

THE ROLE OF PARLIAMENTARY CULTURE IN THE PROCESS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC POLICY ANALYSIS

Martin AGHAJANYAN

YSU, Faculty of International Relations
Public Administration Department Master Student

Vladimir MKRTCYAN

Ph.D. in Economics

Keywords: parliamentary culture, parliament-society dialogue, public policy analysis, political participation, public interest

Introduction. The role of parliamentary culture is crucial to public administration and public policy analysis. Due to the precedence of the political dialogue between the parliament and the society, this topic is relevant for a detailed study in public administration and public policy analysis areas. The parliamentary culture is constantly transforming based on national interests and peculiarities at different stages of civilizational development. In the process of public administration and public policy analysis, it is vital to ensure the effectiveness of the political system, which is especially promoted by the development of parliamentary culture. The realization of national interests and their effective alignment with public ones, is a prerequisite for cooperation between the society and the parliament in the processes of democratization [Savchenko, 2013, 76-89].

It is necessary to apply an appropriate system of checks and balances, which will allow the finding of common ground between the public authorities and the society, considering the role of parliamentary culture in the process of public administration and public policy analysis.

Methodology. The selection of the study methods for this work was based on the imperatives of modern political development. The study of the role of parliamentary culture was carried out in the framework of transitional studies, consolidation studies, and political hermeneutics. Both systematic and dialectical methodology of development has been applied in the above-mentioned areas, combining the institutional, social-psychological, civilizational aspects of parliamentary culture in the political context of public administration and public policy analysis. The theoretical basis for the research was the works and analyses of well-known theorists on different stages of political development, which enabled a comprehensive and multi-level study of the role of parliamentary culture in the process of public administration and public policy analysis.

Literature review. There is no shortage of the "parliamentary culture" definition in the political science literature. The various functions of parliamentary cul-

ture were observed by Plato, Aristotle, N. Machiavelli, T. Hobbes, J. Locke, J. J. Rousseau, I. Kant, Y. Herder, Hegel, J. Mill, H. Spencer, G. Le Bon, G. Almond, S. Verba, N. Bogdanova, F. Burlatski and others. They emphasized the importance of the parliamentary culture's political, communicative, socializing, cognitive, regulatory, consolidating, and integration functions in their works [Gerder, 1977; Almond, Verba, 1992, 122-134; Aron 1993; Il'in 2010, 69-82]. In addition, the study of the socio-political nature of the parliament and the classification of political representation were present in the works of A. Birch, E. McLean, E. Haywood, and others. According to F. Burlatski, the parliamentary culture is the institutional and non-institutional historical and social experience of a national-supranational community, which has its impact on the political consciousness of the state and society, on the political behavior of public administration entities, on the formation of political assessments of political developments by the society [Burlatski, 1970, 49-50]. Finally, parliamentary culture is an axiological field formed during the cultural and historical development processes and based on democratic consolidation and human rights protection mechanisms.

Analysis. Parliamentary culture ensures the effectiveness of the dialogue between the society and the state in the process of public administration and public policy analysis. The parliamentary culture development, its institutional peculiarities, and structure contribute to the formation and evolution of the content of public opinion. In this backdrop, Almond and Verba, referring to the issues of civic participation, argue that the stability and viability of a democratic political system are conditioned not only by the constitutional-legal nature of democratic institutions but also by the revaluation of the political system, its inputs, and outputs, as well as a citizen's role in that system [Almond, Verba, 2014, 283-322].

There are two different approaches to the interpretation of parliamentary culture in contemporary political research. Proponents of the first approach argue that parliamentary culture is intertwined with "state science," in which parliamentary culture is seen as a form of government. In this sense, parliamentary culture is considered as a medium of organizing public administration system, ensuring effective separation of powers [Palonen, 2018, 219-227]. The proponents of the second approach argue that parliamentary culture is based on control functions and societal values.

Parliamentary culture is often interpreted as an embodiment of political consciousness. In this regard, the American researcher Jennings considers the primary function of parliament to be criticism but not governance. According to him, the criticism is not aimed at a significant change in government policy, but at the establishment of prostrate political consciousness. Parliamentary culture should guarantee the formation of political assessments of the speeches made in parliament by the public [Jennings, 1959, 472].

Political consciousness acts as a balancing mechanism between the legislative and the executive branches of power. The members of society, who hold civic culture, have the exact idea about the political system, their place, and their role in it; they also enjoy effective mechanisms for participating in political life, which leads to a noticeably high level of political consciousness in the society [Saroyan, 2015, 58].

There are other definitions of the "parliamentary political culture" term in the political science literature, which can be classified in narrow and broad meanings. In a narrow meaning, parliamentary culture is parliamentary ethics, which is viewed as a socio-political phenomenon conditioned by political relations [Achkasov, 2004, 173-191].

Parliamentary culture, being in the institutional and non-institutional spheres, is a vital component of the public policy analysis process, which is based on political-legal values, interests, and motives [Vorob'ev, 2004; Konstantinova, Lavrikova, 2012, 212-217]. In the context of postmodern political developments, parliamentary culture includes the axiological system of parliamentary governance and public relations, on which the influence of civil society is significant [GOPAC]. Parliamentary culture is a system of axiological orientations and motives, which determines the effectiveness and efficiency of the parliament as a representative body [Kovbenko, 2009].

Due to the national and historical peculiarities, the substance of the parliamentary culture is supplemented by the traditions, value system, customs, as well as religious and moral notions rooted in the society. Thus, the parliamentary culture, covering a wide range of political, legal, social, and cultural relations, reproduces the legal order through legislative activities while also regulating to some extent the social relations in the legal and political platforms. In this framework, the parliamentary culture at different levels of its development contributes to the transformation of society, influencing social development, which promotes the raising of the level of political consciousness among society members, as well as it leads the society to the path of modernization. Due to this circumstance, the role of formation and development of parliamentary culture is paramount in the public policy analysis.

In a broad meaning, parliamentary culture is a high level of consolidation of the public administration system, as well as continuous cooperation between the state and society [Herbert, 1996, 24]. Parliamentary culture is an indicator of the level of legitimacy of public administration institutions, and at the same time, it reflects the level of public participation in the platform for dialogue between the state and society [Ilie, 2018, 133-145]. In this setting, it is necessary to focus on the attitudes towards the parliamentary governance system and democratic representation by the political ruling elite and society.

In the process of transition to democracy, the representative institutions of the states need to ensure the effectiveness of the parliamentary culture and the political system of government per international standards. The gap between the state and the society deepens, undermining the institutional foundations for the establishment of parliamentary culture until a dialogue based on national identity and historical memory is established between the parliament and the society [Ganghof, 2021, 66-86].

Within the framework of parliamentary culture, the public administration system possesses the following distinct advantage: considerable representation of the country's population in making fundamental decisions for the state governance [Alekseeva, 1908, 18-20]. In the case of the effective development of parliamentary culture, it can be stated that the process of making the most significant decisions for the sake of the country is more prolonged and detailed as different political forces express their opinions on the decisions to be taken and, therefore, as a result of different approaches, a more expedient and rational decision is made. Analyzing this provision in more detail, political scientist Melville notes that the advantages of parliamentary culture are so sublime and unprecedented that modern political thought is faced with the problem of conceptual renewal of political changes and political development, taking into account the disparate nature of post-communist transformations [Melville, 2004, 25-47].

In the process of public administration and public policy analysis, ensuring public participation guarantees the combination of national and public interests based on the existing political dialogue between the parliament and the society. Political dialogue is a continuous and serviceable activity between the parliamentary parties, ensuring the realization of people's right to be represented and involved in the public administration system. When the national dialogue is disrupted, there is a crisis of trust and mass marginalization between the parliament and the society, which leads to a sharp decline in the internal and external image of the parliament as a people's representative body. Awareness of the national interest by the parliament creates the need to make the transition from object to the subject during its socialization process [Ulitin, 2003, 129-131]. The effectiveness of the dialogue process is primarily conditioned by the existence of a political regime appropriate to the government system and a national ideology based on consensus. The culture of dialogue is identified with the legitimacy of the public administration system [Banerjee, 2012, 16-19]. The existence of the latter is bound to the axiological dimensions of political relations between the parliament and the society and to the social guarantees' provision to ensure public safety.

The political consciousness and beliefs of the political elite, of civic representative institutions, of the society, as well as the dialogue between the state and the public, is vital for the establishment and further development of the parliamentary culture. Due to the coalition-building and deliberation features, the parliamentary culture allows for a

more responsive government. When a system is better able to represent a vast array of people, it is better equipped to respond if changes in the public administration need to occur [Rachel James, 2021, 1-13].

Parliamentary governance procedures include the priorities of managerial activity: professional training, the culture of parliamentary ethics, the ability to respond to socio-political issues promptly, creation of a legal framework following national specifics [Ledjaev, 2001, 43]. These are two different areas of parliamentary governance regulatory activities. Otherwise, there is a conflict of interest, which leads to the complete loss of the parliament's representative function.

Scientific novelty. Our research work provides an opportunity to prove the scientific novelty of this article. Thus, the novelty of this paper is that the awareness of national interests is a necessary condition for cooperation between the society and the parliament, which must be converged with the public interest. Political dialogue is a central component of parliamentary culture, ensuring public representation and engagement in the public administration system and decision-making process.

Conclusions. Summarizing the theoretical-ideological bases of parliamentary culture in the process of public administration and public policy analysis as well as analyzing the uninterrupted interaction of structural and content components of the concept, we came to the conclusion that parliamentary culture is the primary stimulus in the process of public administration and public policy analysis and which ensures the broadest representation of public participation in the process of political decision-making and their implementation. The practical application of the principles of parliamentary culture ensures the smooth operation of the state-society dialogue mechanisms. All this enables the effective development, implementation, and analysis of public policy at different levels of the public administration system based on the public interest.

References

1. Achkasov V. A. Transformacija tradicij i političeskaja modernizacija: fenomen rossijskogo tradicionalizma // "Filosofija i social'no-političeskie cennosti konservativizma v obshhestvennom soznanii Rossii". Vypusk 1. SPb., 2004, ss. 173-191. (In Russian)
2. Alekseeva A. A. K Ucheniju o Parlamentarizme, G. Sankt Peterburg, 1908, s. 18-20. (In Russian)
3. Almond G., Verba S. Grazhdanskaja kul'tura i stabil'nost' demokratii // "Političeskie issledovanija", 1992, № 4, ss. 122-134. (In Russian)
4. Almond G., Verba S. Grazhdanskaja kul'tura: političeskie ustanovki i demokratija v pjati stranah. M., 2014, ss. 283-322. (In Russian)
5. Aron R. Demokratija i totalitarizm. M., 1993. (In Russian)
6. Banerjee, Sumanta. "From Parliamentary to Paramilitary Democracy." Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 47, no. 1, Economic and Political Weekly, 2012, pp. 16–19, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23065567>.

7. Burlatski F. M. Sociologicheskie problemy politiki // "Social'nye issledovanija". Vypusk 5. M., 1970, ss. 49-50. (In Russian)
8. Ganghof, Steffen. "Beyond Presidentialism and Parliamentarism. Democratic Design and the Separation of Powers." Oxford University Press, United Kingdom April 2021, p. 199.
9. Gerder I. Idei k filosofii istorii chelovechestva. M., 1977. (In Russian)
10. Herbert, Garry D. H. "Cabinet Government." RSA Journal, vol. 144, no. 5474, Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, 1996, pp. 24–24, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41377211>.
11. Ilie, Cornelia. "Parliamentary Discourse and Deliberative Rhetoric." Parliament and Parliamentarism: A Comparative History of a European Concept, edited by Cornelia Ilie et al., 1st ed., Berghahn Books, 2018, pp. 133–45, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvgs0b7n.13>.
12. Il'in A. N. Massovaja kul'tura i subkul'tura // "Sociologija kul'tury", 2010, № 2, ss. 69-82. (In Russian)
13. Jennings, Ivor. Cabinet Government. Cambridge University Press, 1959, p. 472.
14. Konstantinova L. A., Lavrikova A. A. Cennostnye orientacii kak faktor social'noj stratifikacii sovremennogo rossijskogo obshhestva. Izvestija tul'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. gumanitarnye nauki, Nomer: 2, 2012, ss. 212-217.
15. Kovbenko L. N. Parlamentskaja kul'tura v sovremennom rossijskom političeskom processe: uslovija i faktory razvitija. SPb., 2009 // <http://www.dissercat.com/content/parlamentskaya-kultura-v-sovremennom-rossijskom-politicheskom-protsesse-usloviya-ifactory-r#ixzz2XVI9WweX> (Accessed 10.02.2021). (In Russian)
16. Ledjaev V. G. Vlast'. Konceptual'nyj analiz. M., 2001, s. 43. (In Russian)
17. Melville A., O traektorijah postkommunističeskikh transformacij, Polis, 2004, №2, ss. 25-47. (In Russian)
18. Palonen, Kari. "Political Theories of Parliamentarism." Parliament and Parliamentarism: A Comparative History of a European Concept, edited by Kari Palonen et al., 1st ed., Berghahn Books, 2018, pp. 219–27, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvgs0b7n.18>.
19. Rachel, James. "Survival of Democracy in Parliamentary and Presidential Systems." Drake Undergraduate Social Science Journal, Edition Spring 2021, pp. 1-13.
20. Saroyan, Knyaz. Qaghaqaciakan mshakowyt' haskacowt'yan sahanman showrj // «Banber Er&ani hamalsarani. Mijazgayin haraberowt'yownner, Qaghaqagitowt'yown», 2015, № 2 (17), e'j 58. (In Armenian)
21. Savchenko I. A. Sovremennye metody osushhestvlenija dialoga mezhdou gosudarstvom i obshhestvom // http://psyjournals.ru/files/64939/6_Savchenkp.PDF (accessed 12.01.2021). (In Russian)
22. The Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC), // <http://gopacnetwork.org>.
23. Ulitin R.R. Sootnoshenie ponjatij «nacional'nyj interes» i «nacional'naja bezopasnost'» v trudah zapadnyh i otechestvennyh issledovatelej // Vestnik Nizhegorod. un-ta im. N.I. Lobachevskogo. Ser.: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija, Politologija, Regionovedenie. 2003, № 1, ss. 129-131. (In Russian)
24. Vorob'ev I. V. Stanovlenie instituta parlamentarizma v sovremennoj Rossii: vzaimodejstvie deputatskogo korpusa i apparata Gosudarstvennoj Dumy: Avtoref. dis. kand. sociol.nauk. M., 2004. (In Russian)

Martin AGHAJANYAN, Vladimir MKRTCYAN
The Role of Parliamentary Culture in the Process of Public Administration and Public Policy Analysis

Key words: parliamentary culture, parliament-society dialogue, public policy analysis, political participation, public interest

Parliamentary culture plays a key role in the public administration and public policy analysis process, as its development contributes to raising the public's political awareness and ensures effective public participation in public administration and various stages of the public policy development, implementation, and analysis processes. Parliamentary culture contributes to the establishment of a dialogue between state and society aimed at increasing the efficiency of the public administration system. The selection of the study methods for this work was based on the imperatives of modern political development. The study of the role of parliamentary culture was carried out in the framework of transitional studies, consolidation studies, and political hermeneutics. Both systematic and dialectical methodology of development has been applied in the above-mentioned areas, combining the institutional, social-psychological, civilizational aspects of parliamentary culture in the context of public administration and public policy analysis. Summarizing the theoretical-ideological bases of parliamentary culture in the process of public administration and public policy analysis as well as analyzing the uninterrupted interaction of structural and content components of the concept, we came to the conclusion that parliamentary culture is the primary stimulus in the process of public administration and public policy analysis and which ensures the broadest representation of public participation in the process of political decision-making and their implementation.