of coalitions requires long and extensive negotiations, compromises and coordination among parties which can make process of passing a legislation into a prolonged procedure. Needless to say, that maintaining a unity within a coalition, in the context of fluctuating political landscape is a challenging task as well. While multiparty system allows more diversity and broader representation of political views, it can also lead to political instability, especially when parties do not have a consensus over the solution of different issues.

In contrast, two-party systems (system that operates in the US and UK) could be found in states with first-past-the-post electoral system, where the winner of each district takes the seat, leading to concentration of political power into two dominant parties. The structure of two-party system often leas to clearer distinctions between policy alternatives and sometimes it tends to produce more decisive political outcomes, especially in the context of forming governments and passing legislations [13]. The strength of this system is that it offers political stability as the transition of power between the two major parties is often more straightforward and ruling parties have a

clear mandate to implement their policies. Though, the system also has disadvantages in terms of representation. Smaller political groups may be alienated and may not be able to compete, which in its turn may lead to marginalization of certain political ideologies. In addition, two-party system may lead to political polarization and ideological divide. Polarization also can hinder effective governance, especially during political gridlock, when one party controls executive and the other is in charge of legislative.

In dominant-party systems one political party usually consistently controls the majority of parliamentary seats for a long period of time. Such system could be seen in authoritarian or semi-authoritarian countries like Iraq prior to invasion of 2003, Assad's Syria, Russia and Singapore. Regardless of fact that under such system state may lose its democratic appearance, the ruling party receives an opportunity to pass legislation with minimal opposition, which would may to efficient decision-making and "long-term" political stability [14]. While the dominance of one party may result in effective governance, it may and based on the particular examples it will also rise about democratic accountability which in turn may led political tensions, turmoil and in worst scenario uprising. Still, if the opposition is fragmented and weak, the ruling party becomes unchecked which lead to the concentration of authority in hands of particular individuals and potential abuse of power. Additionally, the lack or absence of political competition may stifle innovation and reduce the responsiveness of the government regarding public concerns.

Finally, talking about the political parties a reference has to be made to party discipline, which refers to which extent members follow the party's official position on legislative matters. Regardless of the system, this discipline is important in ensuring for parties to maintain coherence and unity which will allow them to push through their legislative agendas. Its strength can slightly influence legislative outcomes and the overall effectiveness of parliamentary governance. In countries with strong party discipline members of the party at least are expected to vote in accordance with party instructions. Strong discipline is typical in political parties with centralized leadership structures, when the leader has significant control over the behavior of the its party members. In this case it enables the governing party to pass its agenda more efficiently, as members are less likely to defect or vote against the party line [15]. Inside cohesion allows the government to implement their policies with greater ease and stability, particularly in coalition governments, where cooperation among the party members is essential. Meanwhile, strong party discipline may contribute to the effectiveness of parliamentary governance, it may also have negative consequences. Sometimes, overly rigid discipline may stifle individual MPs' ability to represent the diverse views of their constituents, as they sometimes compelled to vote in line with party's position, even when it conflicts with the local interests. In extreme, high level of discipline may harm the quality of the debate as party leader may prioritize loyalty over genuine discussion of policy ideas. In this case, parliamentary proceedings may become, more about maintaining party unity than about engaging in meaningful dialogue.

In contrast, weak party discipline, happens when party members tend to vote independently or defy the position of the party in legislative matters. Weak discipline could be found in systems with decentralized party structures, where leaders have less control over the actions of the party members. From one perspective weak discipline allows MPs to vote according their own views and

will, but it may also lead to instability and inefficiency. When the party positions are frequently defied, it becomes harder for the government to pass legislation due to less predictability in how members will vote. Unpredictability can make the coalition-building process more difficult and hinder the ability of a parliament to act decisively on important issues. Weak discipline can contribute to political fragmentation, especially in multiparty systems where smaller parties have an ability to find a way to act independently. Though, this can give rise to greater political diversity, it may also make it harder to achieve consensus for passing a legislation.

The Interplay of Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches

Process of studying parliamentary governance is inherently a multifaceted task, which requires a deep understanding of the structures and practices which will enable legislative bodies to function effectively within a broader political system. For the scholars, one of the key challenges in this field is to determine the best ways and methods to analyze the complex processes that define parliamentary behavior, decision-making and overall effectiveness. Debate among scholars whether appeal qualitative or quantitative approach is still a topic for a heated debate; however, integration and usage of both these approaches may offer more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of parliamentary governance.

Quantitative methods used in political science emphasize the use of numerical data, statistical analysis and empirical measurement to examine and study political phenomena. In the context of parliamentary governance quantitative approach can be used to gather data about the amount of laws and bills that were passed, frequency of debates and the number of parliamentary sessions held [17]. This method allows researchers to asses the overall productivity and efficiency of the parliament by providing a data on legislative behavior and outcomes. Probably the most common quantitative tool used in studies of parliamentary governance is the legislative input analysis, which measures the specific number of bills passed for a specific time period. This tool gives insight into the functioning of a parliament and its ability to translate political mandates into concrete laws. Level of party cohesion, frequency of votes on critical issues and the ability of party to maintain discipline within its ranks is also a quantitative indicator.

Moreover, public opinion surveys and voter behavior analysis are also an integral part of quantitative studies, as they give information about how citizens perceive the functioning of the parliament. Analysists may look also to the voting patterns, election results and approval ratings to gauge the legitimacy and public satisfaction of the parliamentary performance. Such type of analysis is truly valuable in order to understand the interrelationship between public trust and parliamentary performance. Though, while quantitative methods may provide valuable insight into parliamentary productivity, they have specific limitations. For example, focus on numerical data can obscure the qualitative aspects of parliamentary behavior like quality of debates, the main nature of political discourse or the level of political engagement. In addition, relying only on quantitative measures can lead to narrow understanding of parliamentary effectiveness, because it may fail to account for the broader political context or the internal dynamics of parliamentary processes.

In contrast, qualitative research mainly focuses on the subjective aspects of the parliamentarian governance like motivation of political actors, quality of debates and internal

dynamics of legislative processes [18]. Qualitative approach opens more space for a researcher for interpretation and allow for a more profound exploration of contextual, social and political factors that may influence parliamentary behavior. The major analysis tool used in this approach is the case study analysis, where scholars examine specific instances of parliament's decision-making or the development of legislation's particular pieces. Case studies may provide rich and detailed insights into strategic choices of the MPs, how much influence the party leaders have and how negotiation may impact in reaching political consensus. Analysis of particular periods in the history of parliament, qualitative researchers can uncover patterns of behavior that may not be apparent in qualitative studies.

Interviewing is another qualitative method which is quietly used in many types of researches, and in this context, interviewing political staff experts and even MPs may shed light to many questions. Usually, interviews give first-hand insights into internal circle and workings of the parliamentary institutions, which allows to reveal the behind-the-scene dynamics that may impact the decision-making process. Interviews sometime shed light on personal motivations, values and beliefs, which could not be captured in numerical data. Moreover, participant observation in parliamentary sessions or committee meetings may provide the researchers with an opportunity to directly observe the interactions, debates and negotiations that take place in parliament. Needless to say that qualitative research may be used to explore institutional culture by investigating how norms, practices and historical traditions shape legislative behavior. For instance, scholars can examine how the leadership style or the role of party discipline impact the decisions and parliamentary debates. By focusing only on the qualitative aspect of governance, researchers may have more comprehensive understanding about the formal structures and power dynamics that play a crucial role in shaping parliamentary outcomes.

Still, qualitative research also has its limitations, as besides offering a deep insight into the working process, its usage may be subjective and difficult to generalize across different contexts. Results based on the qualitative research are often based on small samples, specific case studies or interviews, which may not be representative on broader patterns. Furthermore, take into consideration that qualitative research is time consuming and sometimes lack scalability that quantitative methods offer, making it more challenging to study large datasets or generalize across many parliaments.

The Complementary Nature of Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches

Despite of having strengths and weaknesses, qualitative and quantitative methods can be mixed with each other in order to give maximum output for the sake of the research. Combination of both methods could be referred as mixed-methods approached which will allow to overcome limitations inherent each individual approach and create more holistic analysis of parliament functioning. For instance, a researcher may use quantitative data to measure the output of parliamentary activities and then employ qualitative methods in order to explore the context in which the bills were passed, including the role of political negotiations or even public opinion. Such approach enables researchers to connect the measurable outcomes of parliamentary work with the underlying factors and processes that contribute to these outcomes.

Another example of integration of the two approaches could be found in the study of party systems and discipline in parliament. Quantitative analysis allows to measure the level of party cohesion in the voting, while qualitative research may examine the reasons could examine reasons behind party loyalty or defection, including party ideologies, leadership styles or even strategic considerations. Combination of both methods can gain full understanding of the relationship between party discipline and legislative outcomes. Moreover, quantitative research may help to identify the patterns or trends that may warrant further investigation suing qualitative methods. For example, if the quantitative data reveals parliamentary sessions are characterized by low productivity or high level of conflict, qualitative researchers may delve into profound reasons behind these trends by exploring problems like leadership styles and institutional cultures.

The Role of Media in Parliamentary Governance

"Fourth estate' or otherwise known as media plays vital role in modern parliamentarian governance and in politics in general as media platforms provide citizens with information about the activities of the legislator, actions of the elected officials and also give insides about the problems that dominate in political discourse. For example, professional media outlets cover parliamentary sessions, debates and committee hearings and based on the gathered material they provide analysis and summaries that have to help people to understand complex legislative issues. Such articles inform citizens about the positions taken by lawmakers, priorities of political parties and the outcomes of parliamentary votes [19]. Previously through newspapers, radio and television, and now mainly through internet platforms media started to serve as a bridge between the government and the public, which in ideal scenario have to facilitate the communication and ensure transparency.

Furthermore, media significantly influences the shaping of public opinion as each media outlet frames political issues in certain way. Those who are engaged in this process such as journalists, editors and media producers make editorial choices which affect how political events are presented to the public. The emphasis put on certain problems and issues or offering particular interpretation of events media may influence on how the public or at least some its part perceives the actions of parliamentarians and the policies they advocate. In general terms, the media may portray a controversial bill (for instance Georgian law on foreign agents introduced in May 2024) or law draft either a necessary reform or as a threat to the freedom of people, once again, depending on how it is framed. In this essence, media contributes to the creation of public narrative, which in its turn shapes public opinion and in future may affect the support or opposition to government. Last but not least, media acts as a watchdog and should hold parliamentarians accountable for their actions and decisions. Investigative journalism may expose corruption, mismanagement or even ethical scandals in the parliament and present them to the public. Such scandals often lead to increased scrutiny of elected officials, calls for resignation and even fall of the government (though such consequence is too radical and is not widespread). Thus, media coverage may act as a counterbalance to power, ensuring that MPs remains responsive to public and most importantly their ethical scandals.

Public Opinion and its Impact on Parliamentary Decision-Making

In the aforementioned part the phenomenon of public opinion was touched but was not fully disclosed. In democratic states elected official are expected to represents the will and interest of those who elected them and public opinion serves as an important indicator of what citizens value and expect from the government. The connection between public opinion and parliamentary governance is often direct as shifts in public discourse and sentiment may promote to changes in policy priorities and actions of the government.

In one way which public opinion impact the parliamentary governance is the electoral pressure. In many systems, the legitimacy of the government depends on the support of the electorate, which is expressed through elections or party support [21]. Parties and MPs sometimes are highly sensitive to public opinion, as negative opinion may lead to electoral defeat or the collapse of the coalition government. In case if public disapproves the policy of in general the performance of the government, it may result in a loss of parliamentary seats for the ruling party or coalition in the next election. However, from another perspective positive public opinion may bolster the position of the government and provide a mandate for the implementation of governmental polices.

Public opinion may also influence the policy-making process as elected official often consider public attitudes while crafting legislation, as they seek to align their policies with the preferences of their constituents to maintain political order. For instance, if public opinion strongly favors environmental protection, parliament can pass laws or bills at reducing carbon emissions. In other case, if public is concerned about national security, parliament can take actions to increase the funding of the Ministry of Defense and initiate additional security measures. In this way, public opinion acts as a check on government and ensures that policies reflect the values and concerns of electorate. Needless to say, that public opinion may shape the behavior of parliamentarians. Politicians often respond to shifts in public sentiment by modifying their positions of adjusting their rhetoric. For example, if parliamentary candidate experiences a surge in support for a particular problem, they may adopt more aggressive position on that issue to maintain their appeal. Similarly, if public opinion turns against a particular policy, politicians can distance from it or propose other solutions to regain public favor.

Interaction between media and public creates a dynamic relationship that influences parliamentary governance. Public opinions may express through polling, protests, or public sentiment may impact the away media covers political events as journalists and news outlets respond to the concern their audience. Such circular relationship amplifies the effect that both media and public opinion may have on parliamentarian decision-making. Worth to mention that public opinion may significantly shape agenda-setting role of the media. Media will more certainly cover issues of public interest regarding the legislative processes. For instance, if public outcry over healthcare, media will often amplify that issue by pressuring on parliaments to address the concerns of the electorate.

While media and public opinion are powerful tools for democratic governance, that may also face challenges. For example, media bias may distort the relationship between public and legislator. In states where media is controlled by the elites (especially political elites) or corporations, media

coverage can be skewed to favor certain political agendas or ideologies, which leads to misinformed or polarized public opinion. It can undermine the quality of democratic debate and hinder the parliament's ability to represent the true will of people.

Conclusion

In conclusion, parliamentary governance requires a multifaceted approach should consider both qualitative and quantitative methods. While each approach offers diverse advantages, their integration through mixed-methods approach presents a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the complexities of parliamentary processes. Quantitative methods provide important data on the performance of parliament and public opinion, and allows for measurable assessments of legislative activity, productivity and public satisfaction. Though, these methods may overlook deeper, contextual factors which influence decision-making. In contrast, qualitative approach offers rich insights into the motivations, strategies and internal dynamics of parliamentary actors, even though they are limited by their subjectivity and lack of generalizability. Combination of these methods may bridge the gaps and provide more holistic view of parliamentary governance which accounts for both measurable outcomes and the underlying processes that drive them.

In addition, role of media in shaping public opinion and influencing parliamentary decision-making process cannot be overstated. Media serves as an important conduit for information, a forum for political discourse and a check on governmental activities. Its ability to shape the public perception and influence legislative agenda highlights the interconnectedness between media, public opinion and parliamentary governance. The dynamic interplay of such elements underscores the need for a balanced approach in studying parliamentary system – one that incorporates both objective information and subjective insights and that considers the broader political and social context which these institutions operate.

References

1. **Stenimo S.,** (2015) Institutionalism: ResearchGate. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323838673_Institutionalism Accessed January 10, 2025.
2. **Roskin M.G.,** (2024). political science. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/political-science. Accessed January 10, 2025.
3. **Britannica T.,** Editors of Encyclopaedia (2008). pluralism. Encyclopedia Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/pluralism-politics. Accessed January 17, 2025.
4. **Mariotti C.,** (2020). Elite Theory: ResearchGate. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346487306_Elite_Theory. Accessed January 17, 2025.
5. **Dean R.,** et all. (2019). What Is Democratic Theory. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jean-Paul-Gagnon/publication/338019949_What_Is_Democratic Theory/links/5dfab8c24585159aa487d4c3/What-Is-Democratic-Theory.pdf. Accessed January 10, 2025.
6. **Stanford** Encyclopedia of Philosophy, (2022). Social Choice Theory. Retrieved from: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/social-choice/. Accessed January 17, 2025.
7. **Laszio A.** & Krippner, S. (1998). Chapter 3. Systems Theories: Their Origins, Foundations, and development. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251455580Chapter 3_SystemsTheories_Their_Origins_Foundations_and_development. Accessed January 13, 2025.

8. **Navarro J.,** et all. (2012). Measuring parliamentary effectiveness in the French national assembly: The contribution of non-parametric frontier methods. Retrieved from: file:///C:/Users/PC-6/Downloads/measuring-parliamentary-effectiveness-in-the-french-national-assembly.pdf. Accessed January 17, 2025.

9. **Schobess R.,** (2022). Behind the Scenes: What is Parliamentary Performance and How Can We Measure It?, Parliamentary Affairs, Volume 75, Issue 4, Pages 767–790. Accessed January 14, 2025.

10. **Bowler S.,** Farrell D.M., & Katz R.S., (Eds.). (1999). Party discipline and parliamentary government. Ohio State University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv177tghd.

11. **Mushemeza E.,** (2007) The Functioning of A Multiparty System in Local Government. Retrieved from: https://www.acode-u.org/uploadedFiles/PBP20.pdf. Accessed January 17, 2025.

12. **Anthpny G.** & CarA.I, (2019). Two-Party system: A case study of United States of America. Retrieved from: https://www.idosr.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/IDOSR-JCE-41-18-26-2019.pdf. Accessed January 10, 2025.

13. **Laws E.,** (2016). Dominant party systems and development programming. Retrieved from: https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/K4D-report-4-Dominant-party-systems-and-development-programming.pdf. Accessed January 27, 2025.

14. Kam, Christopher, 'Party Discipline', in Shane Martin, Thomas Saalfeld, and Kaare W. Strøm (eds), The Oxford Handbook of Legislative Studies (2014; online edn, Oxford Academic, 2 Sept. 2014), https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199653010.013.0020. Accessed January 12, 2025.

15. **Ikponmwosa M,.** et all. (2024). an analysis of the use of quantitative methods in political science research. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383212917_AN_ANALYSIS_OF_THE_USE_OF_QUANTITATIVE_METHODS_IN_POLITICAL_SCIENCE_RESEARCH. Accessed January 17, 2025.

16. **Blatter J.,** et all. (2016). Qualitative Research in Political Science. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Markus-Haverland/publication/312174464_Qualitative_Research_in_Political_Science_Introductions_to_the_four_volumes/links/5874c09d08aebf17d3b3af56/Qualitative-Research-in-Political-Science-Introductions-to-the-four-volumes.pdf. Accessed January 11, 2025.

17. **Bouchet N.,** & Kariithi N., (2003). Parliament and the Media Building an Informed Society. Retrieved from: https://www.agora-parl.org/sites/default/files/agora-documents/CPA-WBI%20-%20Parliament%20and%20the%20Media-Building%20an%20Informed%20Society%20-%202002-2003%20-%20English%20-%20PI.pdf. Accessed January 10, 2025.

18. **Walgrave S.,** et all. (2022). The Impact of Public Opinion on Political Action. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/367256636_The_Impact_of_Public_Opinion_on_Political_Action. Accessed January 17, 2025.

Տ.Կ. Սիմոնյան

ԽՈՐՀՐԴԱՐԱՆԱԿԱՆ ԿԱՌԱՎԱՐՄԱՆ ՏԵՍԱՄԵԹՈԴԱԿԱՆ ՈՐՈՇ ՀԻՄՆԱԽՆԴԻՐՆԵՐԻ ՄԱՍԻՆ

Սույն հոդվածը ներկայացնում է խորհրդարանական կառավարման համապարփակ վերլուծություն և դրա բարդությունների պատբեր կողմեր: Այն ուսումնասիրում է քաղաքական գիտության պատբեր պեսությաներ, ինչպիսիք են ինսապիպուցիոնալիզմը, ռացիոնալ ընտրության պեսությունը, պլուրալիզմը, էլիպարիզմը, ժողովրդավարական պեսությունը և սոցիալական ընտրության պեսությունը, որոնք կազնել գիպնականաներին հասկանալ խորհրդարանական համակարգերի գործառույթները: Հոդվածը քննարկում է, թե ինչպես են այս պեսությունները կիրառվում խորհրդարանական համակարգի գործունեությունում,

քաղաքական դերակատարների վարքագծի և խորհրդարանական որոշումների ազդեցությունը հասկանալու համար: Այն նաև վերաբերում է խորհրդարանական արդյունավետության կոնցեպտուալացման և չափման դժվարություններին՝ հաշվի առնելով քաղաքական համատեքստը, կուսակցությունների համակարգերը և արտաքին ազդեցությունները: Բացի այդ, հոդվածում քննարկում է կուսակցությունների համակարգերի և կարգապահության դերը խորհրդարանական դինամիկայի ձևավորման մեջ՝ ընդգծելով բազմակուսակցային, երկկուսակցային և գերիշխող կուսակցությունների համակարգերի միջև տարբերությունները: Այն նաև ուսումնասիրում է կուսակցական համակարգերի և կուսակցական կարգապահության դերը խորհրդարանական դինամիկայի ձևավորման գործում՝ ընդգծելով բազմակուսակցական, երկկուսակցական և գերիշխող կուսակցական համակարգերի միջև եղած տարբերությունները: Հոդվածը միաժամանակ դիտարկում է քաղաքագիտության մեջ օգտագործվող որակական և քանակական մոտեցումները՝ ուսումնասիրելու, թե ինչպես կարելի է չափել խորհրդարանական համակարգի արդյունավետությունը: Վերջում հոդվածն անդրադառնում է ԶԼՄ-ների դերին հանրային դիսկուրսի ձևավորման մեջ:

Առանցքային բառեր. *խորհրդարանական կառավարում, քաղաքագիտության տեսություններ, ինստիտուցիոնալիզմ, ռացիոնալ ընտրության տեսություն, բազմակարծություն, էլիտայի տեսություն, դեմոկրատական տեսություն, սոցիալական ընտրության տեսություն, խորհրդարանական արդյունավետություն, կուսակցական համակարգեր:*

Т.К. Симонян

О НЕКОТОРЫХ КЛЮЧЕВЫХ МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ПРОБЛЕМАХ ПАРЛАМЕНТСКОГО ПРАВЛЕНИЯ

Статья представляет собой всесторонний анализ парламентского правления и его различных сложностей. В ней рассматриваются различные теоретические подходы в политологии, такие как институционализм, теория рационального выбора, плюрализм, элитная теория, демократическая теория и теория социального выбора, которые помогают ученым понять, как функционируют парламентские системы. В статье обсуждается, как эти теории применимы для понимания законодательного процесса, поведения политических акторов и воздействия парламентских решений. Также затрагиваются проблемы концептуализации и измерения эффективности парламента с учетом таких факторов, как политический контекст, партийные системы и внешние влияния. Рассматривается роль партийных систем и партийной дисциплины в формировании парламентской динамики, подчеркиваются различия между многопартийными, двухпартийными и доминирующими партийными системами. В статье также рассматривается роль партийных систем и партийной дисциплины в формировании парламентской динамики, подчеркиваются различия между многопартийными, двухпартийными и доминирующими системами. Одновременно в статье рассматриваются качественные и количественные подходы, используемые в политической науке для изучения и изучения того, как можно измерить эффективность парламентской системы. В конце статьи затрагивается роль СМИ в форме публичного дискурса.

Ключевые слова: *парламентское равление, теории политологии, институционализм, теория рационального выбора, плюрализм, теория элиты, демократическая теория, теория социального выбора, эффективность парламента, партийные системы.*

Simonyan Tigran Karen - Ph.D. Student at the Department of Political Science after K.A. Mirumyan Russian-Armenian University