

Facing The Enemy Head on During the Parliamentary Debates in Africa

Douglas John Chikhowe Banda, Prof. Nirmala Dorasamy, Prof. Zamokuhle Mbandlwa,

PhD candidate, Durban University of Technology, chikhowebanda@gmail.com;

Senior Lecturer, Durban University of Technology, nirmala@dut.ac.za;

ZamokuhleM@dut.ac.za

HOW TO CITE:

Douglas John Chikhowe Banda, Nirmala Dorasamy, Zamokuhle Mbandlwa, (2026). Facing The Enemy Head on During the Parliamentary Debates in Africa International Journal of Special Education, 41(20s), 775 - 791

ABSTRACT:

Several research efforts have focused primarily on intensifying enmity between the ruling and opposition parties in different African states highlighted in different parliamentary debates. African politics have not changed for decades, name calling, labelling and insults has led to tensions, disappearance, unexpected deaths and reactive civil wars in different institutions. Facing the enemy head on in parliamentary debates is an approach which is aimed at identifying the gaps needed to compromise on issues to promote effective governance needed to change the situations. The parliamentary debates are conducted to clarify the policy implementation to improve the innovative actions to reduce the tensions that may disrupt the efficiency in different institutions. The aim of this article is to examine facing the enemy head on in parliamentary debates between the ruling and opposition party working very hard to educate the public about different initiatives. The discussions related to parliament debates are ongoing in different African states to measure the data collected from eight articles collecting the data. The gaps identified in the literature reviewed provide a definitive theory of efficiency using the legal frameworks acceptable as the basis of an analysis of the parliamentary debates, especially facing the enemy head on. Based on the articles collected from 2010 – 2019, highlight facing the enemy head on in parliamentary debates at different debates. This systematic qualitative method presents a modified framework to assess the effectiveness of parliamentary debates by defining policy, practice, and performance, as well as loops to share the lessons learned. It was found that facing the enemy head on in parliamentary debates the misleading comparisons, overgeneralizing a point, framing as extremism, ignoring nuance, simplifying motivations, and distorting consequences. The results highlight the urgent need to reduce unnecessary parliamentary debates by developing better awareness, increased

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.

Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

understanding the implementation of appropriate measures for long-term adaptation.

Keywords: debates, democratization, development, enemy, framework, parliamentary, and representations

Introduction

The parliamentary debates have been a platform portrayed as a battle ground for promoting semantic languages between the ruling and opposition parties to secure the electoral mandate in their constituencies (Emmanuel, & Jonason, 2020). In Africa, Kuta, (2020) states that the opposition parties are branded as the enemies of the state, who are incompetent, ungrateful, bankrupt and clueless on how the government systems works to implement policies. Yet, they both face challenges, to address citizen petitions, representations, the complexities of parliamentary procedure, and the potential for debates to be used for political gain (Umney, Lloyd, & Potter, 2014). Thoma, (1988) states that the most of the parliamentary debates taking place in Africa do not adequately address the issues the people face on a daily basis. The institutionalized processes, hinder the effective citizen engagement in guiding constructive discussions, because the parliamentarians are not afraid of losing their constituencies (Strang, 2010). Additionally, Lulham, & Kaldor, (2013) state that there are concerns about the quality of the debates and effectiveness of parliamentary speeches, they are dominated by certain individuals, representing their political parties. The parliamentary procedures are complex, potentially hindering group discussion and action, or even becoming a barrier to securing ideas and suggestions (Emmanuel, & Jonason, 2020). The main aim of this articles is to examine the parliamentarians facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates in Africa. Ehrlich, and Ehrlich, (2013) state that facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates are not accessible to the public, both in terms of format and content, to ensure that citizens are informed and can engage with the legislative process. During the parliamentary debates in the twentieth century, the context of struggles over

democratization of parliament which undermine universal suffrage (Evans, and Silk, 2008). In Africa, Umney, et al., (2014) state that the reflections on parliamentary debates particularly appealing, to constitutional tradition supporting the system of political representation which are exceptionally old and not strong. There are gaps in knowledge about the effectiveness of different parliamentary debate approaches motivating MPs, and at the same time hindering the development of best practices (Strang, 2010).

Van Dijk, (1984) states that while parliamentary debates has mechanisms for special petitions, general petitions, representations, rather than constructive discussions educating the entire Africans in different countries, prejudice is used to undermine the opposition MPs. There's a risk that certain individuals or parties dominating debates, hindering the diverse representation of viewpoints and hindering effective deliberation during the parliamentary debates (Emmanuel, & Jonason, 2020). Lulham, & Kaldor, (2013) state that the style and quality of parliamentary speeches vary, and they are guided by the complex parliamentary procedures which are not informative for both fellow members of parliament (MPs) and the broader public. They are used by the MPs during the parliamentary debates used by opposition parties to criticize ministers or the government, or by the majority party to highlight achievements, potentially overshadowing the need for genuine deliberation (Ehrlich, and Ehrlich, 2013). This has led the political parties to exploit debates which lack efficient mechanisms for MPs to make inputs during the parliamentary debates because of prejudice when implementing the policies (Van Dijk, 1984). Martin, and Vanberg, (2008) state that facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates limit meeting duration time constraints to hinder the ability to fully explore complex issues needed to develop the

Africans. The African parliamentary life is commonly viewed as an old parliamentary culture among European liberal circles yet adopted wrongly by the African leaders (Kuta, 2020).

Problem statement

Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa, has led to the delayed response when discussing the ways of implementing the policies (Emmanuel, & Jonason, 2020). Evans, and Silk, (2008) state that the waiting too long to communicate with the opposition led to misinformation and increased anxiety delayed even if it's incomplete when facing the enemy head on during the debates. The lack of follow - up makes it difficult to stopping communication after the immediate crisis leave questions unanswered when facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates (Lulham, & Kaldor, 2013). This has led to the lack of transparency due to the withholding information erode trust and fuel speculation inconsistent messaging providing conflicting information to confuse stakeholders (Strang, 2010). Ehrlich, and Ehrlich, (2013) state that facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates ignoring the audience who fail to consider the needs and concerns of the audience lead to disengagement. The failure to address destructive messages ensure the messages are not aligned and coordinated across channels using the media in developing the people (Van Dijk, 1984). Laver, and Shepsle. (1996) states that these mistakes caused by the MPs when facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates, fails to manage the crisis communication and build trust with stakeholders. In most cases, the MPs use jargon to alienate the audience and obscure the message use unclear language that is not easily understood by the electorate to engage in successful parliamentary debates. As a result, Kuta, (2020) states that the overly use of technical language focus on self – interest prioritizing the organization's reputation over stakeholder safety backfire after facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates in Africa. This has led to neglecting social media ignoring the misinformation spreading unchecked not

having a crisis communication plan lead to chaos when a crisis occurs during the parliamentary debates (Emmanuel, & Jonason, 2020).

Objectives of the paper

- To examine the consensus about facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa.
- To identify the success or failures about facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa.
- To determine the impact of facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa.
- To know the best ways to reduce tensions when facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa.

Literature review

It is important to note that literature review both the ruling and opposition parties during the parliamentary debates and the argumentation of the parliamentary tradition (Strang, 2010). Lulham, & Kaldor, (2013) state that facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa were built on the idealization of appeasement policy to keep the rural areas suffering while unjustly enriching themselves. The committee-based negotiations hardly compromise during the parliamentary debates, which are characterized internal ineffective parliamentary politics in Africa (Pekonen, 2014). Van Dijk, (1984) states that the utilizing parliamentary rules when facing the enemy head on understands the rules to familiarize with parliamentary procedures to effectively navigate debates. The use of Points of Order, raise procedural points to disrupt the opponent's flow during the parliamentary debates (Laver, & Shepsle. 1996).

Parliamentary debates

Parliamentary debates are defined as the formal discussions that take place within a parliament, where elected representatives gather to discuss the formulation and implementation of policies (Diermeier, Timothy, & Feddersen. 1998). Both the ruling party and the opposition make

decisions on legislative proposals, policies, and issues of national importance, to redress the grievances of the past. The parliamentary debates serve several key purposes indicated in detail.

Legislation: The MPs debate proposed laws, amendments, and policies to evaluate their merits and implications in Africa's parliament's debates in different states when discussing policies (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996). The MPs framing the legislation as extremism about responsible regulation, not an outright ban focus on accountability and reform, during the parliamentary debates (Van Dijk, 1984). Recognizing the legislation allows the MPs to identify the fallacies which distort the original argument is about healthcare reform, ensure that the rebuttal isn't just attacking an unrelated issue (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Accountability: The MPs debates allow members to question government officials and hold them accountable for their actions and decisions during policy analysis (Strang, 2010). Simplifying accountability through parliamentary privileges provide a hiding safety net, encouraging laziness for some MPs in following specific techniques to be followed. This uses a slippery slope to misrepresent the actual discussion about equality not an indictment of all officers (Lulham, & Kaldor, 2013).

Representation: The MPs during the parliamentary debates express the views and concerns of their constituents, ensuring that diverse perspectives are considered by the enemy in power (Diermeier, et al. 1998). Huber, (1996) states that the consequences of representation, pay attention to claims that seem overly exaggerated or extreme compared to the original argument. The MPs have a tendency of using different techniques to directly compare the responses to the original claims to see if they align or if the response has diverted to an easier argument ((Perrow, and Pulver, 2015). This has identified attacks the person's personal situation rather than engaging with the merits of the funding argument without any concrete result.

Public discourse: The MPs debates contribute to public understanding of issues, as they are

often broadcast or reported in the media, facilitating wider civic engagement (Pekonen, 2014). Martin, and Vanberg, (2008) state that the wary of arguments are conducted during the parliamentary debated invoke strong emotions without addressing the substance of the original claim. MPs look for mischaracterizations which inaccurately reflects the intent and nuance of the original position if the discussion shifts from the main argument to an easier target that misrepresents the original claim (Van Dijk, 1984).

Decision-Making: The MPs ultimately, debates lead to votes on issues, determining the course of legislation and governance help maintain focus on the actual issues and improve the quality of the debate (Strang, 2010). Huber, (1996) states that facing the enemy head on focus has shifted from specific policies to broad generalizations in employing the techniques, more effectively identify fallacies in discussions and debates. The parliamentary debates undermine vital aspect of democratic governance, enabling discussion, dissent, and decision-making within a structured framework (Lulham, & Kaldor, 2013).

Factors influencing parliamentary debates

The factors influence parliamentary debates, shaping how discussions unfold and the outcomes that emerge, as indicated in detail.

Political ideology: The MPs beliefs and values of political parties significantly shape their arguments and strategies during debates in breaking down the argument into components (Van Dijk, 1984). Diermeier, et al. (1998) state that the parliamentary debates allow elected officials to explain their actions and decisions publicly to enable opposition parties to challenge the government and hold it accountable. Employing the strategies, effectively confront opponents in parliamentary debates while advocating for positions and engaging with the broader legislative process (Huber, 1996).

Party whip system: The MPs party whip ensures members vote in line with party positions, which limit individual expression during debates encourage civic participation by highlighting the role of citizens in democracy

(Perrow, and Pulver, 2015). Facing the enemy head-on in parliamentary debates requires a strategic approach keep the debate grounded in factual information to maintain credibility. This has led the MPs to use deceptive tactics to trick their enemies (opposition MPs) into revealing sensitive information used to promote political agendas or social change (Lulham, & Kaldor, 2013).

Public opinion: MPs politicians often gauge public sentiment and may tailor their arguments to align with what constituents want to hear (Pekonen, 2014). The adopting of different values involves understanding of the planning process to interface of top-down and bottom-up approaches during parliamentary debates. However, the parliamentary debates help resolve disagreements through discussion and compromise to implement the policies effectively in different institutions (Van Dijk, 1984).

Media coverage: The way MPs parliamentary debates are reported influence public perception and pressure politicians to adjust their rhetoric when facing the enemy head on (Diermeier, et al. 1998). Huber, (1996) states that the MPs examination of the political debates has led to developing of practices creates tensions when facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in African states. This has led to the MPs to provide a structured environment for conflict resolution, debates contribute to political stability, due to the media exposure of the parliamentary debates (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Historical context: The MPs previous events and long-standing issues can frame current debates, affecting how topics are approached during the parliamentary debates in Africa (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996). These historical context support autonomous adaptations which require an enabling policy environment for their effective implementation of policies in different parliaments. This help the MPs to engage in parliamentary debate reinforces the legitimacy of the legislative process and the decisions made when implementing the policies (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996).

Leadership styles: The leadership of parties' impact debate dynamics, as strong leaders may dominate discussions or set the tone inform the public about important issues, policies, and legislative proposals (Van Dijk, 1984). In most cases, communities in the region are already adapting to changes, including climate change through the parliamentary debates. This may help the MPs to gain public trust using the open discussions enhanced when facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates (Diermeier, et al. 1998).

Coalition politics: In systems where multiple parties must collaborate, the need for compromise can shape debate strategies and topics provide a platform for various viewpoints, reflecting the diversity of opinions in society (Pekonen, 2014). They foster dialogue among different political parties, encouraging cooperation during the parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on. They promote critical analysis and discussion of political ideas and proposals which may be quickly attended to during the parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Debate format and rules: The structure of the debate itself, including time limits and formats, can influence how aggressively or passively MPs engage on issues of national interests during parliamentary debates (Huber, 1996). Yet, Benford, & Snow, (2000) state that the major challenge to the parliamentary debates in the implementation of planned adaptation likely to require a long period of trial and error. The parliamentary debates serve as a learning experience for both lawmakers and the public about governance and policy issues to be addressed before implementation (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Expert opinions and research: The use of data and expert testimony lend credibility to arguments and sway opinions during parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on (Van Dijk, 1984). Laver, and Shepsle, (1996) state the MPs have ways of using autonomous adaptation strategies as an immediate option for many vulnerable people in

different institutions when implementing the policies. The expert opinions conducting research engage in discussions inspiring new ideas and solutions to complex problems in different parliamentary settings (Diermeier, et al. 1998).

Emotional appeals: The MPs rhetoric that appeals to emotions which are persuasive, affecting how arguments are received by both peers and the public (Pekonen, 2014). Laver, and Shepsle. (1996) state that the emotional appeals are aimed at influencing electoral outcomes in various countries in developing frameworks to address threats and promote resilience. This lead the parliamentary debates to provide a more thorough examination and refinement of proposed policies presented before the enemies seeking clarity (Lulham, & Kaldor, 2013).

The use of Points of Order during parliamentary debates

Points of Order are crucial in parliamentary procedure and serve several important functions:

Maintaining order: Points of Order help maintain decorum and ensure that debates are conducted respectfully and according to rules. In other words, they enforce discipline during the parliamentary debates to allow MPs to call attention to procedural violations, keeping discussions on track (Diermeier, et al. 1998). The MPs may misuse Points of Order to disrupt proceedings or delay the parliamentary debates in Africa. It is a tactical manoeuvring to use them strategically to gain an advantage rather than to address genuine concerns during the parliamentary debates (Van Dijk, 1984).

Ensuring fairness: Points of Order provide a mechanism for members to address perceived unfairness in parliamentary debates or decision-making processes in Africa (Huber, 1996). Laver, and Shepsle. (1996) state that it ensures that rules are followed promotes fairness in legislative processes, when MPs provide their opinions. The ambiguous rules regarding Points of Order, lead to confusion about their proper use of the parliamentary debates when implementing the policies in different departments (Benford, &

Snow, 2000). This has led to the inconsistent application or interpretations of rules resulting in inconsistent handling of Points of Order by the MPs, participating during the parliamentary debates (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Clarifying procedures: Points of Order clarify the rules governing the session, helping members understand proper procedures during the parliamentary debates (Diermeier, et al. 1998). Huber, (1996) states that it help prevent mistakes raised by the MPs when introducing the policy which may affect the outcome of legislative actions ordered by the chair controlling the parliamentary debates. Busby, (2013) states that in time-sensitive parliamentary debates, lengthy discussions on Points of Order detract MPs from substantive issues, needed to redress the issues at hand in different departments. This causes frustration due to the extended procedural disputes may frustrate members and hinder effective parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on (Van Dijk, 1984).

Upholding rights of members: Points of Order protect the rights of MPs to speak and participate in discussions, ensuring their voices are heard by the electorate through the media (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015). Busby, (2013) states that the MPs raise concerns about procedural issues that may impact their ability to contribute the development of knowledge during parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on. The chair's discretion in ruling on Points of Order lead to perceptions of bias or unfairness during the parliamentary debates involving the implementation of policies (Benford, & Snow, 2000). As a result, the authority challenges are seen when MPs are in disagreements with the chair's rulings can escalate tensions during parliamentary debates (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996).

Facilitating effective debate: The MPs streamline the discussions in addressing procedural issues quickly, Points of Order help keep debates efficient and focused on the issues raised in parliament (Huber, 1996). This encourages public participation when they feel the rules are being upheld by certain powerful individuals representing the governments in Africa. Busby,

(2013) states that the MPs knowledge gaps exposes the newer or less experienced members to struggle to effectively utilizing the Points of Order due to a lack of understanding. The insufficient training on parliamentary procedures lead to improper use of the Points of Order during the parliamentary debates (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996).

Promoting transparency: Raising a Point of Order by the MPs hold the chair and other members accountable for following the established rules, when altering obscene words known as unparliamentarily (Diermeier, et al. 1998). This boost the public confidence in promoting the transparency in procedures to foster public trust in the legislative process when implementing the policies. In highly polarized environments. Perrow, and Pulver, (2015) states that points of Order are seen as partisan tools, exacerbating conflicts during the parliamentary debates. As a result, distrust in the motives behind policy implementation continues among the political rivalries leading to raising Points of Order (Van Dijk, 1984).

Why parliamentary debates vary significantly across African countries?

The parliamentary debates vary due to differences in political systems, cultural contexts, and institutional structures. Here are some key differences:

System of Government

Westminster model: The countries such as the UK, Canada, and Australia have a parliamentary system where the executive is drawn from the legislature representing their constituencies (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996). The parliamentary debates often focus on party policy lines introduced in the legislature and government accountability when implementing the policies in different departments (Kreps, 1990).

Presidential systems: In countries like the US, the executive is separate from the legislature, the president elects them based on loyalty and expertise to implement the elected government policy (Busby, 2013). The parliamentary debates involve more partisan conflict on issues raised by

the MPs and less immediate accountable to the executive implementing the policies in different departments (Benford, & Snow, 2000).

Debate format

Structured vs. Unstructured: Some parliaments have strict rules regarding speaking times and formats, when formulating the policies, for example, the UK House of Commons has structured question times, while others allow more free-form discussions (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996). While other parliamentary systems allow more open debates to take place with an intention to provide clarity to policies. However, the negative image is shown through the frequent or contentious use of Points of Order creating a perception of inefficiency or dysfunction in parliament (Busby, 2013).

Cultural norms

Confrontational vs. Collaborative: In some cultures, parliamentary debates are more adversarial, such as the UK, which educate the entire public about the country's positions in policy formulations and implementation (Benford, & Snow, 2000). While in other countries such as Scandinavian countries, they emphasize consensus-building, through promoting consistency when formulating the policies to be implemented. However, the MPs public frustration with procedural disputes may lead to decreased interest in parliamentary processes during debates (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996).

Language and rhetoric

The style of parliamentary debates vary based on linguistic and cultural factors of different countries formulating and implementing the policies in different departments in Africa (Reeves, 1983). Some countries prioritize eloquence and rhetoric opinions during the parliamentary debates, while others focus on factual and technical arguments to keep the government in check (Schmitt, 1988).

Role of the Opposition:

In some parliamentary systems, the role of opposition plays a critical role in debates, with

designated time to challenge the government approach indicated briefly (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996). In others, the government may dominate discussions more significantly during parliamentary debates in Africa when implementing policies in different institutions (Reeves, 1983).

Influence of Media:

The role of media coverage differ in African countries, affecting how debates are conducted, in most cases, they side with the ruling party knowingly about shortcomings during the parliamentary debates. In some countries, parliamentary debates are heavily scrutinized by the media, influencing the behaviour of MPs in and outside parliament while reporting back to their constituencies (Benford, & Snow, 2000).

Use of Technology:

The parliamentary debates have integrated technology, such as live streaming and social media engagement, varies, impacting how debates are perceived and participated in by the public (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996). The use of technology is vital for maintaining order, ensuring fairness, and upholding the integrity of parliamentary proceedings during debates. They empower members to engage meaningfully in the legislative process while adhering to established rules during parliamentary debates (Schmitt, 1988).

Civic Engagement:

In some countries, public participation in parliamentary debates is encouraged by the constitution e.g., town hall meetings, shaped by a combination of historical, political, and cultural factors (Reeves, 1983). While in others, parliamentary debates are more insular leading to diverse practices and outcomes, thus, limiting public participation in policy formulation and implementation (Schmitt, 1988).

Similarities between ruling party and opportunities during parliamentary debates in Africa

In many African countries, parliamentary debates often reveal both similarities between ruling

parties and opportunities for engagement. Here are some key points are:

Similarities between ruling parties

Policy agenda: The ruling parties often share similar policy goals, focusing on economic development, infrastructure, and social welfare (Huber, 1996). The MPs time lags changes when facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates affect the economy due to delays in how lagged effects on economic activity. However, its ability to shape expectations may be diminished due to the behaviour shown by the MPs during the parliamentary debates (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Political alliances: The ruling parties form strategic alliances with other parties or interest groups to strengthen their position and ensure legislative support during parliamentary debates (Reeves, 1983). The prolonged periods of debates lead to diminishing interest in stimulating economic growth, as the electorate may become desensitized to further alliances. However, the MPs expectations are influenced by past actions, and a history of inconsistent policies, its guidance may be ignored during parliamentary debates when implementing policies (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996).

Control of Legislative Processes: The ruling parties typically have greater control over the parliamentary agenda, allowing them to prioritize their initiatives and influence debate topics (Huber, 1996). The MPs persistently low interest in facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates encourage excessive risk-taking in financial markets, potentially leading to instability. However, the MPs lack adequate information during the parliamentary debates, lower interest of the electorates and may not lead to increased support for the party showing the effectiveness of this channel (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Use of Parliamentary Whips: The ruling parties may employ whips to ensure party discipline, ensuring members vote in line with the party's stance during debates (Reeves, 1983). The MPs regulatory measures may push each other to

undermine the enemy for pointing out less regulated sectors which reduce the effectiveness of traditional policy tools and increase systemic risk. However, the not all MPs respond uniformly to sensitive issues, they a conditions, leading to uneven economic impacts during the parliamentary debates in different institutions (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996).

Media Strategy: Both ruling parties often utilize similar communication strategies, emphasizing their achievements and framing opposition critiques in a negative light. The expectations are influenced by psychological and behavioural factors of the MPs that can be unpredictable. The MPs during the parliamentary debates may not adjust their behaviour as anticipated, undermining policy effectiveness. However, some MPs may be reluctant to use the media, particularly during periods of economic uncertainty or when they face capital constraints (Huber, 1996).

Opportunities during parliamentary debates

Engagement with opposition: The parliamentary debates provide a platform for opposition parties to challenge the ruling party's policies and present alternative solutions, fostering democratic discourse (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015). Schmitt, (1988) states that facing the enemy head on in parliamentary debates address the audience's concerns frame your responses in a way that resonates with the audience's values and priorities. The posing of questions encourage the audience to think critically about the opponent's claims enforce the points raised by the opposition parties in Africa (Reeves, 1983).

Public participation: The parliamentary debates often attract public interest, allowing citizens to engage with political processes and hold their representatives accountable (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996). Thus, addressing misleading claims from the political enemy misrepresents the argument, calmly clarify actual issues affecting the different the people on the ground despite having parliamentary debates (Schmitt, 1988)

Coalition building: The parliamentary debates facilitate the formation of coalitions among smaller parties, creating opportunities to influence legislation and policy decisions (Martin, 201). Schmitt, (1988) states facing the enemy head on avoid personal attacks to maintain professionalism and focus on the arguments rather than attacking the individual during the parliamentary debates. The learning from peers or mentors to improve the parliamentary debating skills for future encounters analyses the policies before the implementation of policies in different institutions (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996).

Raising critical issues: The parliamentary sessions allow members to highlight pressing national issues, such as corruption, human rights, and governance challenges when implementing the policies (Reeves, 1983). During the parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on in promoting civil discourse in encouraging the respectful dialogue to foster a constructive debate environment (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Legislative reforms: Opportunities for parliamentary debate lead to the introduction of reforms that enhance transparency, accountability, and citizen participation in governance (Laver, and Shepsle. 1996). Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates allows the parties to listen carefully by paying attention to arguments to identify manipulative tactics and respond effectively (Schmitt, 1988).

Awareness and advocacy: Debates can serve as a platform for advocacy on social issues, drawing attention to concerns such as health care, education, and environmental protection (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015). Thus, Martin, and Vanberg. (2011) state that acknowledging the valid points to show you are fair-minded in evaluating the responses after the debate, assess what worked and what didn't in countering manipulative tactics. These similarities and opportunities demonstrate the dynamic nature of parliamentary debates in Africa, highlighting both the challenges and potential for political engagement and reform (Reeves, 1983).

The fallacies of parliamentarians in Africa

Parliamentarians in Africa, like those elsewhere, sometimes engage in logical fallacies during debates and discussions with some common fallacies identified.

Ad hominem: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates gives them the opportunity to attack the character or motives of opponents rather than addressing the issues raised (Martin, and Vanberg. 2011). Schmitt, (1988) states that the overexploitation of natural resources leads to environmental degradation by the powerful foreign states when implementing the policies in different institutions. This undermine constructive parliamentary debates and focus on personal conflicts (Pekonen, 2017). Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates causes vulnerability to climate impacts, such as droughts and floods, affects food security and livelihoods (Reeves, 1983).

Straw man: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates misrepresent an opponent's position to make it easier to attack others when implementing the policies (Martin, and Vanberg. 2011). The insufficient education systems hinder skill development necessary for modern economies needed to be managed by the MPs during parliamentary debates (Pekonen, 2017). Perrow, and Pulver, (2015) state that the skilled professionals often migrate to seek better opportunities abroad, exacerbating local skill shortages when implementing the policies in different institutions. This distort the actual issues at stake and led to misunderstandings during the parliamentary debates to ensure there's progress in promoting effective development (Martin, 2011).

Appeal to emotion: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates gives a platform to make emotional appeals rather than logical arguments to sway opinion (Reeves, 1983). Schmitt, (1988) states that while emotions are important, relying solely on them detract from rational discourse during parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on. The efforts to enhance regional integration often face political

and economic barriers that slow progress during the parliamentary debates (Martin, and Vanberg. 2011).

False dichotomy: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates present issues as having only two sides, ignoring the complexity of situations in one's country (Pekonen, 2017). Pekonen, (2017) states that the countries' economies promote reliant on raw materials are vulnerable to global market fluctuations when implementing policies in different parliamentary debates when implementing policies. The tariffs and trade restrictions limit regional economic integration due to the changing cultural trends when facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates in Africa (Martin, 2011). This oversimplify parliamentary debates and limit potential solutions needed to implement the policies in different institutions, through the development of knowledge and skills (Schmitt, 1988).

Slippery slope: Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates lead to a series of negative consequences without sufficient evidence managing the diverse cultures leading to tensions if not managed inclusively (Martin, and Vanberg. 2011). Perrow, and Pulver, (2015) state that the parliamentary debates allow the migration issues through the internal and cross-border migration creating the challenges in resource allocation and social integration. This create unnecessary fear and hinder rational decision-making when implementing the policies in different institutions, following the heated parliamentary debates (Martin, 2011).

Bandwagon: Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates assuming that a position is valid simply because it is popular or widely accepted with high prevalence of diseases can strain healthcare systems (Reeves, 1983). Schmitt, (1988) states that the Bandwagon reduces workforce productivity due to the underutilization of financial resources in different parliamentary debates in Africa. The limited healthcare access and resources hinder effective responses to health challenges discouraging independent thinking and critical analysis when

implementing the policies (Martin, and Vanberg, 2011).

Red herring: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates introduces irrelevant information to distract from the main issue with the limited access to technology (Pekonen, 2017). The internet hinder economic participation and innovation derailing discussions and prevent resolution of the actual topic to identify the gaps of knowledge from the MPs representing their constituencies (Hix, 2002).

Appeal to authority: Facing the enemy head on relying on the opinion of a perceived authority without critical examination of their argument related to policy formulation (Lijphart, 1999). Perrow, and Pulver, (2015) state that the poor infrastructure limits trade and access to markets, hampering economic growth with inadequate healthcare, education, and sanitation services affect quality of life and productivity. This led some MPs to accept flawed reasoning during the parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on in Africa (Binder, Brandt, Ehn, & Halse, 2015).

Hasty generalization: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates draw broad conclusions from insufficient evidence caused by the significant gaps between wealthy and poor communities hinder inclusive growth (Reeves, 1983). Hix, (2002) states that the high unemployment rates, especially among youth, create social tensions and limit economic participation due to the lack of exposure. This lead to misinformed policies and decisions in making hasty decisions which affect the MPs in generalising the outcome of parliamentary debates in Africa (Pekonen, 2017).

Confirmation bias: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates favour information that supports pre-existing beliefs while disregarding contradictory evidence (Martin, and Vanberg, 2011). Eulau, (1940) states that the corruption, lack of transparency, and weak institutions undermine public trust and effective governance during the parliamentary debates. The historical conflicts and ongoing tensions disrupt development efforts when

implementing the policies in different institutions (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015). This stifle constructive debate and reform during the parliamentary debates engaged by the certain individuals or parties in managing different institutions (Pekonen, 2017).

Why is it difficult to face the enemy head on during parliamentary debates?

Facing an enemy head-on during parliamentary debates can be difficult for several reasons:

Complex rules and procedures: Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates often have strict rules that govern how discussions are conducted without the appropriate mechanisms to assess progress leading to public disillusionment (Reeves, 1983). Schmitt, (1988) states that the MPs without feedback, find it difficult to make necessary adjustments or celebrate successes when implementing policies. These rules limit direct confrontations and require members to articulate their points within set frameworks during the parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on (Martin, and Vanberg, 2011).

Political strategy: Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates often prefer to use indirect methods to criticize opponents during parliamentary debates (Pekonen, 2017). Schmitt, (1988) states that the execution of the strategies lead to unrealistic expectations during the parliamentary debates lead to the stakeholder's disappointment about the services. This includes using rhetoric, framing issues strategically, and appealing to the audience rather than engaging in direct confrontation (Eulau, 1940).

Public perception: Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates direct attacks backfire, potentially alienating constituents when analysing the policies to be implemented by the public officials (Hix, 2002). Perrow, and Pulver, (2015) state that the politicians may choose to maintain a more diplomatic tone to preserve their public image and keep support of the ruling party facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates. As a result, the MPs fall short, during the parliamentary debates,

stakeholders may lose faith in the policy implementation process taking place in Africa (Reeves, 1983).

Coalition dynamics: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates allows the parties to form coalitions or maintain alliances when implementing the policies in different institutions (Martin, and Vanberg. 2011). Hix, (2002) states that the direct confrontation jeopardize these relationships, leading to a more cautious approach in debates to ensure that debates are accessible and engaging for the public. This lead to further disillusionment among the MPs who feel marginalized during the parliamentary debates in most African countries when implementing policies (Lijphart, 1999).

Focus on policy over personal attacks: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates often prioritize policy discussions over personal grievances (Reeves, 1983). The policies that disproportionately benefit certain groups foster resentment and intensify parliamentary debates in Africa. This focus lead to a reluctance to engage in direct confrontations that might shift the focus away from substantive issues during the parliamentary debates (Eulau, 1940).

Emotional control: Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates maintain composure which is crucial in policy formulation and implementations (Martin, and Vanberg. 2011). The direct confrontations escalate tensions and lead to emotional responses, which may undermine a speaker's credibility. While direct confrontation can be effective in some contexts, the complexities of parliamentary dynamics often encourage more nuanced and strategic forms of engagement (Pekonen, 2017).

Research Methodology

Research methodology plays a crucial role in social sciences to provide an in depth of contexts capture the development of knowledge from the authors (Binder, et al. 2015). The research methodology is invaluable in articles, reports and books for its ability to explore new areas, in complementing new ideas. Researchers often use qualitative methods to explore new topics or

areas where little prior research exists, to generate hypotheses for further studies (Reeves, 1983). Schmitt, (1988) states that it allows for a deeper understanding of complex social, economic, or cultural issues by exploring participants' perspectives, experiences, and motivations during the parliamentary debates. The systematic qualitative research aid in the development of new concepts or theories by gathering rich, descriptive data to gather insights from various stakeholders, helping policymakers understand diverse viewpoints and needs (Martin, 2011). The research process for this study consists of three phases. First, a thorough review of articles facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa. Secondly, further books were identified through desktop research facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa. Thirdly, the desktop research was conducted to further strengthen the qualitative research method, in the collection of data from other articles apart of the selected few, these steps are covered as follows;

Phase 1 (Use of old and new articles)

Phase 1, the articles from 1980 – 2022, which provided the clear picture of facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa. As a result, three articles were older, to compare facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa. All the articles, by Buchanan, 1985. Declaration by Design: Rhetoric, Argument and Demonstration in Design Practice, Design Issues, 2(1) pp.4–22; Diermeier, and Timothy, 1998. Cohesion in Legislatures and the Vote of Confidence Procedure. American Political Science Review 92 (3): pp. 611–621; Martin, and Georg, 2008. Coalition government and political communication. Political Research Quarterly 61 (3): pp. 502–516; Martin, 2011. Using parliamentary questions to measure constituency focus: An application to the Irish case. Political studies 59 (2): pp. 472–488; and Umney, Lloyd, & Potter, 2014. Political debate as design process: a frame analysis, Proceedings of the Design Research Society Conference, Umea, June 2014. The use of different scholars reports the access publications from different journals agencies that

provide statistics and analysis relevant to the field of study. This provided a more balanced view, in the collection of data needed to combine the knowledge of facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates in Africa. A wide range of perspectives from different states were examined, focusing on the public officials heading different departments, presented the existence of political capitalism in states. The content analysis was used to analyse the literature by counting the number of articles reviewed (Mewburn, 2009).

Phase 2 (Use of textbooks)

Phase 2, The systematic qualitative research is concerned with feelings, ideas, or experiences from the book by Laver, and Shepsle. 1996. *Making and breaking governments: Cabinets and legislatures in parliamentary democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Lijphart, 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty Six Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press; and Reeves, 1983. *British racial discourse. A study of British political discourse about race and race-related matters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, provided the detailed content depicting the topic. To ensure the results were credible the targeted literature was identified and collected considering the sensitivity of the topic (Corbin, 2008). Utilizing reliable sources and organizing the findings effectively, create well-informed and compelling content that resonates with the audience (Mewburn, 2009). Finding insights that can result in testable hypotheses is the main goal of the data collection, which is frequently done in narrative form. The textbooks explored by the authors provided insights and trends of the parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on. The contextual analysis helps in examining the context surrounding an issue, offering insights into how different factors influence behaviours and attitudes (Schmitt, 1988).

Phase 3, (Use of general articles)

Phase 3, The systematic qualitative research assess the effectiveness of programs or interventions by exploring participants'

experiences and outcomes using desktop research. The availability of the published literature, desktop research, also known as secondary research, involves gathering existing data and information from various sources rather than conducting primary research. Desktop research is a valuable method for gathering existing information to support articles conducted in different articles to identify the gaps left by the selected articles and books, due to the current trends in Southern African politics (Schmitt, 1988). It is difficult to obtain data directly from the public officials due to the busy schedules in governing the institutions of the state. The desktop research contributed to the underlying dimensions involved in providing a variance necessary to analyse the content data from different literature. Therefore, content analysis is a systematic technique used to analyze and interpret textual, visual, or audio content. It's particularly useful in qualitative research for understanding the meaning and context behind various forms of communication (Mewburn, 2009).

Results and Discussions

Parliamentary debates in Africa face challenges like limited public participation, fiscal framework ambiguities, capacity constraints, and constitutional obligations.

Public participation: Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates lead to the limited public participation (Doring, 1995). The public participation through digital governance implementing e-governance initiatives in using platforms for citizen feedback and engagement to enhance accountability

Lack of transparency: The lack of feedback effectively manipulate the parliamentary debating tactics and maintain a strong, credible presence in discussions (Martin, and Vanberg. 2011). This increased transparency and efficiency in local administration when facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates when implementation of policies in different institutions.

Fiscal framework ambiguities: The unclear defined fiscal frameworks are essential for effective budget management following the parliamentary debates and policy implementation in different departments (Schmitt, 1988).

Capacity constraints: The human affect implementation of policies is measured by short-term, and immediate, benefits rather than long-term adaptation strategies (Doring, 1995). The constraints caused by capacity are focused on policy implementation which is well-suited to achieve fruitful parliamentary debates when facing the enemy head on.

Floor-crossing and electoral integrity: Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates encourages floor crossing making it difficult to bring about broad government coalitions after universal suffrage. This often shifting majorities in parliament during the parliamentary debates when implementing the policies when facing the enemy head on (Perrow, and Pulver, 2015).

Party discipline and Independent Judgment: Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates introduced by the parties with a steady majority lead to unnecessary waste of time (Martin, and Vanberg, 2011).

Constitutional obligations: It requires strong oversight mechanisms, effective enforcement of laws, and a commitment to good governance affecting the constitutional tradition moving towards a practice that is not compatible with the modern principle of parliamentary government (Doring, 1995).

Corruption: It impact the effectiveness of parliamentary oversight and the ability of parliaments to hold the executive accountable which is limited by the lack of information. Furthermore, concerns about corruption, and declining public trust undermine the credibility of parliamentary debates (Martin, and Vanberg, 2011).

Discussions

Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates lead to misleading comparisons oversimplifies the argument for public

transportation by conflating it with a broader, unrealistic expectation. In addition, Buchanan, (1985) states that facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates overgeneralizing a point advocates simply be calling for more sustainable practices, not a complete shutdown. The environmentalists want to shut down all factories and put everyone out of work (Doboli, & Umbarkar, 2014).

Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates limited public participation ensure that citizens actively participate in the legislative process is crucial for democratic governance (Doring, 1995). However, public participation in parliamentary debates can be limited due to various factors, such as lack of access to information, language barriers, and limited opportunities for feedback. Facing the enemy head during the parliamentary debates leads to the use of fiscal framework ambiguity creating uncertainty and hinder the ability of parliaments to scrutinize government spending and hold the executive accountable (Perrow, and Pulver, (2015).

Buchanan, (1985) states that facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates led to the human capacity constraints in many African parliaments lack the expertise to effectively discharge their oversight and legislative functions. This lead to delays in processing petitions, limited capacity for research and analysis, and difficulties in engaging with complex issues (Doring, 1995). Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates, MPs are often tasked with fulfilling a range of constitutional obligations, including scrutinizing executive action, enacting legislation, and overseeing the budget. However, fulfilling these obligations can be challenging, particularly when faced with limited resources and political obstacles (Doboli, & Umbarkar, 2014).

Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates, identified corruption and lack of transparency erode public trust in parliament and undermine the legitimacy of the legislative process in addressing the issues faced by the people in different communities

(Perrow, and Pulver, 2015). Facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates, in some African countries, party discipline limit the ability of MPs to exercise independent judgment and hold the executive to account. This can be particularly problematic when members of the executive are accused of wrongdoing (Doring, 1995).

Buchanan, (1985) states that facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates allows "floor-crossing," or party-switching by MPs, raise concerns about electoral integrity and voter representation. It makes it more difficult for parliaments to hold the executive accountable, as MPs may be less likely to vote against their party's interests (Doboli, & Umbarkar, 2014).

Recommendations

Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates, MPs must effectively respond to arguments and maintain a constructive debates indicated in detail.

- The clear and confident communication articulate ways clearly using straightforward language for the enemies facing each other during parliamentary debates. This has led to maintain composure in staying calm and collected, even during heated exchanges in parliaments. When facing an enemy head on during the parliamentary debates clarify your position during the parliamentary debates to ensure it's accurately understood, using words such as, 'my position is that we need to reform the system, not eliminate it entirely.'
- The building of alliances provide the leverage to provide cross-party support seeking common ground with members from other parties on specific issues in parliament. The key messages are reiterated using the core values too reinforce the attitude when facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates. This is strategically used to repeat important points to make them memorable, for the enemy to decide before voting on issues affecting everyone. When facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates point out the misrepresentation explain how it distorts your argument, by using the words such as 'you've

interpreted my point as wanting to eliminate all regulations, but that's not what I said'.

- When facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary refocus the discussion by bringing the conversation back to the actual issue at hand. As an MP must say, 'Let's return to the topic of how we can improve our education system.' Thus engaging the audience connected with voters to frame arguments in a way that resonates with the concerns of constituents with different use of stories affecting the communities. The share of personal anecdotes or relatable examples to illustrate points to encourage fellow members to support their positions on proposed legislation or policies.
- The direct engagement in addressing opponents directly respond to their points head-on to demonstrate confidence to collaborate with supporters working with colleagues who share views to amplify message. The use of questions pose direct questions to challenge their arguments and make them defend their position. When facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates ask clarifying questions, then pose to encourage your opponent to clarify their understanding or reasoning. As an MP must ask politely, Can you explain how my suggestion for reform leads you to believe I want to abolish the program?'
- Countering manipulative debating tactics requires awareness and strategic responses to react emotionally to provocations; stay focused on the debate. Recognizing the manipulative techniques to be aware of common tactics like straw man arguments, ad hominem, or red herrings to clarify misrepresentation. When facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates, use evidence available to identify the facts that reinforce your actual argument and counter the straw man. As an MP must say, 'Studies show that moderate reforms lead to improved efficiency, which is what I'm advocating.'
- Redirect the key issues to the enemy bring the conversation back to the main topic to avoid getting side tracked by manipulative tactics provide evidence to counter false claims and engage the audience. When facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates stay

calm and respectful by maintaining composure to avoid escalating tensions, which help keep the conversation productive. As an MP must say, 'I appreciate your perspective, but let's clarify what we're actually discussing.'

- Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates reflect and adapt to assess what worked and what didn't to improve future engagements. Seek input from colleagues to refine debating strategy in being open to feedback when facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates. When facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates, highlight the importance of accurate representation to address the real arguments to foster constructive dialogue. As an MP must say, 'For a productive discussion, we need to engage with each other's actual positions.'
- Facing the enemy head on during the parliamentary debates, there's need to summarize the key points to reinforce your position. As an MP must say, 'To summarize, my key points are that we need targeted reforms to enhance efficiency and accessibility.'

References

- Benford, R.D.R. & Snow, D.A. (2000) 'Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment', *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, pp.611–639
- Binder, T., Brandt, E., Ehn, P., & Halse, J. (2015) 'Democratic design experiments: between parliament and laboratory', *Co-Design*, 11(4) pp.152-165.
- Bright, J., 2020. 'Why Congress isn't working remotely due to COVID-19', *TechCrunch*, 18 March 2020, <<https://techcrunch.com/2020/03/18/whycongress-isnt-working-remotely-due-to-covid-19/>>, accessed 21 April 2020
- Buchanan, R. (1985) 'Declaration by Design: Rhetoric, Argument and Demonstration in Design Practice', *Design Issues*, 2(1) pp.4–22.
- Busby, A. (2013) *The Everyday Practice and Performance of European Politics : An Ethnography of the European Parliament*, Thesis, University of Sussex.
- Diermeier, D, Timothy J. & Feddersen. 1998. "Cohesion in Legislatures and the Vote of Confidence Procedure." *American Political Science Review* 92 (3): pp. 611–621.
- Döring, H. 1995. "Time as a Scarce Resource: Government Control of the Agenda." In H. Döring (editor), *Parliaments and Majority Rule in Western Europe*, pp. 223–246. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Doboli, A & Umbarkar, A. (2014) 'The role of precedents in increasing creativity during iterative design of electronic embedded systems', *Design Studies*, 35 (3), 298-326
- Emmanuel C, & Jonason, P. 2020. Contemporary challenges facing Parliament; Mutations in time, representativeness, transparency and accountability. Working paper 2020:1
- Ehrlich, P. R. and Ehrlich, A. H., 2013. 'Can a collapse of global civilization be avoided?' *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280/1754 (2013), pp. 1–9,
- Evans, P. and Silk, P., 2008. *The Parliamentary Assembly: Practice and Procedure* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2008)

Conclusion

The capturing the complexity of human experiences and perspectives, of MPs when facing the enemy head on during parliamentary debates in Africa enriches the understanding of various issues and informs decision-making processes across disciplines. These tools can help organizations effectively monitor and analyze sentiment on social media during a crisis, enabling timely and informed responses. It recognizes and address these fallacies is essential for improving the quality of parliamentary debates to foster more effective governance in African countries. Overall, parliamentary debates are essential for fostering a healthy democracy, ensuring accountability, and enhancing citizen engagement in the political process. Addressing these challenges requires coordinated efforts among governments, civil society, and international partners to promote sustainable development, stability, and resilience in Africa.

- Eulau, H.H.H. 1940. 'Early Theories of Parliamentarism', *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 8, (1940), pp. 33–55.
- Hix, S. 2002. "Parliamentary Behavior with Two Principals: Preferences, Parties, and Voting in the European Parliament." *American Journal of Political Science* 46 (3): pp. 688– 698.
- Huber, J.D. 1996. "The vote of confidence in parliamentary democracies." *American Political Science Review* 90 (2): pp. 269–282.
- Laver, M, and Shepsle. K.A. 1996. *Making and breaking governments: Cabinets and legislatures in parliamentary democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lijphart, A. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty Six Countries*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Lulham, R. & Kaldor, L. (2013) 'Creating alternative frames for a retail security problem' in 5th International Congress of International Association of Societies of Design Research, Tokyo, pp. 4637–4648
- Kuta, M., 2020. Head of the General Analyses Department, Parliamentary Institute of the Chamber of Deputies of the Czech Republic, email communication with the author, 14 April 2020
- Kreps, G. A., 1990. The federal emergency management system in the United States: Past and present, *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*, 8/3 (1990), pp. 275–300
- Martin, L.W., and Vanberg. G. 2008. "Coalition government and political communication." *Political Research Quarterly* 61 (3): pp. 502–516.
- Martin, L.W., and Vanberg. G. 2011. *Parliaments and Coalitions: The Role of Legislative Institutions in Multiparty Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, S. 2011. "Using parliamentary questions to measure constituency focus: An application to the Irish case." *Political studies* 59 (2): pp. 472–488
- Mewburn, I. (2009) *Constructing Bodies : Gesture, Speech and Representation at Work in Architectural Design Studios*, Thesis, University of Melbourne.
- Pekonen, O. 2017. 'Parliamentarizing the Estate Diet: The debate on plenum in late 19th-century Finland', *Scandinavian Journal of History* 42, (2017), p. 256.
- Pekonen, O. 2014. Debating the ABCs of Parliamentary Life: The Learning of Parliamentary Rules and Practices in the Late Nineteenth-Century Finnish Diet and the Early Eduskunta (Jyväskylä, 2014), pp. 302–4.
- Perrow, C. and Pulver, S. 2015. 'Organizations and markets', in R. E. Dunlap and R. J. Brulle (eds), *Climate Change and Society: Sociological Perspectives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015, pp. 61–92).
- Prudham, S., 2004. 'Poisoning the well: neoliberalism and the contamination of municipal water in Walkerton, Ontario', *Geoforum*, 35/3 (2004), pp. 343–59, <<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2003.08.010>>
- Reeves, E (1983). *British racial discourse. A study of British political discourse about race and race-related matters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt, C. 1988. *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1988 [1926]), pp. 15–17.
- Strang, J. 2010. 'Why "Nordic Democracy"', in J. Kurunmäki and J. Strang (eds), *Rhetorics of Nordic Democracy* (Helsinki, 2010), pp. 83–113.
- Thoma, R. 1988. 'On the Ideology of Parliamentarism', in *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*, translated by E. Kennedy (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London, 1988), pp. 77–83.
- Umney, D., Lloyd, P. & Potter, S. (2014) Political debate as design process: a frame analysis, *Proceedings of the Design Research Society Conference*, Umeå, June 2014
- Urbinati, N. and Warren, M. E., 'The concept of representation in contemporary democratic theory', *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11 (2008), pp. 387–412, <<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.053006.190533>>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. Amsterdam Philadelphia: J. Benjamins Co.